

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 45,760

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO
PETITIONERS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Exhibit 2024 Is the August 24, 2005 Product Requirements Document Supporting that GuideLiner Rapid Exchange Had Been Tested and Shown to Work for its Intended Purpose by At Least That Date	1
II. Exhibit 2024 Is Authenticated Under Federal Rule of Evidence 901	3
III. Exhibit 2024 Is Admissible Under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(6).....	10
IV. The Authority Relied on by Petitioner Is Unhelpful and Distinguishable	10
V. Petitioner’s Objections Should Also Be Overruled for Failure to Satisfy Rule 42.64(b)	13
VI. Conclusion	14

TABLE OF AUTHRORITES

Cases

Comcast Cable Commc 'ns, LLC v. Veveo, Inc.,
IPR2019-00237, Paper 59 (PTAB Aug. 12, 2020)9

Conoco Inc. v. Department of Energy,
99 F.3d 387 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....9

Hamilton Beach Brands, Inc. v. F'Real Foods, LLC,
IPR2016-01107, Paper 40 (PTAB Dec. 19, 2017)10

Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC,
IPR2019-00929, Paper 53 (PTAB Sept. 21, 2020)..... 10, 11

Lexington Ins. Co. v. Western Pa. Hosp.,
423 F.3d 318 (3d Cir. 2005).....4

Linear Tech. Corp. v. Micrel, Inc.,
275 F.3d 1040 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....11

Riverbed Tech. Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC,
IPR2016-00978, Paper 67 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2017)12

Schroeder v. Smith's Food & Drug Ctrs., Inc.,
2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17830 (D. Nev. Feb. 11, 2014)13

Tremont LLC v. Halliburton Energy Servs.,
696 F. Supp. 2d 741 (S.D. Tex. March 11, 2010)3

United States v. Dhinsa,
243 F.3d 635 (2d Cir. 2001).....3

United States v. Ruggiero,
928 F.2d 1289 (2d Cir. 1991).....3

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1).....14

Fed. R. Evid. 803(6).....10

Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(1) 4, 6, 8

Petitioner’s Motion to Exclude Exhibit 2024 (Paper 111 (“MTE”)) should be denied. The motion attempts to exclude a highly relevant, potentially case-dispositive business document on inconsequential grounds that, at best, could go to the weight of the evidence. No authority cited by Petitioner gives grounds to exclude Exhibit 2024. Substantial testimony and surrounding evidence support the authenticity of this regularly kept business record. From beginning to end, Petitioner’s motion falls flat on exclusion and instead, only further exposes that Petitioner simply cannot overcome Patent Owner’s overwhelming evidence that the GuideLiner patents were conceived and reduced to practice before Itou’s priority date.

I. Exhibit 2024 Is the August 24, 2005 Product Requirements Document Supporting that GuideLiner Rapid Exchange Had Been Tested and Shown to Work for its Intended Purpose by At Least That Date

At Vascular Solutions, Inc. (“VSI”), the Product Requirements document at Exhibit 2024 marked the beginning of the formal regulatory process, or design history process, for bringing the GuideLiner project to market. Ex-2119, ¶44; Ex-2039, ¶6. The document defined “the safety and performance requirements for the [VSI] GuideLiner (OTW) and rapid exchange (RX) guide catheter support system.” Ex-2024, ¶1.1.

As VSI’s founder, CEO, and GuideLiner RX inventor Howard Root explained, Exhibit 2024 would not have been drafted, and the formal regulatory

process that it signaled would not have begun, “if the rapid exchange GuideLiner had not been determined to work for its intended purpose.” Ex-2118, ¶54. Indeed, it was VSI’s business practice to only create the Product Requirements document after a product was “prototyped, thoroughly tested, and shown to work for its intended purpose.” Ex-2039, ¶6; *see also* Ex-1926, ¶18 (“The document was made as a regular practice of developing a product at VSI and was maintained in the regular course of VSI’s business on its network.”). As that business practice was applied here, Exhibit 2024 was created after the April 2005 and July 2005 GuideLiner RX prototypes were built, tested, and shown to work for their intended purpose. Ex-2119, ¶¶21-22, 44; Ex-2039, ¶6. From the time this document was created on August 24, 2005 forward, VSI continued to refine GuideLiner RX prototypes for purposes of manufacturability and commercialization. Ex-2119, ¶44.

As shown on the face of the document, Exhibit 2024 is the first revision, “[p]re-release” of this document, not the final Product Requirements document for the product. Ex-2024 at 4 (“Rev. 01” and “Pre-release”). The August 24, 2005 date of this document is consistent throughout, twice on the first page of the document, and again on the last. *Id.*, at 1, 4. It is also consistently labeled as “Rev. 01” in the top right-hand corner of each of the document’s four pages. *Id.*, at 1-4.

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.