

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FRONT LINE MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Petitioner

v.

PRYTIME MEDICAL DEVICES, INC.

Patent Owner

Post Grant Review No. PGR2024-00028

Patent No. 11,857,737

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.70

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a) and the Board's October 16, 2024 Scheduling Order (Paper No. 8) ("Scheduling Order"), Patent Owner Prytime Medical Devices, Inc. ("Patent Owner") hereby respectfully requests oral argument (currently scheduled to take place on July 16, 2025 per the Scheduling Order) on at least the issues set forth below in connection with this proceeding (PGR2024-00028). Patent Owner respectfully requests that the oral argument be held virtually by videoconference pursuant to the Scheduling Order.

Patent Owner respectfully requests that each side be given one hour to present its arguments. Patent Owner requests (without waiving consideration of any issue not listed below) to address at least the following issues:

- (1) The proper constructions of "proximal hub," "flow valve," "distal catheter section," and "a solid wire, secured at a proximal-most end thereof within the proximal hub";
- (2) Whether Petitioner has failed to provide evidence showing the distinctly claimed "proximal hub" and "flow valve" components can be satisfied by a single component in the prior art;
- (3) Whether Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that claims 1-10 of the '737 Patent are obvious over Fogarty, Chengod, and a PHOSITA's knowledge;

- (4) Whether Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that claims 1-10 of the '737 Patent are obvious over Eliason and a PHOSITA's knowledge;
- (5) Whether Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that claims 1-10 of the '737 Patent are obvious over Eliason, Fogarty, and a PHOSITA's knowledge;
- (6) Whether Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that claim 2 is obvious in further view of Saab;
- (7) The proper definition of a PHOSITA for the '737 Patent;
- (8) The amount of weight that should be afforded to Dr. Scott Resnick's opinions in this proceeding;
- (9) Whether Petitioner improperly submitted new evidence and argument in its Reply; and
- (10) Any additional issues on which the Board seeks clarification.

Date: June 4, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

Prytime Medical Devices, Inc.

By: /Stephen E. Murray/
Stephen E. Murray, Reg. No. 63,206
Ragi A.I. Elias, Reg. No. 67,772
PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP
Two Commerce Square
2001 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
(215) 965-1330
(215) 965-1331 (Fax)
smurray@panitchlaw.com (E-Mail)
relias@panitchlaw.com (E-Mail)

John D. Simmons, Reg. No. 52,225
Dennis J. Butler, Reg. No. 51,519
PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP
Delaware Corporate Center
1 Righter Parkway, Suite 220
Wilmington, DE 19803
(302) 394-6030
(302) 394-6031 (Fax)
jsimmons@panitchlaw.com (E-mail)
dbutler@panitchlaw.com (E-mail)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE UNDER 37 CFR § 42.6(e)

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.70 has been served in its entirety this 4th day of June 2025, by electronic mail on Petitioner's lead and back-up counsel, as follows:

Brian C. Banner
Slayden Grubert Beard PLLC
401 Congress Ave., Ste. 1650
Austin, TX 78701
bbanner@sgbfirm.com

Daniel A. Tysver
James M. Urzedowski
FORSGREN FISHER MCCALMONT
DEMAREA TYSVER LLP
1500 Capella Tower
225 S. 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
dtysver@forsgrenfisher.com
jurzedowski@forsgrenfisher.com

/Stephen E. Murray/
Stephen E. Murray
Registration No. 63,206
Attorney for Prytime Medical Devices, Inc.