

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 IPR2020-00133  
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 *QXM* and *Medtronic* Cases: Parallel Litigation Regarding the  
        Validity of the '760 Patent in the District of Minnesota..... 11

IV. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ..... 13

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 14

VI. MEDTRONIC’S REFERENCES ..... 14

    A. Ressemann (Ex. 1208) ..... 14

    B. Takahasi (Ex. 1210) ..... 16

VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW ..... 18

    A. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. §  
        314(a) ..... 18

    B. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because Medtronic  
        Failed to Justify Its Three-Petition Attack on the '760 Patent.....21

    C. ALL GROUNDS: Medtronic Has Not Shown that Any Challenged  
        Claim Is Obvious in View of Ressemann, Takahashi, and the  
        Knowledge of a POSITA ..... 25

        1. Ressemann Fails to Disclose a “Tubular Structure Defining a Lumen  
            Coaxial ... With the Lumen of the Guide Catheter” (Claim 25.c.i) .26

        2. The Petition Fails to Show that a POSITA Would Have Been  
            Motivated to Completely Eliminate Ressemann’s Emboli Protection  
            Purpose to Achieve the “One-French” Limitation (Claim 25.c.ii) ...28

            a. The Petition’s Modifications Would Render Ressemann’s Device  
                Inoperable for Its Intended Purpose.....29

b. The Petition Fails to Establish a Motivation to Combine Ressemann and Takahashi .....	32
c. Takahash and Ressemann Teach Away from Their Combination .....	35
D. ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Fails to Address Known Objective Evidence of Non-Obviousness.....	36
1. Commercial Success.....	39
2. Industry Praise .....	43
3. Licensing and Licensing Attempts .....	44
4. Copying.....	45
5. Long-Felt Need.....	47
E. The Petition Should Be Denied Because <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is Unconstitutional .....	48
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	49

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	42
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	48, 49
<i>Askeladden L.L.C. v. Encoditech, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00452, Paper 12 (PTAB July 31, 2017) .....	30
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016) .....	39
<i>Comcast Cable Commc 'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00279, -00280, -00282, -00283, Paper 10 (PTAB July 1, 2019).....	23
<i>Comcast Cable Commc 'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-01354, -01355, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020) .....	23
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	29
<i>Dropbox, Inc. v. Whitserve LLC</i> , IPR2019-01018, Paper 13 (PTAB Nov. 1, 2019).....	23
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 dropbF.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	39
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019) .....	19, 21
<i>Freebit AS v. Bose Corp.</i> , IPR2018-00142, Paper 7 (PTAB May 11, 2018) .....	30
<i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020).....	39

<i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01455, Paper 16 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020).....	39
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	36
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	31
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2014) .....	46
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....	49
<i>Merial Ltd. v. Virbac</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper 13 (PTAB Jan. 22, 2015) .....	39
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd., v. Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	18, 19, 20
<i>Pfenex, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals SA</i> , IPR2019-01027, Paper 12 (PTAB Nov. 13, 2019).....	24
<i>Plas-Pak Indus. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 Fed. Appx. 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	30
<i>Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	29, 39, 41
<i>R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.</i> , IPR2018-00629, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2018).....	30
<i>Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. SD3, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01753, Paper 15 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2017) .....	38, 42
<i>Square, Inc. v. 4361423 Canada Inc.</i> , IPR2019-01628, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2020) .....	22

# 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.