Filed: June 11, 2021

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION1					
II.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL					
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE '739 INVENTION4					
IV.	CHALLENGED CLAIMS					
V.	PROSECUTION HISTORY9					
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION					
	A.	"flare	es at both ends in a trumpet-like configuration" (claim 1)	12		
	B.		ber" (claim 1)trein the prosthetic heart valve is collapsed <i>onto</i> the pusher	12		
	C.	"valv	ve means" (claim 1)	19		
VII.	PATE	GROUND 1: PANIAGUA IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE '739 PATENT AND SO DOES NOT ANTICIPATE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS				
VIII.	OBV VIEW	IOUS V OF E	5 2-5: THE '739 PATENT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN TO A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART IN BESSLER, KLINT, AND TEITELBAUM OR	24		
			1.2.5. A POSA W. 11N 4 H			
	A.		nds 2-5: A POSA Would Not Have Started with Bessler	24		
	В.	Grounds 2-3: Bessler in View of Leonhardt or Teitelbaum Does Not Disclose that "the prosthetic heart valve is collapsed onto the pusher member"				
		1.	Bessler Does Not Disclose that "the prosthetic heart valve is collapsed onto the pusher member"	32		
		2.	Bessler in View of Leonhardt Does Not Disclose that "the prosthetic heart valve is collapsed onto the pusher member".	34		



	3.	Bessler in View of Teitelbaum Does Not Disclose that "the prosthetic heart valve is collapsed onto the pusher member"	39		
C.	Grounds 4-5: Bessler in View of Klint and Teitelbaum or Leonhardt Does Not Disclose that "the prosthetic heart valve is collapsed onto the pusher member"				
	1.	Klint Does Not Disclose that "the prosthetic heart valve is collapsed onto the pusher member"	40		
	2.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Bessler's Heart Valve Device with Klint's Pusher Member	45		
D.	with	nds 2-5: A POSA Would Not Have Combined Bessler Teitelbaum or Leonhardt to Achieve a "stent…that flares th ends in a trumpet-like configuration"	51		
	1.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Bessler with Teitelbaum	53		
	2.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Bessler with Leonhardt	59		
	3.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Bessler and Klint with Teitelbaum or Leonhardt	64		
E.	Leon	nds 4-5: Bessler in View of Klint and Teitelbaum and/or hardt Does Not Disclose Claim 5's "pusher member [that] des a controlled release mechanism that can be activated"	65		
		ATION OF THE CHALLENGED PATENTS MAY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION	66		
CON	CLUS	ION	67		



IX.

X.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abbott Labs. v. Dey, L.P., 287 F.3d 1097, 62 USPQ2d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	18
Apple Inc. v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A., IPR2017-02041 (PTAB Mar. 8, 2018) (Paper 10)	31, 51
Aro Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co., 365 U.S. 336 (1961)	23
e.Digital Corp. v. Futurewei Techs., Inc., 772 F.3d 723 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	17, 18
Envtl. Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	3, 4
G.B.T. Inc. v. Walletex Microelectronics Ltd., IPR2018-00326 (PTAB June 25, 2019) (Paper 60)	27
Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc., 405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	23
Goldenberg v. Cytogen, Inc., 373 F.3d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	15, 18
Housey Pharms., Inc. v. Astrazeneca UK Ltd., 366 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	23
In re Nordt Dev. Co., LLC, 881 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	22
Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs, 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	53
Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc., 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	21, 23
Neutrino Dev. Corp. v. Sonosite, Inc., 410 F. Supp. 2d 529 (S.D. Tex. 2006)	4



Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd., 457 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2006)
Praxair, Inc. v. ATMI, Inc., 543 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2008)
Texas Digital Sys., Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc., 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002)
Texas Instruments, Inc. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n, 805 F.2d 1558 (Fed. Cir.1986)
U.S. v. Arthrex, Inc., et al., No. 19-1434, cert. granted, (Oct. 13, 2020)67
Vanguard Prods. Corp. v. Parker Hannifin Corp., 234 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2000)
Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)
Winner Int'l Royalty Corp. v. Wang, 202 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2000)
Rules
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2113
Regulations
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

