

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BECTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY
Petitioner,

v.

B. BRAUN MELSUNGEN AG
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01585
Patent 8,337,463

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	4
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
A.	<i>Background and Overview of the Law</i>	5
B.	<i>“Needle Protective Device” is Synonymous with “Needle Guard Element”</i>	6
C.	<i>“Needle Protective Device” a.k.a. “Needle Guard Element” is Not a Means-Plus-Function Term</i>	9
1.	The ’463 Patent Discloses “Needle Protective Device” is A Structure.....	9
2.	The Prosecution History Teaches “Needle Protective Device” is A Structure.....	12
3.	“Needle Protective Device” is a Class of Structures Well-Known to a POSITA.....	13
4.	Surrounding Claim Language Indicates “Needle Protective Device” is Structural and Not Limited to Spring Clips.....	16
IV.	STANDARD FOR INSTITUTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	18
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF GROUND 1 BECAUSE IT IS BASED ON THE SAME PRIOR ART AND SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ARGUMENTS ALREADY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE	22
A.	<i>The Office has already determined it would not be obvious for a POSITA to incorporate a valve into the Woehr-108 catheters.....</i>	23
B.	<i>The Office already determined it would not be obvious to incorporate the valve assembly of Tauschinski into a catheter hub</i>	26

C.	<i>Petitioner’s proposed combination of Woehr-108 and Tauschinski adds nothing beyond what was already considered by the Office....</i>	28
D.	<i>Arnett adds nothing beyond what is already disclosed in Tauschinski.....</i>	30
E.	<i>Petitioner merely concludes, without supporting evidence, that it would be obvious to include Tauschinski’s disc 3 and member 10 in the catheter hub of Woehr-108.....</i>	35
F.	<i>Patent Owner’s Australian expert never stated there were “no design concerns” with incorporating a valve into the catheter hub of Woehr-108.....</i>	37
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF GROUND 1 BECAUSE PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW HOW TO SUCCESSFULLY INCORPORATE A VALVE AND ACTUATOR INTO THE CATHETER HUB OF WOEHR-108 WHILE MAINTAINING THE FUNCTIONALITY OF THE WOEHR-108 CATHETER	39
A.	<i>Significant design challenges exist for a POSITA considering incorporating a valve and actuator into the Woehr-108 catheter hub.....</i>	40
B.	<i>Petitioner never adequately explains how a POSITA would overcome the design challenges.....</i>	45
C.	<i>There is no reason to modify the Tauschinski actuator</i>	48
VII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 2 BECAUSE VAN HEUGTEN DOES NOT DISCLOSE A VALVE WITH SLITS, AND BECAUSE THERE IS NO REASON TO USE THE ACTUATOR OF ARNETT WITH THE VALVE OF VAN HEUGTEN	51
A.	<i>Van Heugten fails to disclose a valve with slits, as required by all Challenged Claims.....</i>	52
B.	<i>There is no reason to modify the already existing actuator of Van Heugten based on Arnett.....</i>	54

VIII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS58

IX. CONCLUSION.....59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communs., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	34, 36
<i>In re Am. Acad. Of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	5
<i>Apex Inc. v. Raritan Comp., Inc.</i> , 325 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	6
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	34
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	5
<i>Front Row Technologies, LLC v. MLB Advanced Media, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01932, Paper 7 (Mar. 24, 2016)	20
<i>Fujunon Corp. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83088 (D. Del. Sept. 11, 2009).....	9
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	19
<i>Inventio AG v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Am. Corp.</i> , 649 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	17
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	20
<i>Lighting World, Inc. v. Birchwood Lighting, Inc.</i> , 382 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	6, 13, 15
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	18, 19, 20, 52
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F. 3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	57

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.