

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 IPR2020-01342
U.S. Patent No. 8,142,413

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
III.	THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	6
IV.	OVERVIEW OF PETITIONER’S REFERENCES	6
	A. Kontos (Ex-1409)	6
	B. Adams (Ex-1435)	9
V.	PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ’413 PATENT ARE INVALID AS OBVIOUS.....	12
	A. ALL GROUNDS: Petitioner Fails to Show that Kontos and/or Adams Would be Used in the Manner Required by the Steps of the Claimed Methods (All Claims)	12
	1. The Claimed Step of Inserting an ICD Must Be Performed After the Coaxial Guide Catheter Is Inserted Into the Guide Catheter	12
	2. Petitioner Does Not Show Prior Art Methods Performed in the Required Sequence.....	18
	B. GROUND 1: Petitioner Fails to Show that Kontos Discloses Particular Claimed Methods of Providing Backup Support (Claims 2 and 7)	21
	C. GROUND 1: Petitioner Fails to Show that Claims 4, 9-12, and 14 Are Obvious Because It Is Not Obvious to Modify Kontos in View of Adams to Create a Proximal Side Opening (Claims 4, 9-12, and 14)	26
	1. No Motivation or Reasonable Expectation of Success— Removing Kontos’s Funnel Portion would <i>Create Problems</i> ..	26
	2. Petitioner’s Modification Requires Ignoring What Adams Actually Teaches.....	31

3.	Petitioner’s Alleged Motivations Are Based on Hindsight And/or Unsupported by the Evidence.....	34
D.	GROUND 2: Petitioner Fails to Show It Would Be Obvious to Modify the Inner Diameter of the Lumen of Kontos’s Tubular Structure “to be not more than one French smaller than the cross- sectional inner diameter of the guide catheter”	42
E.	The Objective, Real-World Evidence Shows that Challenged Claims 4, 9, and 14 Are Not Obvious	47
1.	Long-Felt Need	49
2.	Commercial Success	51
3.	Industry Praise.....	55
4.	Licensing	57
5.	Copying.....	57
a.	Boston Scientific’s Guidezilla.....	58
b.	QXM’s Boosting Catheter	60
c.	Petitioner’s Telescope.....	60
6.	There Is Nexus Between the Invention of Claims 4, 9, and 14 and the Objective Evidence of Nonobviousness	64
F.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is Unconstitutional	71
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	71
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT COMPLIANCE.....	73
	CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE.....	74

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Altiris, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 318 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	13
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	64
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	30
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	71
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	64, 70
<i>Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	67
<i>Hytera Communs. Co. v. Motorola Sols., Inc.</i> , 841 F. App'x 210 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	17
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	31, 55, 57
<i>Intendis GmbH v. Glenmark Pharm., Inc.</i> , 822 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	64
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. CompuServe Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	13
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. et al. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2015)	58
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	64
<i>Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020)	65

<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018)	71
<i>Mantech Envtl. Corp. v. Hudson Envtl. Servs.</i> , 152 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	16, 17, 18
<i>Mformation Techs., Inc. v. Research in Motion Ltd.</i> , 764 F.3d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs.</i> , 290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	23
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> , 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	47
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	49, 51, 57, 65
<i>Winner Int'l Royalty Corp. v. Wang</i> , 202 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	41
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	57, 58

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.