

1 **WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI**
 2 PAUL D. TRIPODI II (SBN 162380)
 3 ptripodi@wsgr.com
 4 WENDY L. DEVINE (SBN 246337)
 5 wdevine@wsgr.com
 6 NATALIE J. MORGAN (SBN 211143)
 7 nmorgan@wsgr.com
 8 633 West Fifth Street, Suite 1550
 9 Los Angeles, CA 90071
 10 Telephone: 323-210-2900
 11 Fax: 866-974-7329

7 **Hilgers Graben PLLC**
 8 MICHAEL T. HILGERS (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 9 mhilgers@hilgersgraben.com
 10 575 Fallbrook Blvd, Suite 202
 11 Lincoln, NE 68521
 12 Telephone: 402-218-2106
 13 Fax: 402-413-1880

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff NuVasive, Inc.*

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 16 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17 SAN DIEGO DIVISION

<p>15 NUVASIVE, INC., a Delaware 16 corporation, 17 Plaintiff, 18 v. 19 ALPHATEC HOLDINGS, INC., a 20 Delaware corporation, and ALPHATEC 21 SPINE, INC., a California corporation, 22 Defendants.</p>	<p>) Case No. 18-cv-00347-CAB-MDD)) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS) AND AUTHORITIES IN) SUPPORT OF NUVASIVE, INC.’S) MOTION FOR PARTIAL) SUMMARY JUDGMENT)) PER CHAMBERS RULES, NO) ORAL ARGUMENT UNLESS) SEPARATELY ORDERED BY THE) COURT)) Judge: Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo) Magistrate Judge: Mitchell D. Dembin</p>
--	--

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE(S)
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. UNDISPUTED FACTS	1
A. The Asserted Patents	1
1. The '832 Patent.....	1
2. The '780 Patent.....	2
3. The '270 Patent.....	2
B. Claim Construction	3
C. The Accused Products.....	3
D. Prior Art	5
III. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	6
A. Summary Judgment.....	6
B. Infringement.....	7
C. Inequitable Conduct.....	8
D. Validity.....	7
IV. INFRINGEMENT	9
A. The Accused Alphatec Devices Infringe claims 1, 3, 9, and 10 of the '832 Patent.....	9
1. Alphatec's Distraction Corridor Argument	9
2. Alphatec's Incomplete Surgical Guide Argument	11
B. The Accused Alphatec Devices Infringe Claims 21, 22, 24, 25, and 27 of the '780 Patent	12
1. Alphatec's Distraction Corridor Argument	12
2. Alphatec's Incomplete Surgical Guide Argument	13
3. Alphatec's Separate Dilator Argument.....	13
4. Alphatec's New Claim Construction for Pivot Argument	14

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
(CONTINUED)**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

	PAGE(S)
C. The Accused Alphatec Devices Infringe the '270 Patent.....	15
1. Alphatec's the Detent is not a Ridge Structure Argument	16
V. VALIDITY	18
A. The '832 Patent is Valid.....	18
B. The '227 Patent is Valid.....	21
C. The '780 Patent is Valid.....	23
D. The '270 Patent is Valid.....	24
E. The '801 Patent is Valid.....	26
F. The '531 Patent is Valid.....	28
G. The '859 Patent is Valid.....	32
VI. INEQUITABLE CONDUCT	35
A. The '832 Patent	36
1. Leu is Cumulative of Prior Art of Record	36
2. Alphatec Cannot Show That Leu is Material	38
3. Alphatec Cannot Show Specific Intent to Deceive by Any Individual Who Owed a Duty of Candor to the PTO.....	39
B. The '227 Patent	40
1. Kanter is Cumulative of Prior Art of Record	40
2. Alphatec Cannot Show Kanter is Material.....	41
3. Alphatec Cannot Show Specific Intent to Deceive by Any Individual Who Owed a Duty of Candor to the PTO.....	42
4. No Individual Who Owed a Duty of Candor to the PTO Made a Materially Misleading Statement.....	43
C. The '859 Patent	44
1. The Undisclosed Reference Are Cumulative of Prior Art of Record.....	44
2. Alphatec Cannot Show That the Undisclosed References Are Material.....	45

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 3. Alphatec Cannot Show Specific Intent to Deceive by Any Individual Who Owed a Duty of Candor to the PTO.....46
- D. The '531 Patent46
 - 1. Kanter is Cumulative of Prior Art of Record46
 - 2. Alphatec Cannot Show Kanter is Material.....47
 - 3. Alphatec Cannot Show Specific Intent to Deceive by Any Individual Who Owed a Duty of Candor to the PTO.....48
 - 4. No Individual Who Owed a Duty of Candor to the PTO Made a Materially Misleading Statement.....49
- E. **Alphatec’s Improper and Untimely Expert Opinions**.....49

- VII. CONCLUSION50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE(S)

CASES

Ist Media, LLC v. Elec. Arts, Inc., 694 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 8

Altair Instruments, Inc. v. Kelley W. Enters., Ltd. Liab. Co., No. CV 15-8115-R (C.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2016)..... 9

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242 (1986) 7

Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Semiconductor Materials Am., Inc., No. C 92-20643 RMW, 1995 WL 261407 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 1995)..... 50

Asia Vital Components Co. v. Asetek Danmark A/S, 377 F. Supp. 3d 990 (N.D. Cal. 2019) 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 33

Avid Identification Sys., Inc. v. Crystal Import Corp., 603 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 39

Barry v. Medtronic, Inc., No. 1:14-CV-104, 2016 WL 7665782 (E.D. Tex. July 19, 2016)..... 50

Becton Dickinson & Co. v. C.R. Bard, Inc., 922 F.2d 792 (Fed. Cir. 1990)..... 6

Carl Zeiss Vision Int’l GmbH v. Signet Armorlite, Inc., No. 07cv0894 DMS (POR), 2011 WL 6372785 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2011)39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49

Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986)..... 6

Colorado v. New Mexico, 467 U.S. 310 (1984) 7

Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc., 138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (en banc) 7

Dimension One Spas, Inc. v. Coverplay, Inc., Case No. 03cv1099-L(CAB), 2007 WL 2815042 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2007)..... 36

In re Katz Interactive, Nos. 07-ML-01816-RGK, 2009 WL 8635983 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2009) 36, 41, 47

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd., 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 33

Intellect Wireless, Inc. v. HTC Corp., 732 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 8

Intermec Techs. Corp. v. Palm Inc., 738 F. Supp. 2d 522 (D. Del. 2010), *aff’d*, 466 F. App’x 881 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 36

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398..... 20, 23, 31, 35

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.