

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

VASCULAR SOLUTIONS LLC;
TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.à r.l.,
ARROW INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
and TELEFLEX LLC,

Court File No. 0:19-cv-1760 (PJS/TNL)

REDACTED

Plaintiffs/
Counterclaim Defendants,

v.

MEDTRONIC, INC. and
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,

Defendants/
Counterclaim Plaintiffs.

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iv

INTRODUCTION..... 1

I. THE PARTIES’ CLAIMS AND TELEFLEX’S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION..... 2

 A. Teleflex’s Claims and Medtronic’s Counterclaims..... 2

 B. Medtronic’s Recently Filed IPRs. 3

 C. Teleflex’s Request for Extraordinary Relief. 4

 D. Teleflex’s Characterization of the Parties is Misleading. 5

II. TELEFLEX’S INTERVENTIONAL BUSINESS UNIT AND ACQUISITION OF VSI..... 5

III. GUIDELINER IS THE LEADING GEC..... 7

IV. TELEFLEX SUCCESSFULLY COMPETES AGAINST BSC..... 8

 A. Teleflex Licensed the Patents-in-Suit to BSC in 2014..... 8

 B. Teleflex Maintained its Large Market Share and High Margin on GuideLiner after BSC Started Selling Guidezilla. 8

V. MEDTRONIC SPENT YEARS DEVELOPING TELESCOPE™ TO BE DIFFERENT FROM EXISTING GECS, INCLUDING GUIDELINER..... 10

 A. Medtronic Designed Telescope™ to Remedy the Deficiencies in GuideLiner and Guidezilla. 10

 B. Telescope™ is Not a Copy of GuideLiner..... 10

 C. Medtronic Emphasizes the Differences between Telescope™ and Other GECS. 12

 D. Telescope™ Can be Successfully Used in Cases that GuideLiner Cannot. 14

VI. THE MINIMAL IMPACT TELESCOPE HAS ALLEGEDLY HAD ON GUIDELINER IS ADMITTELY QUANTIFIABLE. 16

VII. STATE OF THE ART AT THE TIME OF THE ORIGINAL PATENT APPLICATION..... 18

VIII. TELEFLEX’S INITIAL DESIGN AND ORIGINAL PATENT APPLICATION..... 20

 A. Teleflex Initially Worked on a Mother-and-Child GEC..... 20

 B. Teleflex’s Original Patent Application Disclosed a GEC with an Opening *Only* in the Substantially Rigid Portion..... 21

IX. TELEFLEX IMPROPERLY OBTAINED BROADER PATENT CLAIMS TRYING TO COVER ITS CHANGING PRODUCT DESIGN. 22

ARGUMENT..... 25

I. A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION IS AN EXTRAORDINARY REMEDY THAT CANNOT BE GRANTED IN THE ABSENCE OF IRREPARABLE HARM OR SUCCESS ON THE MERITS. 25

II. TELEFLEX HAS NOT AND WILL NOT SUFFER IRREPARABLE HARM. 26

 A. The Welch Declaration Fails to Establish Irreparable Harm. 26

 B. Teleflex Concedes that Any Alleged Harm is Quantifiable..... 29

 C. Teleflex Will Not Suffer Irreparable Loss of Market Share. 30

 D. Teleflex Will Not Suffer Irreparable Price Erosion. 32

 E. Teleflex Will Not Suffer Irreparable Lost Sales of Other Products..... 33

 F. Teleflex Will Not Suffer Irreparable Sales Force Attrition. 33

 G. Teleflex Will Not Suffer Irreparable Harm to Reputation. 34

 H. Teleflex Will Not Suffer Irreparable Loss of Revenue to Fund R&D..... 35

III. TELEFLEX IS UNLIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS..... 37

 A. The Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit are Invalid. 38

 1. The Asserted Claims are Invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103..... 38

- a. Itou, alone and in view of either Ressemann, Kataishi, or Enger, anticipate and make obvious every asserted patent claim. 39
- b. Kontos in view of Adams makes obvious the '380 asserted patent claims, and in view of Ressemann makes obvious the '776 asserted patent claims. 42
- c. Ressemann, alone and in view of the Takahashi publication, anticipates or makes obvious each asserted claim of the '379 and '760 patents. 44
- 2. The Asserted Claims of the '760, '379, and '776 Patents are Also Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for Lack of Written Description. 46
- B. Medtronic Does Not Infringe the Asserted Claims. 48
 - 1. Medtronic Does Not Directly or Indirectly Infringe the '379 Patent Because Neither It nor Anyone Else Forms a Device with a Guide Catheter. 49
 - 2. Medtronic Does Not Directly or Indirectly Infringe the System Claims in the '760 Patent. 51
 - 3. Medtronic Does Not Directly or Indirectly Infringe the System Claims in the '380 Patent. 53
- IV. THE BALANCE OF HARMS FAVORS MEDTRONIC. 55
- V. THE PUBLIC INTEREST WOULD NOT BE SERVED BY AN INJUNCTION. 55
- CONCLUSION 57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Abbott Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Edwards Lifesciences Corp.,
 No. 19-cv-149 (MN), 2019 WL 2521305, (D. Del. June 6, 2019) 25, 30, 34, 56

Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharm., Inc.,
 452 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 26

Acumed LLC v. Stryker Corp.,
 551 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 29

Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Medtronic Vascular, Inc.,
 579 F. Supp. 2d 554 (D. Del. 2008)..... 29

Altana Pharma AG v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
 566 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 37, 38

Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.,
 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 25, 37, 38

Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.,
 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 48

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
 809 F.3d 633 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 30

Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
 678 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 26

Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 46, 47

Automated Merch. Sys., Inc. v. Crane Co.,
 357 F. App'x 297 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 26

CardioVention, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.,
 483 F. Supp. 2d 830 (D. Minn. 2007)..... 11

Celsis In Vitro, Inc. v. CellzDirect, Inc.,
 664 F.3d 922 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 26

Centillion Data Sys., LLC v. Qwest Commc'ns Int'l, Inc.,
 631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 51

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.