

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 IPR2020-00135
Patent RE45,776

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. The GuideLiner Invention and the Resulting ‘776 Patent	3
III. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	6
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
A. “One or more interventional cardiology devices” (all challenged claims)	7
B. “The segment defining the angled proximal end of the partially cylindrical opening includes at least one inclined region that tapers into a non-inclined region” (dependent claim 36)	10
V. THE PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INVALID	11
A. Ground 1 (Claims 25-27, 29-33, 35-37, 41-45, and 47-49): Itou Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims.....	11
1. Itou (Ex-1007)	11
2. Independent Claim 25	13
3. <i>Dependent Claim 32</i>	16
4. Dependent Claim 36	17
B. GROUND 2 (Claims 39 and 46): The Petition Fails to Show That Itou in Combination With the knowledge of a POSITA Renders the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	19
C. GROUND 3 (Claims 36-37, 52-56): Itou and Kataishi Do Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	19
1. The Challenged Claims Are Patentable for the Same Reasons as Claim 25	19
2. Claims 52 and 53: <i>A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Modify Itou’s Proximal Opening Based on Kataishi’s Distal End to Create an “angled proximal end of the partially cylindrical opening [that] includes at least two inclined regions”</i>	20

i.	Kataishi (Ex-1025)	20
ii.	Petitioner’s Arguments Based on Kataishi’s Distal Opening are Unsupported and Unpersuasive	21
3.	Dependent Claims 36 and 37	25
D.	GROUND 4 (Claims 32, 36-37, 46, 52-56): The Petition Fails to Show that Itou in Combination with Ressemann Renders the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	25
1.	The Challenged Claims Are Patentable for the Same Reasons as Claim 25	25
2.	Claims 52 and 53: A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Itou’s Proximal Opening with Ressemann’s Support Collar Such that “ <i>the segment defining the angled proximal end of the partially cylindrical opening includes at least two inclined regions</i> ”	26
i.	A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated to Modify Itou based on Ressemann’s Fundamentally Different Embolic Protection Device.....	28
ii.	Ressemaann Undisputedly Does Not Disclose a Device with a Segment Defining a Partially Cylindrical Opening that Includes “ <i>At Least Two Inclined Regions</i> ”	30
iii.	The So-Called “Incline #1” in Ressemann’s Support Collar Serves No Purpose in Ressemann	37
iv.	The Purported “Motivations” Are Unsupported and Hindsight-Driven	38
v.	Even if a POSITA Was Motivated to Combine Itou and Ressemann, the Resulting Combination Would Not Work and/or Would Not Satisfy the Claim Language	44
3.	Claim 53: The Petition’s Proposed Combination of Itou with Ressemann’s Collar 2141 Would Not Result in a Lumen Having a “ <i>uniform cross-sectional inner diameter that is not more than one French size smaller</i> ” than the Inner Diameter of the Guide Catheter	49
4.	Dependent Claim 32	51
5.	Dependent Claims 36 and 37	51

E.	GROUND 5 (Claims 52-56): The Petition Fails to Show That Itou in Combination with Enger Renders the Challenged Claims Obvious...	52
1.	The Challenged Claims Are Patentable for the Same Reasons as Claim 25	52
2.	Claims 52 and 53: A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated to Modify Itou’s Proximal Opening in View of Enger Such that “ <i>the segment defining the angled proximal end of the partially cylindrical opening includes at least two inclined regions</i> ” ...	52
i.	Enger (Ex-1050) does not show an opening with two inclined regions.....	53
ii.	Petitioner’s arguments for motivation to combine are fundamentally flawed	56
F.	FOUNDATIONS 3,4, 5: THE REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE OF COPYING SHOWS THAT CHALLENGED CLAIMS 36 and 52-53 WERE NOT OBVIOUS	59
1.	Boston Scientific and QX Medical Copied Version 1 of GuideLiner	60
2.	Petitioner Copied Version 3 of GuideLiner.....	62
G.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because Inter Partes Review Is Unconstitutional	67

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	67
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	13
<i>In re Anova Hearing Labs, Inc.</i> , 809 F. App'x 840 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	43
<i>In re Chudik</i> , 674 F. App'x 1011 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	14
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	13, 14, 16
<i>Mytee Prods., Inc. v. Harris Research, Inc.</i> , 439 F. App'x 882 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	14
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	60
<i>Securus Techs., Inc. v. Glob. Tel*Link Corp.</i> , 701 F. App'x 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	23
<i>Stryker Corp. v. Intermedics Orthopedics, Inc.</i> , 96 F.3d 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	66
<i>Stryker Corp. v. Karl Storz Endoscopy America, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00764, Paper 13 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2015).....	44

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.