

IPR2020-01341
Patent 8,142,413

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MEDTRONIC, INC., AND MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

TELEFLEX LIFE SCIENCES LIMITED,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01341
U.S. Patent No. 8,142,413

PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	2
	A. “Interventional Cardiology Device(s)”	2
	B. Claim-Step Order	4
III.	ITOU IS PRIOR ART.	7
	A. Teleflex must prove prior invention.....	7
	B. Teleflex failed to prove reduction to practice before Itou.	8
	1. Teleflex failed to show that VSI assembled prototypes.	9
	2. Teleflex failed to show that VSI performed the claimed methods.	12
	3. Teleflex failed to show that VSI determined that its inventions would work for their intended purpose.	16
	C. Teleflex has not shown diligence.	21
	D. Evidence shows that VSI did <i>not</i> actually or constructively reduce to practice before Itou.....	24
IV.	GROUND 1: ITOU ANTICIPATES.	26
	A. Catheter 5 is an interventional cardiology device.....	26
	B. Catheter 5 is inserted through the guide catheter “alongside of the substantially rigid portion” of the coaxial guide catheter.	27
	C. Itou discloses challenged claims depending from claim 1.....	28
V.	FOUNDATIONS 2, 3: ITOU RENDERS OBVIOUS.....	30

- A. A POSITA had the motivation to advance interventional cardiology devices other than catheter 5 through Itou’s catheter 2 after catheter 2 was positioned in the coronary artery.31
- B. A POSITA had a reasonable expectation of success because catheter 2 is inherently capable of receiving interventional cardiology devices other than catheter 5 when it is positioned within a guide catheter.33

VI. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS DO NOT OVERCOME OBVIOUSNESS.....36

- A. There is no nexus where Itou and Ressemann disclose every element of claims 4, 9, and 14.....36
- B. Teleflex’s secondary considerations evidence does not establish copying.38
 - 1. Teleflex’s alleged evidence of copying is actually copying of the prior art.38
 - 2. Medtronic did not copy GuideLiner.39

VII. CONCLUSION40

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	4
<i>Altiris, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 318 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	5
<i>Arctic Cat v. GEP Power Prods.</i> , 919 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	24
<i>ATI Techs. ULC v. Iancu</i> , 920 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	7, 21
<i>Bos. Sci. Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson</i> , 481 F. Supp. 2d 1018 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	17
<i>Curtiss-Wright Flow Corp. v. Velan, Inc.</i> , 438 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	3
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>Gen. Access Sols., Ltd. v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.</i> , 811 F. App’x 654 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	8
<i>Hill-Rom Servs. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	3
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	36, 38
<i>In re Meyer Mfg. Corp.</i> , 411 F. App’x 316 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	23
<i>In re Steed</i> , 802 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	7, 8, 12, 14
<i>In re Stempel</i> , 241 F.2d 755 (C.C.P.A. 1957)	16

IPR2020-01341 Patent 8,142,413	
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve, Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	5
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	38, 39
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	31
<i>Lacks Indus., Inc. v. McKechnie Vehicle Components USA, Inc.</i> , 322 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	15
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , No. 02-cv-2060-B(CAB), 2007 WL 2070346 (S.D. Cal. July 12, 2007).....	12
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	15, 17
<i>Mantech Environmental Corp. v. Hudson Environmental Servs., Inc.</i> , 152 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	5
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	8, 15
<i>Mformation Tech. v. Research in Motion Ltd.</i> , 764 F.3d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	36
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	21
<i>Scott v. Finney</i> , 34 F.3d 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	13, 20
<i>Slip Track Sys., Inc. v. Metal-Lite, Inc.</i> , 304 F.3d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	20
<i>Synqor, Inc. v. Artesyn Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 2:07-CV-497-TJW-CE, 2010 WL 2991037 (E.D. Tex. July 26, 2010)	3

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.