

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CORPAK MEDSYSTEMS, INC. and HALYARD HEALTH, INC.,
Petitioners

v.

APPLIED MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 6,631,715 to Kim

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2017-00646

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,715 Under
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. § 42**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW	1
A. Description of the '715 patent	1
B. Background of Nasal Bridles.....	4
III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 41.104(A)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS	6
IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)).....	6
A. Each Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	6
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	6
1. Judicial Matters	6
2. Administrative Matters.....	7
C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))	7
V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(A))	7
VI. THE '715 PATENT AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	8
A. The '715 Patent.....	8
B. The Priority Date of the '715 Patent.....	9
C. Claim Construction.....	10
VII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”) AND STATE OF THE ART	10
VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)).....	11
IX. INVALIDITY ANALYSIS	12
A. Ground 1: Ballantyne Anticipates Claim 18.....	12
1. Disclosure of Ballantyne	14
2. Patentee’s Admissions Regarding its Alleged Improvements over the Disclosure of Ballantyne.....	21
3. Anticipation Analysis of Claim 18.....	22
B. Ground 2: Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over Ballantyne Alone.....	28

1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	29
2.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	29
	a) State of the Art	29
	The state of the art has been described above. See supra	
	Section II(B).....	29
	b) Ballantyne	29
3.	Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art.....	30
C.	Ground 3: Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over	
	Ballantyne in View of the '448 Patent.....	40
	1. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	40
	2. Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art.....	42
D.	Ground 4: Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over	
	Ballantyne in View of the '199 Patent and the '538 Patent	51
	1. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	51
	2. Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art.....	54
E.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	64
X.	CONCLUSION	65
XI.	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
IPR2013-00368 (Institution Decision, Paper 8) at pp. 12-13 (Dec.
17, 2013)..... 55

Applied Medical Technology, Inc. v. Corpak Medsystems, Inc.,
1:16-cv-02190 (N.D. Ohio)..... 4

Boston Sci. Scimed, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.,
554 F.3d 982 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 28

Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs.,
246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 55

Cisco Sys., Inc., et al. v. Crossroads Sys., Inc.,
IPR2014-01544 (Institution Decision, Paper 9) at pp. 13-14 (April 3,
2015)..... 10

Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.,
848 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... 3, 17, 44

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,
136 S. Ct. 2144-46 (2016) 7

Dow Jones & Co. v. Ablaise Ltd.,
606 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 26

Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covigien AG,
IPR2015-01274 (Final Written Decision, Paper 25) at p. 18 (Nov. 30,
2016)..... 46, 54

Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.,
112 F.3d 495 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 6

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 25, 37

<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	55
<i>In re Fout</i> , 675 F.2d 297 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	3, 44
<i>In re Icon Health and Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	45
<i>In re Kalm</i> , 378 F.2d 959 (C.C.P.A. 1967)	28
<i>In re Keller</i> , 642 F.2d 413 (Fed. Cir. 1981).....	46, 54
<i>In re Paulson</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	9, 19
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	7
<i>Int'l Business Machines Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2015-00302 (Institution Decision, Paper 8) at pp. 14-15 (June 2, 2015).....	10
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	8, 25, 46
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. Board of Trustees of Univ. of Ill.</i> , IPR2013-00005 (Institution Decision, Paper 19) at pp. 5-7 (March 13, 2013).....	10
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00483 (Institution Decision, Paper 10) at p. 15 (July 15, 2015).....	10
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00486 (Institution Decision, Paper 10) at p. 15 (July 15, 2015).....	10
<i>Newell Cos., Inc. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.</i> , 864 F.2d 757 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	55

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.