

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 IPR2020-00132  
Patent RE 45,760E

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION COMMON TO ALL IPR PETITIONS.....	1
II.	INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT PATENT OWNER RESPONSE...	3
III.	BACKGROUND.....	5
	A. The Revolutionary GuideLiner Product.....	5
	B. The '760 Patent.....	6
	C. The <i>QXM</i> and <i>Medtronic</i> Cases: Parallel Litigation Regarding the Validity of the '760 Patent in the District of Minnesota.....	11
IV.	PRIORITY DATE – PRE-AIA LAW APPLIES.....	14
V.	THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	16
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	16
VII.	MEDTRONIC’S REFERENCES.....	16
	A. Itou (Ex. 1007).....	16
	B. Ressemann (Ex. 1008).....	20
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW.....	24
	A. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because the Itou Reference Is Not Prior Art.....	24
	B. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	27
	C. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because Medtronic Failed to Justify Its Three-Petition Attack on the '760 Patent.....	32
	D. GROUND 1: Medtronic Has Not Shown that Itou’s Suction Catheter Anticipates Any Challenged Claim.....	35
	E. GROUND 2: Medtronic Has Not Shown that Any Challenged Claim Is Obvious in View of Itou and Ressemann and the Knowledge of a POSITA.....	44

::

1. The Petition Fails to Explain Motivation and Reasonable Expectation of Success to Combine Itou with Ressemann’s “Support Collar” ....	44
a. The Petition Does Not Explain Why or How a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Select Ressemann’s Support Collar, Combine It with Itou, and Use It for a Purpose—Facilitating Insertion of Stents or Balloon Catheters—for Which It Is Not Disclosed .....	45
b. The Petition Does Not Address Ressemann’s Teaching that Intravascular Devices Were Prone to “Hang-up” or “Catching” on the Angled Proximal Opening of Its Aspiration Lumen .....	50
c. The Petition Does Not Address How Structural, Non-Diametrical Aspects of Itou Would Be Expected to Successfully Receive Stents or Balloon Catheters .....	51
2. The Petition Fails to Address Known Objective Evidence of Non-Obviousness.....	53
a. Commercial Success.....	54
b. Industry Praise .....	58
c. Licensing and Licensing Attempts .....	59
d. Copying.....	60
e. Long-Felt Need.....	62
F. GROUNDS 3 AND 4: Medtronic Has Failed to Show that There Is a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing as to Its Challenges to Dependent Claim 32 .....	64
G. The Petition Should Be Denied Because <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is Unconstitutional .....	64
IX. CONCLUSION.....	65

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	57
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	64-65
<i>Bettcher Indus. v. Bunzl USA</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	36
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016) .....	54
<i>Comcast Cable Commc'ns LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00279, -00280, -00282, -00283, Paper 10 (PTAB July 1, 2019).....	33
<i>Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-01354, -01355, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020) .....	33
<i>Dropbox, Inc. v. Whitserve LLC</i> , IPR2019-01018, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 1, 2019).....	33
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	54
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019) .....	28-29, 31
<i>Gilead Scis. Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020).....	54, 63
<i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01455, Paper 16 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020).....	54
<i>In re Chudik</i> , 674 F. App'x 1011 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	37
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	53
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	46
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> ,	

829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	46
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (C.C.P.A. 1981) .....	36, 41
<i>Institut Pasteur et al., v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	51, 58, 59
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	44
<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>Johns Manville Corp. et al. v. Knauf Insulation Inc. et al.</i> , IPR2018-00827, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2018) .....	52
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. Wi-LAN Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00704, Paper 14 (PTAB Sept. 5, 2018).....	25
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....	65
<i>Merial Ltd. v. Virbac</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper 13 (PTAB Jan. 22, 2015) .....	54
<i>Mytee Prods., Inc. v. Harris Research, Inc.</i> , 439 F. App'x 882 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	37
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd., v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	27, 29, 30
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. Jazz Pharms. et al.</i> , IPR2016-00002, Paper 12 (PTAB April 12, 2016) .....	51
<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	48, 52
<i>Pfenex, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals SA</i> , IPR2019-01027, Paper 12 (PTAB Nov. 13, 2019).....	34
<i>Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	49, 54, 56
<i>Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. SD3, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01753, Paper 15 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2017) .....	57

# 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.