

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

Petitioner,

v.

TELEFLEX LIFE SCIENCES LIMITED,

Patent Owner.

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

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

Case IPR2020-01343
U.S. Patent No. RE 46,116

Case IPR2020-01344
U.S. Patent No. RE 46,116

PETITIONER'S RESPONSIVE BRIEF ON COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| I. The Board’s First Set of IPR Decisions are not Final. | 1 |
| II. The Board Must Address New Reduction-to-Practice Issues. | 3 |
| III. PO’s Other Issues Were Not Essential to the Final Decision, and Petitioner Did not have a Full and Fair Opportunity to Litigate. | 4 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus.</i> , 575 U.S. 138 (2015)..... | 1 |
| <i>MaxLinear, Inc. v. CF CRESPE LLC</i> , 880 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 1 |
| <i>Mobile Tech, Inc. v. Invue Security Prods. Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00481, Paper 29 (PTAB July 16, 2019)..... | 2 |
| <i>Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe</i> , IPR2016-01129, Paper 154 (PTAB Sept. 27, 2019) | 1 |
| <i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC</i> , 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 4 |
| <i>Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. KG v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , 924 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 2019) | 1 |
| <i>Taskett v. Dentlinger</i> , 344 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2003) | 4 |
| <i>VirnetX Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 909 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 1 |
| <i>Webpower, Inc. v. Wag Acquisition, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01239, Paper 21 (PTAB Dec. 26, 2017)..... | 2 |
| <i>XY, LLC v. Trans Ova Genetics</i> , 890 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 3 |
| Statutes | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 318(b) | 1, 2 |
| Other Authorities | |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.80 | 2 |
| Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 83..... | 2 |

Patent Owner's ("PO") carefully worded brief attempts to mask that collateral estoppel cannot, and should not, apply to these proceedings. The Board's prior decisions are not final, do not address identical issues, and did not rely upon those issues. The Board should not apply collateral estoppel.

I. The Board's First Set of IPR Decisions are not Final.

PO concedes that collateral estoppel does not attach while an appeal is pending. *See* PO Brief at 4-5. Indeed, a final written decision is not final until *either* the time for appeal elapses *or* the Federal Circuit affirms the Board's decision. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 318(b) (issuance of certificate of (un)patentability proper only after appeal time expires or appeal exhausted). Here, Petitioner appealed the previous IPR decisions—none are final, and collateral estoppel does not attach.

PO's argument that the first set of IPR decisions are "sufficiently final" is misleading at best and incorrect at worst. PO relies on cases in which there was no appeal or the appeal had already concluded. *See B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus.*, 575 U.S. 138, 146-48 (2015) (no appeal); *Papst Licensing GMBH & Co. KG v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.*, 924 F.3d 1243, 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (appeal dismissed); *VirnetX Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 909 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (appeal affirmed); *MaxLinear, Inc. v. CF CRESPE LLC*, 880 F.3d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (appeals affirmed); *Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe*, IPR2016-01129, Paper 154 (PTAB Sept. 27, 2019) (appeals affirmed);

Webpower, Inc. v. Wag Acquisition, LLC, IPR2016-01239, Paper 21 (PTAB Dec. 26, 2017) (no appeal). Indeed, PO cites no case in which collateral estoppel attached *during the pendency of an active appeal*.¹

PO's other argument—that collateral estoppel can apply when a *district court* decision is pending on appeal—is similarly inapplicable. PO Brief at 2-3. Importantly, a final written decision by the Board is not a decision by a district court. As the Restatement notes, “[t]o determine finality [of agency decisions], reference must be made to the procedures of the agency that specify what official has authority to decide and the point at which the decision becomes effective.” Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 83 cmt e. And the procedures of the Patent Office specify that its determinations on patentability are not implemented by publication of a certificate until “the time for appeal has expired or any appeal has terminated.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.80; 35 U.S.C. § 318(b). Finality of a Board decision, then, requires finality of appellate process. Petitioner's Opening Brief at 3-4.

¹ PO cites *Mobile Tech, Inc. v. Invue Security Prods. Inc.*, IPR2019-00481, Paper 29 at 33 (PTAB July 16, 2019) for the proposition that a pending appeal does not prevent the application of collateral estoppel. PO Brief at 4. Not only was this statement dicta—the PTAB addressed the issues on the merits—but eight of the eleven appeals were already complete. *Mobile Tech*, Paper 29 at 7.

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.