

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 IPR2020-0135, IPR2020-0136
Patent RE 45,776E

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE TO PETITIONER'S EXPLANATION OF
MATERIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PETITIONS AND PETITION
RANKING FOR U.S. PATENT NO. RE 45,776E**

Petitioners Medtronic, Inc. and Medtronic Vascular, Inc. (collectively “Medtronic”) filed two separate petitions against the ’776 patent, challenging a total of only 27 claims.

Medtronic’s strategic choice to rely on a section 102(e) reference does not justify institution of multiple petitions. Medtronic contends it needs two petitions because Teleflex is asserting an invention date that pre-dates the Itou reference (Ex. 1007). Paper 3 at 1-3. Teleflex did invent before the priority date of Itou. Indeed, Itou’s prior art status is at issue in the parallel district court litigation, and Medtronic was aware of substantial corroborated evidence showing Teleflex’s prior invention before it filed its Petitions. Nevertheless, Medtronic chose to rely on a § 102(e) reference and did *not even try to address* the issue of Teleflex’s invention date in its Petitions. Thus, this is not one of the “rare” cases in which “two petitions by a petitioner may be needed.” November 2019 Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (“TPG”) at 59. Where, as here, a Petitioner proceeds with filing petitions relying on a primary reference that it knows full-well is likely to be antedated, two petitions are not justified.

Medtronic cites *Microsoft Corp. v. IPA Techs Inc.*, IPR2019-00810, Paper 12 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2019). See Paper 3 at 2. But *Microsoft* was different. First, the petitioner in *Microsoft* explained that the “main difference” between its petitions was that each petition challenged different claims. *Microsoft*, IPR2019-

00810, Paper 12 at 12. Thus, denying one of the petitions would completely eliminate the petitioner's opportunity to challenge those claims. Here, in contrast, Medtronic filed two petitions attacking the *same* claims based on different references. Second, while Medtronic is correct that there was a potential dispute about the priority date of Microsoft's Kiss reference, the petitioner explained that "the same analysis of the combination of Kiss/FIPA97 is the basic prior art challenge to every claim in each petition." *Id.* Paper 9 at 1-2 (emphasis added). Thus, if the Kiss reference was found to not qualify as prior art, all of the petitions would fail. Consequently, the petitioner's filing of multiple petitions was clearly not intended to provide a "back-up" petition because of a potential priority issue.

Medtronic's reliance on *Microsoft* is inapt. Indeed, the Board routinely declines to institute multiple petitions, even where there is a priority date dispute. *See, e.g., Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.*, IPR2019-01354, Paper 10 at 6 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020) (denying institution of two of three petitions where a potential priority dispute existed); *Dropbox, Inc. v. Whitserve LLC*, IPR2019-01018, Paper 13 at 8-9 (PTAB Nov. 1, 2019) (denying institution of a second petition where parties disputed the priority date of multiple prior art references); *Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.*, IPR2019-00279, Paper 10 at 6-7 (PTAB July 1, 2019) (declining to institute four of five filed petitions where a potential priority dispute existed).

Medtronic’s strategic choice to include excessive, duplicative challenges to the same claims does not justify institution of multiple petitions. Medtronic contends that the number and length of the claims requires two petitions. Paper 3 at 3-4. But here, the Petitions challenge only a total of twenty-seven claims—hardly an unusually high number. Medtronic’s contention that it could not fit all arguments into a single petition is a problem it created itself by failing to judiciously select and streamline its strongest arguments. Medtronic’s petitions contain many duplicative grounds:

- **Five** separate grounds against each of claims 53-56. IPR2020-00135, Paper 1 at 7 (Grounds 3, 4, 5); IPR2020-00136, Paper 1 at 8 (Grounds 2, 4).
- **Five** separate grounds against claim 52. IPR2020-00135, Paper 1 at 7 (Grounds 3, 4, 5); IPR2020-00136, Paper 1 at 8 (Grounds 1, 3).
- **Four** separate grounds against each of claims 36 and 37. IPR2020-00135, Paper 1 at 7 (Grounds 1, 3, 4); IPR2020-00136, Paper 1 at 8 (Ground 1).

Again, Medtronic’s reliance on *Microsoft* is inapposite. *Microsoft* concerned five petitions challenging **89 claims**; here Medtronic uses two petitions to challenge only **27 claims**. See *Microsoft*, IPR2019-00810, Paper 12 at 14. Medtronic’s deliberate drafting choices do not reasonably justify its choice to

pursue an overly burdensome, inefficient, and unfairly duplicative attack on the '776 patent. *See, e.g., Pfenex, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals SA*, IPR2019-01027, P12 at 13-14 (PTAB Nov. 13, 2019) (“[T]he mere fact that Petitioner may have had additional art to assert, including a different statutory basis for asserting that art, does not, on these facts, justify the additional burden of a second petition directed to the same claims.”).

Instituting both petitions will result in inefficiency and unfairness. As discussed above, Medtronic is aware that Teleflex intends to swear behind Itou, and parallel district court litigation addressing this issue is ongoing. Concurrent adjudication of these issues before the district court and the Board will result in duplicative work, unnecessary and counterproductive litigation costs, the possibility of inconsistent decisions, and will not promote the efficient administration of the Office or the integrity of the patent system. *See* TPG at 56 (the Director must consider “the effect of any such regulation [under this section] on the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter”). For the reasons set forth in Patent Owner’s Preliminary Responses to Petitions, the Board should deny both petitions. However, if the Board is inclined to institute trial on one of the petitions, institution on only the Kontos-based petition (IPR2020-0136) would avoid at least some of these

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.