

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORPORATION, EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES
LLC, AND EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES AG
Petitioners

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC SCIMED, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00060
Patent 8,992,608

Before the Honorable NEIL T. POWELL, JAMES A. TARTAL, and ROBERT L.
KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONERS' OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER'S
DEMONSTRATIVE EXHIBITS**

Petitioners maintain their scope objections (Papers 45, 51) to the new arguments and evidence Patent Owner improperly raises in its motion to exclude papers.

Petitioners object to all of Patent Owner's slides for failing to identify where in the papers any of these arguments were made or exhibits were cited.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 8 as improper new evidence and argument that does not appear in Patent Owner's Response.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 15 for misstating the record because Dr. Buller testified that he has experience in surgical valve operations.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 16 to the extent that it states Dr. Buller has no experience with abdominal aortic aneurysms (AAA), which is contrary to Dr. Buller's testimony.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 20 for misstating the record to the extent it suggests Elliot, Thornton, and Cook are limited to AAA stent grafts by omitting key portions of the quoted disclosures.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 108 as improper new evidence and argument in the form of dictionary definitions never before cited in Patent Owner's Response and never entered into evidence.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 109 as improper new evidence and argument that does not appear in Patent Owner's Response.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 110 as improper new evidence and argument that does not appear in Patent Owner's Response.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 111 as improper new evidence and argument that does not appear in Patent Owner's Response.

Petitioners object to Patent Owner's Slide 112 as improper new evidence and argument in the form of dictionary definitions never before cited in Patent Owner's Response and never entered into evidence.

Dated: December 15, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Cordrey

Gregory S. Cordrey, Esq. (Reg. No. 44,089)

Brian P. Egan, Esq. (Reg. No. 54,866)

Catherine Nyarady, Esq. (Reg. No. 42,042)

Attorneys for Petitioners

Edwards Lifesciences Corporation,

Edwards Lifesciences LLC, and

Edwards Lifesciences AG

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on December 15, 2017, a complete and entire copy of **PETITIONERS’ OBJECTIONS TO PATENT OWNER’S DEMONSTRATIVE EXHIBITS** has been served in its entirety by e-mail on the following addresses of record for Patent Owner:

jennifer.sklenar@apks.com

wallace.wu@apks.com

marc.cohn@apks.com

matthew.wolf@apks.com

edward.han@apks.com

Dated: December 15, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Cordrey

Gregory S. Cordrey, Esq. (Reg. No. 44,089)

Brian P. Egan, Esq. (Reg. No. 54,866)

Catherine Nyarady, Esq. (Reg. No. 42,042)

Attorneys for Petitioners

Edwards Lifesciences Corporation,

Edwards Lifesciences LLC, and

Edwards Lifesciences AG