

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 IPR2020-01343  
Patent RE46,116

---

**PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ITOU IS NOT PRIOR ART .....	1
A. Petitioner’s Arguments Would Impose Erroneous Evidentiary Burdens on Patent Owner, and Ignore Its Own .....	1
B. The Board Already Rejected Petitioner’s Argument that Patent Owner Failed to Show Assembly of Prototypes .....	3
C. Patent Owner Performed and Tested the Claimed Methods .....	7
1. Petitioner proposes an improper standard for performance of a method claim.....	8
2. Patent owner timely performed and tested the claimed methods .....	11
3. Testing was sufficient .....	14
4. Diligent work was performed on the invention through the filing of the first patent application.....	16
5. Continued work on commercialization of GuideLiner does not undo reduction to practice.....	18
III. GROUNDS 2-3: EVEN IF ITOU WERE CONSIDERED PRIOR ART, PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS .....	20
A. GROUND 2—Itou and Ressemann (Claims 25-40, 42, 44-48, 52 and 53).....	20
1. Petitioner fails to show that it would have been obvious to use Itou’s suction catheter as a guide extension catheter for receiving “balloon catheters or stents” into a proximal side opening while the side opening “remains within the guide catheter” (all challenged claims).....	20
a. Petitioner fails to prove motivation .....	20

b.	Petitioner fails to show that Itou’s structure is capable of receiving stents or balloon catheters .....	23
2.	Petitioner fails to show it would have been obvious to redesign Itou’s proximal opening to have “at least two inclined slopes” (dependent claim 45).....	24
B.	GROUND 3—Itou, Ressemann, and Kataishi (Claim 45) .....	28
IV.	COMPELLING OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE CONFIRMS THAT INDEPENDENT CLAIM 25 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS 26-40, 42, 44-48) WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS .....	30
A.	The Objective Evidence Is Undisputed.....	31
B.	The Combination of Features That Resulted in GuideLiner’s Success and Praise Is Not in the Prior Art .....	31
C.	GuideLiner and Telescope Practice Claim 25.....	32
D.	That GuideLiner’s Competitors Copied its Design Confirms Non-Obviousness .....	34
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT COMPLIANCE.....	37
	CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE.....	38

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. GEP Power Prods.</i> , 919 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	16
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	2, 3, 4
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	1, 2
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co. v. Unifrax I LLC</i> , 921 F.3d 1060 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	2, 4
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 135 F.3d 1456 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	4
<i>Focal Therapeutics, Inc. v. Senorx, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00116, Paper 19 (PTAB, July 21, 2014) .....	7
<i>Huawei Technologies, Co. v. Samsung Electronics Co.</i> , 340 F. Supp. 3d 934 (N.D. Cal. 2018) .....	11
<i>In re Steed</i> , 802 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	2, 10
<i>In re Stempel</i> , 241 F.2d 755 (C.C.P.A. 1957) .....	14
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	35
<i>Knorr v. Pearson</i> , 671 F.2d 1368 (CCPA 1982) .....	4
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	21
<i>Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020) .....	32

<i>Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co.</i> , 266 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	2, 3, 18, 19
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , No. 02-cv-2060-B(CAB), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50891 (S.D. Cal. July 12, 2007) .....	10
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	2
<i>Mann v. Werner</i> , 347 F.2d 636 (CCPA 1965) .....	4
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	9, 10
<i>Mosaid Technologies Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co.</i> , 362 F. Supp. 2d 526 (D.N.J. 2005) .....	11
<i>NFC Tech., LLC v. Matal</i> , 871 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	18
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus America, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	16
<i>Scott v. Finney</i> , 34 F.3d 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	8, 9
<i>Taskett v. Dentlinger</i> , 344 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	9
<i>TC Tech. LLC v. Sprint Corp.</i> , 379 F. Supp. 3d 305 (D. Del. 2019).....	11
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	32, 35
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	22
37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) .....	23, 26

# 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.