

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MEDTRONIC, INC. and MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.À.R.L.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2020-00126 (Patent 8,048,032 B2)
IPR2020-00127 (Patent 8,048,032 B2)
IPR2020-00128 (Patent RE45,380)
IPR2020-00129 (Patent RE45,380)
IPR2020-00130 (Patent RE45,380)
IPR2020-00132 (Patent RE45,760)
IPR2020-00134 (Patent RE45,760)
IPR2020-00135 (Patent RE45,776)
IPR2020-00136 (Patent RE45,776)
IPR2020-00137 (Patent RE47,379)
IPR2020-00138 (Patent RE47,379)¹

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, JON B. TORNQUIST, and
CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SNEDDEN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

¹ This Decision addresses identical issues in each of these 11 related cases. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2020-00126, IPR2020-00127 (Patent 8,048,032 B2) IPR2020-00128, IPR2020-00129, IPR2020-00130 (Patent RE45,380) IPR2020-00132, IPR2020-00134 (Patent RE45,760) IPR2020-00135, IPR2020-00136 (Patent RE45,776) IPR2020-00137, IPR2020-00138 (Patent RE47,379)

ORDER

Denying Petitioner's Motion to Compel Deposition of Amy Welch
37 C.F.R. § 42.52

I. INTRODUCTION

With our authorization, Petitioner filed a Motion to Compel Deposition of Amy Welch (Paper 68,² "Motion" or "Mot.") in the instant proceedings. The stated purpose of the deposition is to depose Ms. Welch "regarding the basis for her cited statements and potential related omitted information that may refute or undercut Patent Owner's arguments regarding alleged secondary considerations." Mot. 1. Specifically, "Petitioner wishes to depose Ms. Walsh to expose through cross-examination information omitted from Ms. Welch's declaration that helps refute those positions or shows lack of credibility." *Id.* at 7.

With our authorization, Patent Owner filed an Opposition to the Motion. Paper 72 ("Opp.").

For the reasons stated below, Petitioner's Motion is *denied*.

II. DISCUSSION

A. The Parties' Dispute

With its Patent Owner Response, Patent Owner submitted a declaration from Amy Welch regarding secondary considerations of non-

² Petitioner filed similar motions in each of the above-identified proceedings. For purposes of expediency, we cite to Papers filed in IPR2020-00126 unless otherwise indicated.

IPR2020-00126, IPR2020-00127 (Patent 8,048,032 B2) IPR2020-00128, IPR2020-00129, IPR2020-00130 (Patent RE45,380) IPR2020-00132, IPR2020-00134 (Patent RE45,760) IPR2020-00135, IPR2020-00136 (Patent RE45,776) IPR2020-00137, IPR2020-00138 (Patent RE47,379)

obviousness. PO Resp. 40–41, 46, 48, 50, 53 (citing Ex. 2044³). According to Petitioner, “Ms. Welch’s declaration is the same declaration that was filed in the now-stayed related district court litigation in connection with Patent Owner’s motion for a preliminary injunction.” Mot. 1 (citing Exs. 2043, 2044). Petitioner contends, however, that

Ms. Welch has not been deposed specifically regarding secondary considerations topics, and Petitioner seeks to depose her regarding the basis for her cited statements and potential related omitted information that may refute or undercut Patent Owner’s arguments regarding alleged secondary considerations.

Mot. 1. Petitioner contends that Ms. Welch’s deposition should be compelled as “routine discovery” under 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(1). *Id.* at 2–4. In the alternative, Petitioner contends that Ms. Welch’s deposition is in the interests of justice and should be compelled as “additional discovery” under 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2). *Id.* at 4–9 (citing *Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC*, IPR2012-00001, slip op. at 6–7 (PTAB March 5, 2013) (Paper 26) (precedential) (“*Garmin*”)).

Patent Owner contends that Ms. Welch’s declaration testimony was prepared for the related district court litigation and therefore the cross-examination of Ms. Welch would not fall under routine discovery. Opp. 2–4. Patent Owner contends also that “Petitioner has deposed Ms. Welch on the same testimony in the district court litigation” and that a second deposition will not generate useful information. *Id.* at 5–7. In particular,

³ The declaration of Ms. Welch was filed under seal as Ex. 2043 and a redacted version was filed as Ex. 2044.

IPR2020-00126, IPR2020-00127 (Patent 8,048,032 B2) IPR2020-00128, IPR2020-00129, IPR2020-00130 (Patent RE45,380) IPR2020-00132, IPR2020-00134 (Patent RE45,760) IPR2020-00135, IPR2020-00136 (Patent RE45,776) IPR2020-00137, IPR2020-00138 (Patent RE47,379)

Patent Owner contends that Ms. Welch’s statements regarding secondary considerations were addressed in the previous deposition. *Id.* at 6–7 (citing Ex. 2221, 118:25–120:6 (licensing, market share); 211:1–18 (importance of GuideLiner to overall business); 212:11–213:9 (basis for Ms. Welch’s testimony); 220:13–221:25 (copying); 234:6–237:5 (copying); 239:20–242:7 (basis for Ms. Welch’s testimony); 268:10–269:21 (licensing); 269:22–272:8 (copying); 282:16–283:25 (copying); 294:10–295:21 (sales, market share, licensing)). Thus, according to Patent Owner, another deposition would be redundant and therefore a second deposition is not necessary in the interest of justice. *Id.*

B. Analysis

Discovery is available for the deposition of witnesses submitting affidavits or declarations and for what is otherwise necessary in the interest of justice. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(5). Cross-examination of affidavit testimony prepared for the proceeding falls under “routine discovery.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(1)(ii) (“Cross examination of affidavit testimony prepared for the proceeding is authorized . . .”). For testimony not prepared for the proceeding, “additional discovery” is available if the party seeking additional discovery can show “that such additional discovery is in the interests of justice.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2)(i). In this case, the parties agree that the Ms. Welch’s declaration is the same declaration that was prepared for and filed in the related district court litigation rather than the specific proceedings before the Board. Mot. 1; Opp. 2. Consequently, the testimony of Ms. Welch was prepared for another proceeding and her cross-

IPR2020-00126, IPR2020-00127 (Patent 8,048,032 B2) IPR2020-00128, IPR2020-00129, IPR2020-00130 (Patent RE45,380) IPR2020-00132, IPR2020-00134 (Patent RE45,760) IPR2020-00135, IPR2020-00136 (Patent RE45,776) IPR2020-00137, IPR2020-00138 (Patent RE47,379)

examination in this proceeding is not “routine discovery.” 37 C.F.R.

§ 42.51(b)(1)(ii).

We thus consider whether cross-examination of Ms. Welch as additional discovery is in the interest of justice under 37 C.F.R.

§ 42.51(b)(2)(i). The Board has identified factors important in determining whether the additional discovery request meets the standard of being “in the interest of justice.” *Garmin* at 6–7. In *Garmin*, we held that the following 5 factors (the so-called “*Garmin* factors”) are important in determining whether the additional discovery sought is in the interest of justice: (1) whether there exists more than a possibility and mere allegation that something useful will be discovered; (2) whether the requests seek the other party’s litigation positions and the underlying basis for those positions; (3) whether the moving party has the ability to generate equivalent information by other means; (4) whether the moving party has provided easily understandable instructions; and (5) whether the requests are overly burdensome. *Id.*

Having reviewed Patent Owner’s request and arguments, we find that the *Garmin* factors do not weigh in favor of allowing additional discovery. In particular, we find *Garmin* Factor 1 dispositive. When assessing this factor, “[t]he mere possibility of finding something useful, and mere allegation that something useful will be found, are insufficient to demonstrate that the requested discovery is necessary in the interest of justice.” *Garmin*, Paper 26, at 6. To that point, Petitioner seeks to depose Ms. Welch to uncover “potential related omitted information that may refute

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.