

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

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

v.

TELEFLEX LIFE SCIENCES LIMITED,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-01342  
Patent 8,142,413

---

**PATENT OWNER'S CONSOLIDATED BRIEF ADDRESSING THE  
APPLICABILITY OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL / ISSUE PRECLUSION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. THE PRIOR, RELATED IPRS MAY TRIGGER COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL/ISSUE PRECLUSION .....	1
A. Final Written Decisions in the Prior IPRs Are Sufficiently Final .....	2
B. The PTAB Has Applied Collateral Estoppel in IPRs But Has Also Reached the Merits When the Final Written Decision is on Appeal ....	4
C. <i>Issues</i> Must Be Materially Identical, Not Patents or Claims .....	5
II. SEVERAL ISSUES COULD BE DECIDED IN PATENT OWNER’S FAVOR VIA COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL.....	5
A. RE46,116 Is Not Subject to the AIA First-To-File Rule (IPR -01343).....	6
B. Written Description Support for A Side Opening Not Claimed as Part of a Substantially Rigid Segment (IPR -01344, Grounds 4, 5) .....	6
C. Conception and Reduction to Practice (IPR -01341 and IPR -01343) .....	7
D. Modifying Kontos in View of Takahashi to Arrive at a “one French” Limitation (IPR -01342, Ground 2) or “one French size” limitation (IPR -01344, Ground 2) .....	8
E. Modifying Itou or Kontos to Arrive at a Side Opening with Two Inclines (IPR -01343, Grounds 2 and 3 and IPR -01344, Grounds 2 and 3).....	9
F. Modifying Kontos in View of Adams or Ressmann to Arrive at a Side Opening Limitation (IPR -01342, Ground 1 and IPR -01344, Ground 2) .....	10
CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE.....	12

## TABLE OF AUTHRORITES

### Cases

<i>B&amp;B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus.</i> , 575 U.S. 138 (2015).....	1, 2
<i>Compare Vardon Golf Co. v. Karsten Mfg. Corp.</i> , 294 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	3
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l, Inc.</i> , 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	3
<i>Hawkins v. Risley</i> , 984 F.2d 321 (9th Cir. 1993) .....	2
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Capital One Fin. Corp.</i> , 850 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	2
<i>MaxLinear, Inc. v. CF CRESPE LLC</i> , 880 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	2
<i>Miller Brewing Co. v. Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.</i> , 605 F.2d 990 (7th Cir. 1979) .....	3
<i>Mobile Tech, Inc. v. Invue Security Prods. Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00481, Paper 29 (PTAB July 16, 2019) .....	4, 5
<i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe</i> , IPR2016-01129, Paper 154 (PTAB Sept. 27, 2019).....	4
<i>Nestlé USA, Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.</i> , 884 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	5
<i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC</i> , 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	5
<i>Papst Licensing GMBH &amp; Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , 924 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	2
<i>Rice v. Dep’t of Treasury</i> , 998 F.2d 997 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	4

<i>Samsung Elecs. America, Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2017-01800, Paper 34.....	5
<i>VirnetX Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 909 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	2
<i>Webpower, Inc. v. Wag Acquisition, LLC</i> , IPR216-01239, Paper 21 (PTAB Dec. 26, 2017) .....	4
<i>Williams v. Commissioner</i> , 1 F.3d 502 (7th Cir. 1993) .....	3
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1).....	3
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 13.....	3
Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 27.....	1

There is a tremendous amount of overlap between the factual and legal issues in this set of IPRs and the prior, related IPRs that the Board already has ruled on. Those prior decisions should be persuasive as the Board addresses the issues raised in the present IPRs. Further, there are several specific issues where the Board likely can apply the doctrine of collateral estoppel. However, consistent with the Board's prior practice, Patent Owner suggests that, to the extent the Board chooses to rely on collateral estoppel, out of an abundance of caution it should also address the issues on the merits and/or adopt its prior findings. Regardless of whether the Board decides to apply collateral estoppel to any particular issue, the Board's prior Final Written Decisions are highly relevant, persuasive authority.

**I. THE PRIOR, RELATED IPRS MAY TRIGGER COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL/ISSUE PRECLUSION**

“When an issue of fact or law is actually litigated and determined by a valid and final judgment, and the determination is essential to the judgment, the determination is conclusive in a subsequent action between the parties, whether on the same or a different claim.” *B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus.*, 575 U.S. 138, 148 (2015) (quoting Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 27). Collateral estoppel applies if: (1) a prior action presents an identical issue; (2) the prior action actually litigated and adjudged that issue; (3) the judgment in that prior action necessarily required determination of the identical issue; and (4) the prior action featured full representation of the estopped party. *VirnetX Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 909

# 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.