

Filed: June 2, 2021

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MEDTRONIC COREVALVE LLC,

PETITIONER,

V.

COLIBRI HEART VALVE LLC,

PATENT OWNER.

Case No. IPR2020-01454

U.S. Patent No. 9,125,739

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	2
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE '739 INVENTION	2
IV.	CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	5
V.	PROSECUTION HISTORY	6
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
A.	“trumpet-like” (claim 1)	7
B.	“valve means” (claim 1).....	7
C.	“controlled release mechanism” (claim 5)	8
VII.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS.....	8
A.	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious in View of Garrison Alone	9
1.	A POSA Would Not Know How to Implement the Embodiment of Garrison on Which Petitioner Relies	10
2.	Garrison Does Not Disclose “a valve means including...leaflets made of fixed pericardial tissue,” and Does Not Motivate A POSA to Use Such a Valve with Any Reasonable Expectation of Success	21
3.	Garrison Does Not Disclose “the stent member...flares at both ends in a trumpet-like configuration” and Does Not Motivate a POSA to Use Such a Member with Any Reasonable Expectation of Success	26
4.	A POSA Would Understand that Garrison Does Not Disclose a Functioning “controlled release mechanism that can be activated”	33
B.	Grounds 2, 4: The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious in View of Garrison and Leonhardt.....	37
1.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Garrison with Leonhardt.....	37

2. Garrison in View of Leonhardt Does Not Disclose “the stent member includes a tubular structure away from a central portion that flares at both ends in a trumpet-like configuration”	44
C. Grounds 3-4: The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious in View of Garrison, Leonhardt, and Nguyen	46
D. Grounds 5-10: The Challenged Claims are Not Obvious in View of Andersen, Limon, Garrison, Nguyen, and Gabbay or Phelps.....	48
1. A POSA Would Not be Motivated to Combine Andersen with Limon	48
2. Andersen, Gabbay, and Nguyen Do Not Disclose “a valve means including two to four individual leaflets made of fixed pericardial tissue”	58
3. A POSA Would Not Implement the Flared Stents of Gabbay or Phelps in Andersen’s Valve Prosthesis	62
4. A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Andersen’s Figure 12 Long Valve Prosthesis with Limon’s Stent Delivery System to Achieve “a controlled release mechanism that can be activated”	67
VIII. ADJUDICATION OF THE CHALLENGED PATENTS MAY VIOLATE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION	68
IX. CONCLUSION	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2017-02041 (PTAB Mar. 8, 2018) (Paper 10).....	61
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk–Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	60
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	50
<i>Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	9
<i>G.B.T. Inc. v. Wallelex Microelectronics Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-00326 (PTAB June 25, 2019) (Paper 60).....	31
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	58, 61
<i>In re Stepan Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	20, 34
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	30, 65
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	55, 56
<i>Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.</i> , 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	25
<i>Neutrino Dev. Corp. v. Sonosite, Inc.</i> , 410 F. Supp. 2d 529 (S.D. Tex. 2006).....	9
<i>Raytheon Techs. Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.</i> , 993 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	21, 36
<i>U.S. v. Arthrex, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 19-1434, cert. granted, (Oct. 13, 2020).....	68

Univ. of Maryland Biotechnology Inst. v. Presens Precision Sensing GmbH,
711 F. App'x 1007 (Fed. Cir. 2017)58

Winner Int'l Royalty Corp. v. Wang,
202 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....23

ZTE (USA) Inc. v. Fundamental Innovation Sys. Int'l LLC,
IPR2018-00274 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2018) (Paper 17)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.