# 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 IPR2020-00134 Patent RE 45,760E

### PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION



# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTR	TRODUCTION COMMON TO ALL IPR PETITIONS1				
II.	INTR	NTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT PATENT OWNER RESPONSE				
III.	BACKGROUND					
	A.	The Revolutionary GuideLiner Product	5			
	B.	The '760 Patent	7			
	C.	The <i>QXM</i> and <i>Medtronic</i> Cases: Parallel Litigation Regarding the Validity of the '760 Patent in the District of Minnesota	9			
IV.	PRIO	PRIORITY DATE – PRE-AIA LAW APPLIES				
V.	THE	THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART13				
VI.	CLA	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION13				
VII.	MED	TRONIC'S REFERENCES	13			
	A.	Itou (Ex. 1607)	13			
	B.	Ressemann (Ex. 1608)	17			
	C.	Takahashi (Ex. 1610)	20			
VIII.	THE	BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW	22			
	A.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because the Itou Reference Is Not Prior Art	22			
	B.	ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	26			
	C.	ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because Medtronic Failed to Justify Its Three-Petition Attack on the '760 Patent	31			
	D.	GROUND 1: Medtronic Has Not Shown that Itou's Suction Catheter Anticipates Any Challenged Claim	33			



GROUND 2: Medtronic Has Not Shown that Any Challenged Claim Is Obvious in View of Itou and Ressemann and the Knowledge of a POSITA						
1. The Petition Incompletely Addresses Only Interior Lumen Diameter with Respect to the "configured to receive one or more stents or balloon catheters" Limitation (Claim 48.c.iii 51.c.iiii, 53.c.iii)						
2. The Petition Fails to Explain Both Motivation to Combine with Ressemann's "Support Collar" and Reasonable Expectation of Success in Doing So (Claim 48.c.iii, 51.c.iii 53.c.iii)	i,					
F. GROUND 3: Medtronic Has Failed to Show that There Is a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing as to Its Challenge to Dependent Claim 52						
GROUND 4: Medtronic Has Not Shown that Any Challenged Claim Is Obvious in View of Ressemann, Takahashi, and the Knowledge of a POSITA						
1. Ressemann Fails to Disclose a "Tubular Structure Defining Lumen Coaxial with the Lumen of the Guide Catheter" (Claims 48.c.i, 51.c.i, 53.c.1)						
2. The Petition Fails to Show that a POSITA Would Have Bed Motivated to Completely Eliminate Ressemann's Emboli Protection to Achieve the "One-French" Limitation (Claim 48.c.ii, 51.c.ii, 53.c.ii)	8					
a. The Petition's Modifications Would Render Ressems Device Inoperable for Its Intended Purpose						
b. The Petition Fails to Establish a Motivation to Combine Ressemann and Takahashi	52					
c. Takahashi and Ressemann Teach Away from Their Combination	54					
H. GROUNDS 2-4: The Petition Fails to Address Known Objective Evidence of Non-Obviousness	55					



		1.	Commercial Success	58		
		2.	Industry Praise	61		
		3.	Licensing and Licensing Attempts	63		
		4.	Copying	63		
		5.	Long-Felt Need	66		
	I.		Petition Should Be Denied Because <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is onstitutional	67		
IX.	CONCLUSION6					

# **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### Cases

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,         839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)       61
Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)67
Askeladden L.L.C. v. Encoditech, LLC, IPR2017-00452, Paper 12 (PTAB July 31, 2017)51
Bettcher Indus. v. Bunzl USA, Inc., 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)
Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc., IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016)58
Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc., IPR2019-00279, -00280, -00282, -00283, Paper 10 (PTAB July 1, 2019)32
Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc., IPR2019-01354, -01355, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020)32
Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)50
<i>Dropbox, Inc. v. Whitserve LLC</i> , IPR2019-01018, Paper 13 (PTAB Nov. 1, 2019)32
Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co., 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)58
E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp., IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019)
Freebit AS v. Bose Corp., IPR2018-00142, Paper 7 (PTAB May 11, 2018)51
Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States, IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020)



# DOCKET

# 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.

