

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORP.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC SCIMED, INC.,

*Patent Owner.*

---

Case IPR2017-01294

Patent 6,371,962

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| PATENT OWNER’S LIST OF EXHIBITS .....  | iv          |
| I. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED .....   | 1           |
| II. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1           |
| III. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE ’962 PATENT .....  | 2           |
| IV. THE ART AND GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY RELIED<br>ON BY PETITIONER.....   | 5           |
| V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND THE DISTRICT COURT<br>PROCEEDING.....  | 6           |
| VI. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A<br>REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY IN<br>EACH OF ITS GROUNDS OF CHALLENGE.....   | 8           |
| A. Ground 1: Obviousness Of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 20-22,<br>25, 26, 29, 30, 35, and 36 In View Of Olympus, The<br>Knowledge Of A POSITA, Burton, Fischell ’274, and<br>Fischell ’507 ..... | 9           |
| 1. The References Fail to Disclose Every Limitation of<br>Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 20-22, 25, 26, 29, 30, 35, and 36.....   | 9           |
| 2. Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Demonstrating A<br>Motivation To Combine References.....   | 17          |
| B. Ground 2: Obviousness Of Claims 1-3, 6, 11-13, 20-22, 25,<br>29, 30, 35, and 36 In View Of Fischell ’274 and Burton.....  | 26          |
| 1. The References Fail to Disclose Every Limitation of<br>Claims 2, 3, 6, 20, 21, and 24 .....   | 26          |
| 2. Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Demonstrating A<br>Motivation To Combine Fischell ’274 and Burton.....   | 27          |
| C. Ground 3: Anticipation Of Claims 1-3, 6, 12, 20-22, and 30<br>By Ravenscroft.....   | 30          |
| D. Ground 4: Obviousness Of Claims 9, 10, 13, 27, and 28 In<br>View Of References In Grounds 1 and 2 and Jendersee.....  | 39          |

E. Ground 5: Obviousness Of Claim 8 in View Of References  
In Grounds 1 Through 3, The Knowledge Of A POSITA,  
Burton, Fischell '274, Fischell '507, And/Or Williams.....41

VII. CONCLUSION.....42

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|  | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|--|----------------|
| <b>CASES</b>   |                |
| <i>Activision Blizzard, Inc. v. Acceleration Bay, LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2016-00727, Paper 13 at 17 (PTAB September 9, 2016)..... | 21             |
| <i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> ,<br>732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....  | 20             |
| <i>Exacq Technologies, Inc., v. JDS Technologies, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2016-00567, Paper 7 at 23 (PTAB July 15, 2016) .....    | 22             |
| <i>Exacq Technologies, Inc., v. JDS Technologies, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2016-00567, Paper 7 at 21 (PTAB July 21, 2016) .....    | 20             |
| <i>Ex parte Levy</i> ,<br>17 USPQ2d 1461 (B.P.A.I. 1990) .....   | 36             |
| <i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize Prods. Co.</i> ,<br>840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....                             | 26             |
| <i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> ,<br>545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....                                       | 34             |
| <i>In re Oelrich</i> ,<br>666 F.2d 578, 212 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981).....  | 11, 36         |
| <i>Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2016-00165, Paper 7 at 17-18 (PTAB Apr. 21, 2016) .....            | 20             |
| <i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> ,<br>600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....                              | 21             |
| <i>In re Rijckaert</i> ,<br>9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....   | 12, 36         |
| <i>Seabery N. Am., Inc. v. Lincoln Glob., Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2016-00749, Paper 13 at 11-12 (PTAB Sept. 21, 2016) .....       | 23             |

## STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS

|                             |    |
|-----------------------------|----|
| 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(h)(3)..... | 38 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....   | 11 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....  | 1  |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102.....        | 8  |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103.....        | 12 |

# 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.