

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 SUR-REPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. Claim Construction: The Structure “Through Which Interventional Cardiology Devices Are Insertable” Requires At Least the Defined Set of Guidewires, Balloon Catheters, Stents, and Stent Catheters Be Insertable	2
III. Petitioner Has Not Shown that the Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious.....	3
A. The Board Should Reject Petitioner’s New Theory Relying on Extensive Additional Modifications to Material Aspects of Kontos	3
B. All Challenged Claims (Ground 1): Petitioner Has Not Shown that Kontos’s Support Catheter Has a “Cross-Sectional Inner Diameter Through Which Interventional Cardiology Devices are Insertable” As Required by Independent Claims 1 and 12	7
C. Claim 1 (Ground 1): Petitioner Has Not Shown that Kontos Discloses the Claimed “Flexible Cylindrical Reinforced Portion”	9
D. Dependent Claims 2 and 13 (Ground 1): Petitioner Has Not Shown that Kontos Would Inherently Resist Axial and Shear Forces as Claimed	10
E. Dependent Claims 3, 4, 9, 14, and 19 (Ground 1): Petitioner Has Not Shown that a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Modify Kontos to Arrive at the Claimed Proximal Opening with a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	11
1. Petitioner has not shown that a POSITA would be motivated, with a reasonable expectation of success, to replace Kontos’s funnel with a side opening	12
2. Petitioner’s other motivations are unsupported and driven by hindsight.....	16

3.	Petitioner’s modification would create a problematic gap/catch point where none existed before	18
F.	Dependent Claims 3 and 9 (Ground 1): Petitioner Has Not Shown its Proposed Kontos Modifications Would Meet the “Coaxial” Limitation	20
G.	Dependent Claims 8 and 18 (Ground 2): Petitioner Has Not Shown That it Would Have Been Obvious to Modify Kontos to Meet the “One French” Limitation.....	23
IV.	Compelling Objective Evidence of Non-Obviousness Confirms that Claims 3, 9, 14, and 19 Were Not Obvious	24
A.	The Objective Evidence Is Undisputed.....	24
B.	The Combination of Features that Resulted in GuideLiner’s Success and Praise Is Not in the Prior Art	25
C.	Copying by All GuideLiner’s Competitors Confirms Non-Obviousness.....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	29
<i>Comcast Cable Communs., LLC v. Promptu Sys. Corp.</i> , 2021 U.S. App. LEXIS 42 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 4, 2021)	10
<i>Howmedica Osteonics Corp. v. Zimmer, Inc.</i> , 640 F. App'x 951 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	11
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	11
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5, 8, 10
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	28, 29
<i>Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020)	26
<i>Liqwd, Inc. v. L'Oreal USA, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1133 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	28
<i>Mytee Prods. v. Harris Rsch., Inc.</i> , 439 F. App'x 882 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11
<i>Real Time Data, LLC v. Iancu</i> , 912 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	24
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	2
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	26, 27

Other Authorities

PTAB Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (November 2019)..... 8, 11, 17, 23

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....23

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)11

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.