

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

QXMédical, LLC,

Plaintiff and
Counterclaim-Defendant,

Case No. 17-cv-01969-PJS-TNL

v.

Vascular Solutions LLC, Teleflex
Innovations S.à.r.l., and Arrow
International, Inc.,

Defendants and
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs.

**DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM
IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S
SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION
AND IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANTS' SUMMARY
JUDGMENT MOTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
ARGUMENT.....	2
I. VSI Is Entitled To Summary Judgment On Indefiniteness.....	2
A. QXM’s Argument Fails As A Matter Of Law.	3
B. QXM’s Argument Fails For Lack Of Proof.....	4
II. VSI Is Entitled To Summary Judgment On Recapture.	6
A. QXM Must Prove By Clear And Convincing Evidence That VSI Surrendered Subject Matter To Overcome Prior Art.	6
B. VSI Did Not Surrender Subject Matter To Overcome Prior Art.	6
III. The Boosting Catheter’s Substantially Rigid Portion Defines A Rail Structure Without A Lumen.	9
A. QXM’s Boosting Catheter Literally Meets The “Without A Lumen” Limitation.	9
B. Alternatively, QXM’s Boosting Catheter Infringes Under The Doctrine Of Equivalents.....	11
1. The Structure Of The Boosting Catheter Is Equivalent To Having No Lumen At All.....	12
2. QXM’s Legal Defenses Do Not Bar VSI From Asserting Infringement Under The Doctrine Of Equivalents.....	13
IV. QXM Infringes The “One French” Claims.	17
A. QXM Directly Infringes The “One French” Claims Of The ’032 And ’776 Patents.	18
B. There Are Genuine Issues Of Material Fact Concerning Whether QXM Has Induced Infringement Of The “One French” Claims.	19
V. VSI Is Entitled To Summary Judgment Regarding The Rigidity Of The Side Opening Segment Or Partially Cylindrical Opening Segment Compared To The Tubular Structure Or Distal End Portion.	23

A.	QXM Waived Its Noninfringement Argument.	23
B.	QXM’s Claim Construction Contradicts The Intrinsic Evidence.	24
C.	QXM’s Boosting Catheter Has A Segment Defining A Side/Partially Cylindrical Opening That Is More Rigid Than Its Tubular Structure And Its Distal End Portion.	26
VI.	Adams Does Not Anticipate Claim 53 Of The ’116 Patent.	28
A.	QXM Waived Its Argument that Adams Anticipates Claim 53.	28
B.	If The Court Reaches This Issue, The Court Should Rule That Adams Does Not Anticipate Claim 53.	29
1.	Adams Does Not Disclose A “Segment Defining A Side Opening.”	29
2.	Adams Does Not Disclose A “Segment Defining The Side Opening ... More Rigid Than The Distal End Portion Of The Tubular Structure.”	30
VII.	The Boosting Catheter Infringes Claims 25, 36, 52, And 53 Of The ’776 Patent.	31
A.	“Substantially Rigid Segment”	31
B.	’776 Patent, Claim 36: “The guide extension catheter of claim 25, wherein the segment defining the angled proximal end of the partially cylindrical opening includes at least one inclined region that tapers into a non-inclined region.”	32
C.	Claims 52 and 53: “The segment defining the angled proximal end of the partially cylindrical opening includes at least two inclined regions.”	32
	CONCLUSION	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	19
<i>ACCO Brands, Inc. v. ABA Locks Manufacturer</i> , 501 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	19
<i>AIA Eng’g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Int’l, S/A</i> , 657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	6
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	29
<i>Anchor Wall Sys., Inc. v. Rockwood Retaining Walls, Inc.</i> , 2004 WL 2066823 (D. Minn. Sept. 7, 2004)	16
<i>Asyst Technologies, Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 1188 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	14
<i>Bombardier Recreational Prods., Inc. v. Arctic Cat Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 758335 (D. Minn. Feb. 24, 2017)	31
<i>BreathableBaby, LLC v. Crown Crafts, Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 3928526 (D. Minn. Aug. 12, 2014).....	24, 28
<i>Brilliant Instruments, Inc. v. Guidetech, LLC</i> , 707 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	14
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 543 F.3d 683 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	20
<i>Buckman Co. v. Plaintiffs’ Legal Committee</i> , 531 U.S. 341 (2001).....	21
<i>Capital Sec. Sys., Inc. v. NCR Corp.</i> , 725 F. App’x 952 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	5

Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc.,
135 S.Ct 1920 (2015)..... 18

Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.,
899 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 18, 19

Crown Packaging Tech., Inc. v. Rexam Beverage Can Co.,
559 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 11

Cubist Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Hospira, Inc.,
805 F.3d 1112 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 6

Deere & Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC,
703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 14

DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.,
239 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 13

DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.,
471 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 19

Electro Med. Sys. v. Cooper Life Sciences, Inc.,
34 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... 30

Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.,
535 U.S. 722 (2002)..... 11, 15, 16

Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Group, Inc.,
523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 29

Finnigan Corp. v. ITC,
180 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 31

Fiskars, Inc. v. Hunt Mfg. Co.,
221 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 13

Glaxo Wellcome, Inc. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.,
344 F.3d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 13

Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.,
563 U.S. 754 (2012)..... 20

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.