

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 IPR2020-00136
Patent RE 45,776

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 '776 Patent | 6 |
| C. | The <i>QXM</i> and <i>Medtronic</i> Cases: Parallel Litigation Regarding the Validity of the '776 Patent in the District of Minnesota..... | 12 |
| IV. | THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART | 16 |
| V. | CLAIM CONSTRUCTION | 16 |
| VI. | MEDTRONIC'S REFERENCES..... | 16 |
| A. | Kontos (Ex. 1409) | 16 |
| B. | Ressemann (Ex. 1408)..... | 18 |
| C. | Takahashi (Ex. 1410) | 21 |
| D. | Kataishi (Ex. 1425)..... | 22 |
| VII. | THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW | 24 |
| A. | ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)..... | 24 |
| B. | ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Should Be Denied Because Medtronic Failed to Justify Its Multiple-Petition Attack..... | 28 |
| C. | ALL GROUNDS: Medtronic Has Not Shown That the Claimed Guide Extension Catheter, Including a “Partially Cylindrical Opening,” Would Have Been Obvious Based on Kontos and Ressemann | 31 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1. | The Petition Does Not Address Why One Skilled in the Art Would Focus on Ressemann’s Support Collar to Define a Partially Cylindrical Opening | 33 |
| 2. | The Petition Does Not Address Reasons Why a POSITA Would Be Motivated <i>Not</i> to Make the Combination..... | 36 |
| 3. | The Motivations Identified in the Petition Ignore Key Considerations That Are Necessary for the Board to Assess Likelihood of Success and Therefore Are Unsupported..... | 42 |
| D. | GROUND 2 AND 4: Medtronic Has Not Shown That It Would Have Been Obvious to Make the Inner Diameter of Kontos’s Lumen “Not More Than One French Size Smaller” Than That of the Guide Catheter..... | 46 |
| E. | GROUND 3 and 4: Medtronic Has Not Shown That It Would Have Been Obvious to Modify the Proximal End of Kontos’s Guide Catheter Body Based on the Distal End of Kataishi’s Suction Catheter | 49 |
| F. | ALL GROUNDS: The Petition Failed to Address Known, Strong Objective Evidence of Non-Obviousness | 54 |
| 1. | Commercial Success | 58 |
| 2. | Industry Praise..... | 61 |
| 3. | Licensing and Licensing Attempts | 63 |
| 4. | Copying..... | 63 |
| 5. | Long-Felt Need | 66 |
| J. | The Petition Should Be Denied Because <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is Unconstitutional | 67 |
| VIII. | CONCLUSION..... | 68 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|--|--------|
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 61 |
| <i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017) | 37 |
| <i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019) | 68 |
| <i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016) | 58 |
| <i>Comcast Cable Commn'cs, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00279, -00280, -00282, -00283, Paper 10 (PTAB July 1, 2019) | 31 |
| <i>Comcast Cable Commn'cs., LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-01354, -01355, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2020) | 31 |
| <i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) | 39 |
| <i>Dropbox, Inc. v. Whitserve LLC</i> , IPR2019-01018, Paper 13 (PTAB Nov. 1, 2019) | 31 |
| <i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019) | 26, 28 |
| <i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020) | 58 |
| <i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01455, Paper 16 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020) | 58 |
| <i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 55 |
| <i>Institut Pasteur v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 62, 63 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| <i>Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2014)..... | 64 |
| <i>Kahn v. GMC</i> , 135 F.3d 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... | 46 |
| <i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018) | 68 |
| <i>Merial Ltd. v. Virbac</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper 13 (PTAB Jan. 22, 2015)..... | 58 |
| <i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd., v. Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) | 25 |
| <i>Pfenex, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals SA</i> , IPR2019-01027, Paper 12 (PTAB Nov. 13, 2019) | 32 |
| <i>Plas-Pak Indus. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 40 |
| <i>Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 38, 60 |
| <i>Resmed Ltd. v. Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-01724, Paper 50 (PTAB Mar. 7, 2018)..... | 38 |
| <i>Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. SD3, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01753, Paper 15 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2017)..... | 57, 61 |
| <i>Square, Inc. v. 4361423 Canada Inc.</i> IPR2019-01628, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2020)..... | 30, 31 |
| <i>Stryker Corp. et al.v. KFx Medical, LLC</i> , IPR2019-00817, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2019) | 58 |
| <i>Stryker Corp. v. Intermedics Orthopedics, Inc.</i> , 96 F.3d 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1996) | 66 |
| <i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> , 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 55 |

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.