



I, Joseph W. Winkels, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney with the law firm of Carlson, Caspers, Vandenburg & Lindquist P.A. (“Carlson Caspers”). This declaration is submitted on behalf of Patent Owner Teleflex in support of its Unopposed Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Litigation Counsel. This declaration is made on my own personal knowledge, except as otherwise indicated.
2. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of Minnesota (Minnesota Bar Number 349,707).
3. I have never been suspended or disbarred from any court or administrative body.
4. No application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body that I have filed or that has been filed on my behalf has ever been denied.
5. No sanctions or contempt citations have been imposed on me by any court or administrative body.
6. I have read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R.

7. I agree to be subject to USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 et. seq. and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

8. In the past three years I have applied for, and been granted, *pro hac vice* admission before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in the following related matters: Medtronic, Inc., et al. v. Teleflex Innovations S.A.R.L., IPR2020-00126, IPR2020-00127, IPR2020-00128, IPR2020-00129, IPR2020-00130, IPR2020-00132, IPR2020-00134, IPR2020-00135, IPR2020-00136, IPR2020-00137, and IPR2020-00138. I am also concurrently filing motions for *pro hac vice* admission in the following related matters: Medtronic, Inc. et al. v. Teleflex Innovations S.A.R.L., IPR2020-01341, IPR2020-01343, and IPR2020-01344.

9. I have been involved in many litigations involving patent infringement in multiple federal District Courts. I have practiced law for more than fourteen years and I have litigated patent cases during that entire time period. I have extensive experience with patent issues related to anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, which are the legal theories on which this *Inter Partes* Review was instituted. In the course of my experience litigating patents, I have analyzed many pieces of prior art, prepared many prior art statements and responses, worked with validity experts, and drafted and filed briefing related to anticipation and obviousness arguments.

10. I am familiar with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. My law firm, Carlson Caspers, represents Patent Owner in a patent infringement lawsuit that is pending in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota (Civil Action. No. 19-cv-1760 (PJS/TNL), filed July 2, 2019), in which I am an attorney of record for Patent Owner. This lawsuit involves the patents at issue in this and related *Inter Partes* Reviews, U.S. Patent Nos. RE46,116, 8,142,413, 8,048,032, RE45,380, RE45,760, RE45,776, and RE47,379, and involves the same parties. Through my work on this case, I have gained familiarity with the subjects at issue and the patents at issue in this IPR and the related IPR proceedings.

11. I have also reviewed in detail each of U.S. Patent Nos. RE46,116, 8,142,413, 8,048,032, RE45,380, RE45,760, RE45,776, and RE47,379, the Petitions and corresponding exhibits and expert declarations filed by Petitioner Medtronic in this and the related proceedings, the Patent Owner's Preliminary Responses, and the Board's Decisions instituting review. Further, I have reviewed in detail the prior art references cited by Medtronic's Petitions and relied on by the Board in instituting this review.

12. My technical background provides me with additional understanding of the subject matter at issue. I completed a Bachelor of Science

undergraduate degree in Mechanical Engineering, which included coursework in mechanical design.

I state under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: April 12, 2021.

/ Joseph W. Winkels /
Joseph W. Winkels