

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.A.R.L.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00129
Patent RE45,380

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. BACKGROUND2

III. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART7

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION7

 A. Means for Receiving and Guiding (Independent Claim 25).....7

 B. “Interventional Device” (Independent Claim 25)16

V. THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID17

 A. GROUND 1: Ressemann Does Not Anticipate Independent Claim 2517

 1. Ressemann Does Not Disclose Structure that Is the Same As or Equivalent To the Coaxial Guide Catheter of the ’380 Patent Specification17

 a. Petitioner Fails to Show that Ressemann Discloses Structure that Is *the Same As* the ’380 Patent’s Coaxial Guide Catheter17

 b. Petitioner Fails to Show that Ressemann Discloses An *Equivalent* of the ’380 Patent’s Coaxial Guide Catheter.....20

 B. GROUND 7: Even if it Is Considered to Be Prior Art, Itou Does Not Anticipate Independent Claim 25.....25

 1. Petitioner Fails to Show that Itou Discloses a Means for Receiving an Interventional Device “*from an intermediate or distal portion*” of a Guide Catheter26

 2. Petitioner Fails to Show that Itou Discloses a Means for Guiding and Receiving “*an interventional device*”27

VI. THE PETITION FAILS AS TO SEVERAL DEPENDENT CLAIMS.....28

A.	Ressemann-Based Challenges.....	28
1.	Claim 27 (GROUNDS 1-4)	28
a.	GROUND 1: Ressemann Does Not Anticipate Claim 27.....	28
b.	GROUND 2: Dependent Claim 27 Is Not Obvious in View of Ressemann + Knowledge of a POSITA.....	36
c.	GROUND 3: Dependent Claim 27 Is Not Obvious in View of Ressemann + Kataishi + Knowledge of a POSITA	43
i.	Kataishi (Ex-1225)	43
ii.	A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated to Modify Ressemann’s Proximal Opening Based on Kataishi’s Distal Opening to Create a “ <i>side opening [that] includes at least two different inclined slopes</i> ”	45
d.	GROUND 4: Dependent Claim 27 Is Not Obvious in View of Ressemann + Enger + Knowledge of a POSITA	49
i.	Enger (Ex-1250) Does Not Disclose “a side opening [that] includes at least two different inclined slopes”	49
ii.	A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated to Modify Ressemann’s Proximal Opening Based on Enger’s Guidewire Exit Port to Create a “ <i>side opening [that] includes at least two different inclined slopes</i> ”	52
2.	GROUND 5: Claims 32 and 33 Are Not Obvious in View of Ressemann + Takahashi + Knowledge of a POSITA	54
B.	Itou-Based Challenges.....	57
1.	GROUND 7: Claim 33 Is Not Anticipated by Itou	57

2.	GROUND 9: Claim 27 Is Not Obvious in View of Itou + Kataishi + Knowledge of a POSITA	58
C.	The Repeated Copying of GuideLiner’s Complex Side Opening Supports the Conclusion that Challenged Claim 27 Was Not Obvious.....	59
1.	Boston Scientific and QXMédical Copied Version 1 of GuideLiner	59
2.	Petitioner Medtronic Copied Version 3 of GuideLiner	62
VII.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE INTER PARTES REVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.....	66
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	66
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT COMPLIANCE.....	67
	CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE.....	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	66
<i>Cross Med. Prods. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	10
<i>Freebit AS v. Bose Corp.</i> , IPR2018-00142, Paper 7 (PTAB May 11, 2018)	55
<i>In re Anova Hearing Labs, Inc.</i> , 809 F. App'x 840 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	40
<i>In re Bond</i> , 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	17
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2014)	60
<i>Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.</i> , 780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	33
<i>Laitram Corp. v. Rexnord, Inc.</i> , 939 F.2d 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	8
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....	66
<i>Micro Chem., Inc. v. Great Plains Chem. Co.</i> , 194 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	16
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	8, 33, 34
<i>Odetics, Inc. v. Storage Tech. Corp.</i> , 185 F.3d 1259 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	21
<i>Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	42

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.