

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.A.R.L.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01342
Patent 8,142,413

**PATENT OWNER'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR CONTINUED
SEALING PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 AND 42.54**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 and 42.54, Patent Owner respectfully submits this Patent Owner's Unopposed Motion for Continued Sealing, requesting that the following information remain under seal: portions of Petitioner's Motion for Additional Discovery; Motion for Leave to Subpoena Non-Party Witnesses, Petitioner's Reply, Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Contingent Motion to Amend, and Exhibits 1806, 1819, 1821, 1822, 1830, 1847, and 1851. The under-seal versions of Petitioner's Reply, Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Contingent Motion to Amend, and Exhibits 1806, 1819, 1821, 1822, 1830, 1847, and 1851 were filed on August 6, 2021.

Patent Owner has conferred with the Petitioner, and the Petitioner does not oppose this motion to seal.

In conjunction with the Patent Owner's Preliminary Responses, Patent Owner and Petitioner agreed to and submitted a stipulated Joint Protective Order. Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board enter that stipulated Joint Protective order in the above-captioned case to govern treatment of the documents and information identified herein.

I. Good Cause

For good cause, the Board may "issue an order to protect a party or person from disclosing confidential information." 37 C.F.R. § 42.54. The rules "identify confidential information in a manner consistent with Federal Rule of Civil

Procedure 26(c)(1)(G), which provides for protective orders for trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48760 (Aug. 14, 2012).

Each of the sets of information below meets this standard, and for the reasons explained there is good cause for why those documents should remain under seal.

A. Under-Seal Version of Petitioner’s Reply

Petitioner has filed under-seal its Petitioner’s Reply, as well as a public, redacted version of this Paper. The redacted portions on pages 12, 16, and 24 of Petitioner’s Reply contain confidential Patent Owner information related to the development of Patent Owner’s GuideLiner products. Patent Owner has designated this information as confidential under the protective order in the parallel district court case *Vascular Solutions, LLC, et al v. Medtronic, Inc. et al.*, 0:19-cv-01760 PJS-TNL (D. Minn.).

All of this information fits squarely within the kinds of information that the Trial Practice guide considers to be “confidential information,” such as “confidential research, development, or commercial information.” 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48760.

There is good cause for keeping the redacted information contained in Petitioner’s Reply under seal. Publicly revealing the sensitive, competitive

information could put the parties at a disadvantage in the marketplace.

Additionally, Petitioner does not oppose this information remaining under seal.

B. Under-Seal Version of Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Contingent Motion to Amend

Petitioner has filed under-seal its Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Contingent Motion to Amend, as well as a public, redacted version of this Paper. The redacted portions on pages 20 and 24-25 of Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Contingent Motion to Amend contain confidential Patent Owner information related to the development of Patent Owner's GuideLiner products. Patent Owner has designated this information as confidential under the protective order in the parallel district court case *Vascular Solutions, LLC, et al v. Medtronic, Inc. et al.*, 0:19-cv-01760 PJS-TNL (D. Minn.).

All of this information fits squarely within the kinds of information that the Trial Practice guide considers to be "confidential information," such as "confidential research, development, or commercial information." 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48760.

There is good cause for keeping the redacted information contained in Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Contingent Motion to Amend under seal. Publicly revealing the sensitive, competitive information could put the parties at a disadvantage in the marketplace. Additionally, Petitioner does not oppose this information remaining under seal.

C. Exhibits 1821, 1822, and 1851: Development-Related Documents

Exhibits 1821, 1822, and 1851, filed under seal, are development documents related to the development of Patent Owner's GuideLiner products. These development documents include the October 30, 2019 deposition of Amy Welch in the parallel district court litigation, the transcript from the June 15, 2018 deposition of Howard Root in *QXMedical, LLC v. Vascular Solutions, LLC, et al*, and R&D ideas. These documents were produced and/or designated confidential under the protective order by Patent Owner in the parallel district court litigation in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. All of this information fits squarely within the kinds of information that the Trial Practice guide considers to be "confidential information," such as "confidential research, development, or commercial information." 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48760.

There is good cause for keeping Exhibits 1821, 1822, and 1851 under seal. Publicly revealing the development information related to the GuideLiner products described above could put Patent Owner at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace. Additionally, Petitioner does not oppose this information remaining under seal.

D. Exhibits 1806, 1830, and 1847

Petitioner has filed under-seal the Exhibits 1806, 1830, and 1847; as well as public, redacted versions of these Exhibits. The redacted portions on pages 17 and

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.