

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MEDTRONIC, INC., AND MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.À.R.L.,

Patent Owner.

IPR2020-00126

IPR2020-00128

IPR2020-00129

IPR2020-00132

IPR2020-00134

IPR2020-00135

IPR2020-00137

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
ADDRESSING CONCEPTION AND REDUCTION TO PRACTICE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	TELEFLEX DOES NOT ARGUE CRTP CLAIM-BY-CLAIM AND, THUS, HAS NOT CARRIED ITS BURDEN.....	2
III.	TELEFLEX CANNOT PROVE CONCEPTION BEFORE ITOU.....	3
A.	Teleflex proffers no corroborating evidence.	4
B.	Teleflex’s conception documents do not disclose a side opening.	5
IV.	TELEFLEX CANNOT PROVE REDUCTION TO PRACTICE BEFORE ITOU.....	7
A.	Teleflex is missing key documents.....	8
B.	Teleflex’s documents do not prove reduction to practice.	11
1.	At most four documents relate to particular prototypes.....	11
2.	No document shows that VSI assembled RX prototypes.	16
C.	No evidence shows that VSI performed tests to determine that RX would work for its intended purpose.	17
D.	No testimony corroborates the inventors.	19
1.	Erb	19
2.	Schmalz	21
3.	Keith	22
E.	VSI’s complete GuideLiner record shows that VSI could not have reduced to practice before Itou.	22
1.	In mid-to-late 2005, GuideLiner was in early-stage concept development.....	22
2.	VSI was still experimenting into 2006.....	24
3.	VSI still did not have a working prototype in 2008.....	26
V.	TELEFLEX CANNOT PROVE DILIGENCE.	28
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Aparator Miitors ApS v. Kamstrup A/S</i> , 887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	passim
<i>ATI Techs. ULC v. Iancu</i> , 920 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	2, 28
<i>Curt Mfg., LLC v. Horizon Global Ams. Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00625, 2020 WL 4687044 (PTAB Aug. 11, 2020)	4
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	2
<i>Gen. Access Sols., Ltd. v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.</i> , 811 F. App’x 654 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	2
<i>Hahn v. Wong</i> , 892 F.2d 1028 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	8
<i>In re Meyer Mfg. Corp.</i> , 411 F. App’x 316 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	30
<i>Kolcraft Enters., Inc. v. Graco Children’s Prods., Inc.</i> , 927 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	4
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	8
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	28
<i>REG Synthetic Fuels, LLC v. Neste Oil Oyj</i> , 841 F.3d 954 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	3
<i>Singh v. Brake</i> , 222 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	8
<i>Sprint Commc’ns Co. v. Comcast IP Holdings, LLC</i> , No. 12-1013-RGA, 2015 WL 452289 (D. Del. Jan. 30, 2015)	20

Toshiba Memory Corp. v. Anza Tech., Inc.,
IPR2018-01597, 2020 WL 1229855 (PTAB Mar. 12, 2020)30

Tyco Healthcare Grp. v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.,
514 F. Supp. 2d 351 (D. Conn. 2007).....26

Valencell, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.,
784 F. App'x 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....16

Statutes

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3)2, 29

I. INTRODUCTION

Teleflex asserts invention before Itou's September 23, 2005 effective filing date. But Teleflex cannot prove reduction to practice because no documents show that VSI built and tested prototypes. And no documents *or testimony* address testing *the intended purpose*: providing increased backup support during complex PCI procedures. Indeed, non-inventor Erb, on whom Teleflex relies for corroboration, shredded his laboratory notebook. Teleflex blames its lack of proof-of-concept documents on VSI's practice of not retaining them, but documents that VSI *did* keep show that it built and tested non-inventive over-the-wire (OTW) GuideLiner devices, not rapid-exchange (RX) devices. Indeed, the more complete record shows that VSI could not have reduced to practice in 2005.

Moreover, Teleflex's claim-by-claim arguments sit in appendices to a declaration: Teleflex improperly incorporates by reference. That error ends the analysis because Teleflex bears the burden of proving prior invention.

Substantively and procedurally, Teleflex's attempt to show prior invention fails.¹

¹ Further, because the '380, '760, '776, and '379 patents lack written description for at least one claim, they are AIA patents (first to file, not first to invent), and Teleflex cannot swear behind. *See* Medtronic's Reply.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.