

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

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

v.

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

---

IPR2020-01343  
IPR2020-01344  
Patent RE 46,116

---

**DECLARATION OF PETER T. KEITH**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. PERSONAL BACKGROUND .....	1
II. MATERIALS CONSIDERED .....	4
III. LEGAL STANDARDS .....	6
A. Claim Construction .....	6
B. Obviousness.....	6
IV. SCOPE OF OPINIONS .....	7
V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	8
VI. OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY OF THE ‘116 PATENT.....	9
A. Background on the Technology: Coronary Catheters and Heart Disease.....	9
B. Background on the Technology: Teleflex’s GuideLiner Devices .....	36
C. The GuideLiner In Use.....	49
VII. THE ‘116 PATENT .....	50
VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	57
IX. THE REFERENCES PETITIONER’S EXPERTS REPLY ON.....	58
A. Itou (Ex-1007) .....	58
B. Ressemann (Ex-1008) .....	61
C. Kontos (Ex-1009) .....	72
D. Kataishi (Ex-1025) .....	85
E. Takahashi (Ex-1410) .....	87
F. Root (IPR2020-01344, Ex-1512) .....	89
X. ITOU-BASED CHALLENGES (IPR2020-01343 (GROUNDS 2-3)) .....	89
A. Itou is Not Inherently Capable of Being Used as a Guide Extension Catheter for Balloon Catheters or Stents (Grounds 2-3 (Claims 25-40, 42, 44-48, 52, and 53)) .....	89
1. Itou’s Suction Catheter Does Not Have Structure that Is Inherently Capable of Advancing a Balloon Catheter or Stent	

	Through the Side Opening and Through the Tubular Structure .....	93
2.	The Evidence Does Not Show a POSITA Would Use Itou As a Guide Extension Catheter .....	99
	i.    Itou and Ressemann Are Designed for Different Purposes, and a POSITA Would Not Reply on Ressemann to Modify Itou’s Use .....	101
	ii.   Bagaoism, Limbruno, and Baim are Also Structurally Different from Itou’s Suction Catheter.....	105
B.	The Evidence Does Not Show That a POSITA Would Have Modified Itou to Advance a Stent or Balloon Catheter Through a Side Opening Having At Least Two Inclined Slopes (Grounds 2-3 (Claim 45)) ...	108
	1.    The Evidence Does Not Show that a POSITA Would Modify Itou in View of Ressemann to Advance a Balloon Catheter or Stent Through a Side Opening Structure Having At Least Two Inclined Slopes (Ground 2, Claim 45) .....	108
	i.    Ressemann Does Not Disclose Advancing a Stent or Balloon Catheter Through a Side Opening Having At Least Two Inclined Slopes .....	109
	ii.   The “Motivations” Petitioner’s Experts Identify Would Not Motivate a POSITA to Modify Itou’s Proximal Opening with Ressemann’s Support Collar in the Precise Way Asserted by Dr. Brecker and Dr. Hillstead .....	117
	iii.  Even if a POSITA Was Motivated to Combine Itou and Ressemann, the Resulting Combination Would Not Work and/or Would Not Satisfy the Claim Language .....	125
	2.    The Evidence Does Not Show that a POSITA Would Modify Itou in View of Kataishi to Advance a Balloon Catheter or Stent Through a Side Opening Structure Having At Least Two Inclined Slopes (Ground 3, Claim 45) .....	130
C.	The Evidence Does Not Show a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Increase the Length of the Tubular Portion of Itou’s Suction Catheter (Ground 2, Claim 47) .....	134

XI.	KONTOS-BASED CHALLENGES (IPR2020-01344 (ALL GROUNDS))	135
A.	The Evidence Does Not Show a POSITA Would Modify Kontos to Create a Side Opening (Ground 2, Independent Claim 25)	135
1.	The Evidence Does Not Show a POSITA Would Remove Kontos’ Funnel	135
2.	The Evidence Does Not Support Dr. Brecker and Dr. Hillstead’s Proffered Motivations	144
3.	The Evidence Does Not Show a POSITA Would Modify Kontos’ Tubular Structure to Have an Inner Diameter that Is Not More than One French Size Smaller than the Inner Diameter of the Guide Catheter Lumen	157
B.	The Evidence Does Not Show the Proposed Modifications Would Satisfy the Additional Limitations of Certain Dependent Claims (Ground 2, Dependent Claims 32, 37, and 45)	163
1.	The Evidence Does Not Show that Dr. Hillstead and Dr. Brecker’s Proposed Modifications Would Satisfy the Claimed “Coaxially Aligning” Step (Dependent Claim 32)	163
2.	The Evidence Does Not Show that a Delivery System Including a Stent Can Be Advanced Through Kontos’ Support Catheter (Dependent Claims 37)	165
3.	The Evidence Does Not Show that a POSITA Would Modify Kontos’ Support Catheter to Create a “side opening structure having at least two inclined slopes” (Dependent Claim 45)	166
i.	The Evidence Does Not Show that a POSITA Would Focus on the Specific Shape of Ressemann’s Support Collar	167
ii.	The Evidence Does Not Support Dr. Brecker and Dr. Hillstead’s Proffered Motivations	173
iii.	The Evidence Does Not Show that Dr. Hillstead’s Proposed Combination Would Be Expected to Work or Would Result in a Side Opening with at Least Two Inclined Regions	178

C.	The Evidence Does Not Show a POSITA Would Modify Kontos to Create a Side Opening (Ground I, Claims 52 and 53) .....	182
D.	The Evidence Does Not Show a POSITA Considering Kataishi Would Modify Kontos to Create a Side Opening Having at Least Two Inclined Slopes (Ground III, Claim 45) .....	182
XII.	PRIORITY DATE AND WRITTEN DESCRIPTION (IPR2020-01344 (GROUNDS IV-V)) .....	189
A.	The '629 Application Discloses a Device Having Both a “segment defining a side opening” and a “substantially rigid segment” as Claimed .....	189
B.	The '629 Application Discloses a Side Opening Having “at least two inclined slopes” as Claimed .....	194
XIII.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS .....	194
A.	Interventional Cardiologists’ Use of the GuideLiner Embodies At Least the Method of Claim 25 of the ‘116 Patent .....	196
B.	Long-Felt Need.....	196
C.	Commercial Success.....	202
D.	Industry Praise.....	204
E.	Licensing .....	207
F.	The <i>Guidezilla</i> (Boston Scientific), <i>Boosting Catheter</i> (QXMédical) and <i>Telescope</i> (Medtronic) Products Are All Substantially Similar to Teleflex’s Patented <i>GuideLiner</i> .....	207
1.	Boston Scientific Corp.’s Guidezilla Catheter Is Substantially Similar to the GuideLiner VI .....	208
2.	QXMédical’s Boosting Catheter Is Substantially Similar to GuideLiner V1 .....	213
3.	Medtronic’s Telescope Product Is Substantially Similar to GuideLiner V3 .....	218
G.	Nexus.....	225

# 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.