

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

KIRN MEDICAL DESIGN, L.L.C. and APPLIED MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY,
INC.,
Patent Owner.¹

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

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2017-01990

**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

¹ Petitioners note that Applied Medical Technology, Inc. is the exclusive licensee of the '715 patent. Additional details are provided *infra* fn. 2.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW	1
A. The '715 patent.....	1
B. Background of Nasal Bridles	7
III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 41.104(A)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS	9
IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)).....	9
A. Each Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	9
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	9
1. Judicial Matters	9
2. Administrative Matters	10
C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))	10
V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(A))	11
VI. THE '715 PATENT AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	11
A. The '715 Patent	11
B. The Priority Date of the '715 Patent	13
C. Board's Prior Decision	13
D. Claim Construction.....	14

VII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”) AND STATE OF THE ART	15
VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B))	16
IX. INVALIDITY ANALYSIS	17
A. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art	18
B. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	18
1. State of the Art	18
a) Ballantyne	18
b) Simmons	25
c) Izumi	29
d) Bierman.....	32
C. Ground 1: Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over Ballantyne in View of Simmons	36
1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art	36
2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	36
3. Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art	36
D. Ground 2: Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over Ballantyne in View of Izumi	54
1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art	54
2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	55
3. Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art	55
E. Ground 3: Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over Ballantyne in View of Simmons and Bierman.....	60
1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art	60
2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	60

3.	Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art	60
F.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	68
X.	CONCLUSION.....	69
XI.	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00368 (Institution Decision, Paper 8) at pp. 12-13 (Dec. 17, 2013)	73
<i>Applied Medical Technology, Inc. v. Corpak Medsystems, Inc.</i> , 1:16-cv-02190 (N.D. Ohio)	11
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc., et al. v. Crossroads Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01544 (Institution Decision, Paper 9) at pp. 13-14 (April 3, 2015)	23
<i>Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.</i> , 848 F.2d 1560, 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .4	4
<i>Corpak Medsystems, Inc. et al., v. Kirn Medical Design, L.L.C.</i> , IPR2017-00646, Paper 9 at 8 (Decision).....	3, 5, 12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2144-46 (2016).....	16
<i>Dow Jones & Co. v. Ablaise Ltd.</i> , 606 F.3d 1338, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	20
<i>DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356, 1368, (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	56, 72
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covigien AG</i> , IPR2015-01274 (Final Written Decision, Paper 25) at p. 18 (Nov. 30, 2016)	58
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. TLI Commc'ns, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00778 Paper 17, at 19 (P.T.A.B., Decision Granting Institution, Aug. 28, 2015)	6
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.</i> , 112 F.3d 495, 501 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	14, 59
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966).....	19, 65
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	73

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.