

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

PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ITOU IS NOT PRIOR ART	1
A. Petitioner’s Arguments Would Impose Erroneous Evidentiary Burdens on Patent Owner, and Ignore Its Own	1
B. The Board Already Rejected Petitioner’s Argument that Patent Owner Failed to Show Assembly of Prototypes	3
C. Patent Owner Performed and Tested the Claimed Methods	8
1. <i>Petitioner Proposes an Improper Standard for Performance of a Method Claim</i>	9
2. <i>Patent Owner Timely Performed and Tested the Claimed Methods</i>	12
3. <i>Testing was sufficient</i>	15
D. Diligent Work Was Performed on the Invention Through the Filing of the First Patent Application	17
E. Continued Work on Commercialization of GuideLiner Does Not Undo Reduction to Practice	19
III. GROUND 1: EVEN IF ITOU WERE CONSIDERED PRIOR ART, IT DOES NOT ANTICIPATE THE ’413 PATENT	20
A. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-14: Itou’s “Protective Catheter” Is Not an “Interventional Cardiology Device”	20
B. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-14: Itou’s Protective Catheter Is Not Inserted “Alongside of the Substantially Rigid Portion . . . and [Advanced] Into Contact with or Past a Lesion”	22
1. Itou Does Not Disclose “inserting the interventional cardiology device into and through the continuous lumen of the standard guide catheter alongside of the substantially rigid portion” ...	24
2. Itou Does Not Disclose “advancing the interventional cardiology device . . . into contact with or past a lesion in the second artery”	25

C.	Dependent Claim 2: Ito Does Not Disclose “ <i>applying a force to . . . the coaxial guide catheter such that the distal portion of the coaxial guide catheter remains seated . . . in response to an opposing backward force exerted by the interventional cardiology device</i> ”	25
D.	Dependent Claims 9-12: Ito Does Not Disclose “ <i>extending the interventional cardiology device through a proximal side opening . . . while the proximal portion remains within the lumen of the guide catheter</i> ”	26
IV.	FOUNDATIONS 2-3: EVEN IF ITOU WERE CONSIDERED PRIOR ART, THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS	26
A.	Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-14: Petitioner Has Not Proved a Motivation to Use Ito’s Suction Catheter to Provide Backup Support When Delivering ICDs	27
B.	Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-14: Petitioner Has Not Proved Reasonable Expectation of Success	29
V.	COMPELLING OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE CONFIRMS THAT CLAIMS 4, 9-12, AND 14 OF THE ’413 PATENT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS	30
A.	The Objective Evidence Is Undisputed	30
B.	The Combination of Features That Resulted in GuideLiner’s Success and Praise Is Not in the Prior Art	31
C.	The Fact that GuideLiner’s Competitors Copied its Design Confirms Non-Obviousness	33
VI.	CONCLUSION	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. GEP Power Prods.</i> , 919 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	17
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	2, 3, 4
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	1
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Unifrax I LLC</i> , 921 F.3d 1060 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	2, 4
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 135 F.3d 1456 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	4
<i>Focal Therapeutics, Inc. v. Senorx, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00116, Paper 19 (PTAB, July 21, 2014)	7
<i>Huawei Technologies, Co. v. Samsung Electronics Co.</i> , 340 F. Supp. 3d 934 (N.D. Cal. 2018)	12
<i>In re Steed</i> , 802 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	2, 11
<i>In re Stempel</i> , 241 F.2d 755 (CCPA 1957)	8, 15
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	29
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	34, 35
<i>Knorr v. Pearson</i> , 671 F.2d 1368 (CCPA 1982)	4
<i>Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020)	33

<i>Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co.</i> , 266 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	2, 3, 19, 20
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , No. 02-cv-2060-B(CAB), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50891 (S.D. Cal. July 12, 2007)	11
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	2
<i>Mann v. Werner</i> , 347 F.2d 636 (CCPA 1965)	4
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	10, 11
<i>Mosaid Technologies Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co.</i> , 362 F. Supp. 2d 526 (D.N.J. 2005)	12
<i>NFC Tech., LLC v. Matal</i> , 871 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	18
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus America, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	17
<i>Scott v. Finney</i> , 34 F.3d 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	9, 10
<i>Taskett v. Dentlinger</i> , 344 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	10
<i>TC Tech. LLC v. Sprint Corp.</i> , 379 F. Supp. 3d 305 (D. Del. 2019).....	12
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	33, 34

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)	29
----------------------------	----

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.