

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 IPR2020-00130
Patent RE45,380

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. THE '380 PATENT	4
IV. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
A. “A system for use with interventional cardiology devices adapted to be insertable” and a flexible tip portion/tubular portion “defining a coaxial lumen having a cross-sectional inner diameter through which interventional cardiology devices are insertable” (Independent claims 1 and 12).....	9
VI. THE REFERENCES THE PETITION RELIES ON	11
A. Kontos (Ex-1409).....	11
B. Adams (Ex-1435).....	15
VII. GROUND 1: THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID IN VIEW OF <i>KONTOS</i> , <i>ADAMS</i> , AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF A POSITA.....	19
A. Independent Claims 1, 12: The Petition Fails to Show that Kontos Teaches a “ <i>system for use with interventional cardiology devices</i> ” Having the Claimed Device with a Flexible Tip Portion “ <i>defining a coaxial lumen having a cross-sectional inner diameter through which interventional cardiology devices are insertable</i> ”	19
1. Under the Correct Construction, the Petitioner Fails to Show that Any Challenged Claim Is Invalid	20
2. Even Under the Board’s Preliminary Construction, Petitioner Still Fails to Show that Any Challenged Claim Is Invalid	21
B. Independent Claim 1: The Petitioner Does Not Show that Kontos Discloses a “Cylindrical” Reinforced Portion.....	22

C.	Dependent Claims 2 and 13: Petitioner Has Not Shown that Kontos Discloses a Structure Configured as Claimed Such that it “assists in resisting axial and shear forces exerted by the interventional cardiology device passed through and beyond the coaxial lumen that would otherwise tend to dislodge the guide catheter from the branch artery”	24
D.	Dependent Claim 3: The Petition Does Not Show that a System “. . . wherein the proximal portion of the tubular structure further comprises structure defining a proximal side opening extending for a distance along the longitudinal axis . . . to receive the interventional cardiology devices into the coaxial lumen while the proximal portion remains within the lumen of the guide catheter” Would Have Been Obvious Based on Kontos in view of Adams	28
1.	No Motivation or Reasonable Expectation of Success— Removing Kontos’ Funnel Portion would <i>Create Problems</i>	29
2.	Petitioner’s Modification Requires Ignoring What Adams Actually Teaches.....	33
3.	Petitioner’s Alleged Motivations Are Based on Hindsight And/or Unsupported by the Evidence.....	36
4.	If Modified as Proposed in the Petition, the Resulting Structure Would No Longer Meet the Requirement for a “Coaxial Lumen”	42
E.	Dependent Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19: Petitioner’s Arguments Fail For The Same Reasons as For Claim 3.....	43
VIII.	GROUND II: THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 8 AND 18 ARE INVALID IN VIEW OF <i>KONTOS</i> , <i>ADAMS</i> , <i>TAKAHASHI</i> , AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF A POSITA.....	44
IX.	GROUND III: THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT CLAIM 21 IS INVALID IN VIEW OF <i>KONTOS</i> , <i>ADAMS</i> , <i>BERG</i> , AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF A POSITA.....	49
X.	Claims 3, 9, 14, and 19: Strong Objective, Real-World Evidence Shows Non-Obviousness.....	50

A.	Long-Felt Need.....	52
B.	Commercial Success.....	55
C.	Industry Praise.....	59
D.	Licensing	62
E.	Copying	62
	1. Boston Scientific’s Guidezilla	63
	2. QXM’s Boosting Catheter	65
	3. Petitioner’s Telescope.....	65
F.	There Is Nexus Between the Invention of Claims 3, 9, 14, and 19 and the Objective Evidence of Nonobviousness.....	69
XI.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.....	76
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	77

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	32
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	76
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	24
<i>Fox Factory</i> , 944 F.3d at 1373	69, 75
<i>Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	72
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	25
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	33, 59, 62
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2014)	63
<i>Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enters.</i> , 302 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10
<i>Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 at 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020)	70
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018)	76
<i>Mytee Prods., Inc. v. Harris Research, Inc.</i> , 439 F. App'x 882 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	62

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.