# 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 RE45,776

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTR	RODUCTION1
II.	BAC	KGROUND3
	A.	The GuideLiner Invention
	B.	The '776 Patent4
III.	THE	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART8
IV.	HAS OBV	GROUNDS AND ALL CHALLENGED CLAIMS: PETITIONER NOT SHOWN THAT KONTOS AND RESSEMANN RENDER IOUS THE CLAIMED GUIDE EXTENSION CATHETER HAVING ARTIALLY CYLINDRICAL OPENING"9
	A.	Kontos (Ex-1409)9
	B.	Ressemann (Ex-1408)
	C.	A POSITA Would Not Combine Kontos with Ressemann to Create a "partially cylindrical opening having an angled proximal end"16
		1. Removing Konto's Funnel Would Create Problems, Not Solve Them17
		2. Petitioner's Alleged Motivations Are Based on Hindsight and/or Unsupported by the Evidence22
V.	37, A	UND 1: THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 52, 36-ND 49 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS BASED ON KONTOS IN OF RESSEMANN FOR ADDITIONAL REASONS29
	A.	Claim 52
		1. Ressemann Undisputedly Does Not Disclose a Device with a Segment Defining a Partially Cylindrical Opening that Includes At Least Two Inclined Regions
		2. The Tip of the Tab Portion in Ressemann's Support Collar Serves No Purpose in Ressemann
		3. Even if a POSITA Was Motivated to Combine Kontos and Ressemann, the Petitioner Has Not Shown that the Resulting Combination Would Satisfy the Claim Language and Would Be Reasonably Expected to Work
	B.	Claims 36 and 3742



	C.	Claim 49	13
VI.	VIEV	UND 2: THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT KONTOS IN VOF RESSEMANN AND TAKAHASHI RENDERS CLAIMS 53-56 30-32 OBVIOUS	
VII.	VIEV	UND 3: THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT KONTOS IN V OF RESSEMANN AND KATAHASHI RENDERS CLAIM 52 IOUS	17
	A.	Kataishi (Ex-1425)	18
	B.	Petitioner's Obviousness Arguments Based on Kataishi Are Without Merit	
VIII.	ARE	UND 4: THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 53-56 OBVIOUS OVER KONTOS IN VIEW OF RESSEMANN, AHASHI, AND KATAISHI	53
IX.	ALL GROUNDS: OBJECTIVE, REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE ALSO SHOWS THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WERE NOT OBVIOUS 5		
	A.	Long-Felt Need	55
	B.	Commercial Success	58
	C.	Industry Praise	52
	D.	Licensing	55
	E.	Copying	56
		1. Boston Scientific Guidezilla	56
		2. QXM's Boosting Catheter	59
		3. Petitioner's Telescope	59
	F.	There Is Nexus Between the Invention of Claims 25, 52 and 53 and the Objective Evidence of Nonobviousness	73
X.		HE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE INTER PARTES EVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL	30
CERT	ΓIFICA	ATE OF WORD COUNT COMPLIANCE	32
CEDT	riri <i>c</i> /	ATION OF CEDVICE	2



### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Cases**

Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods., 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	21
Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	80
Fox Factory, v. SRAM, LLC, 944 F.3d at 1373 (201973,	, 79
Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp., 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	75
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	43
Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino, 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)22, 62,	, 65
Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd., 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	29
Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc., IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020)	73
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018)	80
Mytee Prods., Inc. v. Harris Research, Inc., 439 F. App'x 882, (Fed. Cir. 2011)	43
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg.</i> Co., 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	66
Securus Techs., Inc. v. Glob. Tel*Link Corp., 701 F. App'x 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	51
Stryker Corp. v. Intermedics Orthopedics, Inc., 96 F.3d 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	72
Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc., 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	54
WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.,	66



# **TABLE OF EXHIBITS**

Exhibit	Description
2001	[Reserved]
2002	[Reserved]
2003	[Reserved]
2004	[Reserved]
2005	[Reserved]
2006	[Reserved]
2007	[Reserved]
2008	[Reserved]
2009	[Reserved]
2010	[Reserved]
2011	[Reserved]
2012	[Reserved]
2013	[Reserved]
2014	[Reserved]
2015	[Reserved]
2016	[Reserved]
2017	[Reserved]
2018	[Reserved]
2019	[Reserved]
2020	[Reserved]
2021	[Reserved]
2022	[Reserved]
2023	[Reserved]
2024	[Reserved]
2025	[Reserved]
2026	[Reserved]
2027	[Reserved]
2028	[Reserved]
2029	[Reserved]
2030	[Reserved]
2031	[Reserved]
2032	[Reserved]
3033	[Reserved]
2034	[Reserved]



# 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.

