

1 NIMALKA R. WICKRAMASEKERA (SBN: 268518)

nwickramasekera@winston.com

2 DAVID P. DALKE (SBN: 218161)

ddalke@winston.com

3 LEV TSUKERMAN (SBN: 319184)

lsukerman@winston.com

4 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

333 S. Grand Avenue

5 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543

Telephone: (213) 615-1700

6 Facsimile: (213) 615-1750

7 BRIAN J. NISBET (*Pro Hac Vice*)

bnisbet@winston.com

8 SARANYA RAGHAVAN (*Pro Hac Vice*)

sraghavan@winston.com

9 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

35 West Wacker Drive

10 Chicago, IL 60601-9703

Telephone: (312) 558-5600

11 Facsimile: (312) 558-5700

12 CORINNE STONE HOCKMAN (*Pro Hac Vice*)

chockman@winston.com

13 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

1111 Louisiana Street, 25th Floor

14 Houston, TX 77002-5242

Telephone: (713) 651-2600

15 Facsimile: (713) 651-2700

16 Attorneys for Defendants

ALPHATEC HOLDINGS, INC. AND ALPHATEC SPINE, INC.

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

19 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

20 NUVASIVE, INC., a Delaware
21 corporation,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 ALPHATEC HOLDINGS, INC., a
25 Delaware corporation and
ALPHATEC SPINE, INC., a
California corporation,

26 Defendants.

Case No. 18-CV-00347-CAB-MDD

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
NUVASIVE, INC.'S MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Judge: Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo
Courtroom: 4C

**PER CHAMBERS RULES, NO ORAL
ARGUMENT UNLESS SEPARATELY
ORDERED BY THE COURT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

- I. INTRODUCTION 1
- II. RESPONSE TO PURPORTED UNDISPUTED FACTS..... 3
- III. LEGAL STANDARD 5
 - A. Summary Judgment..... 5
 - B. Non-infringement..... 5
 - C. Invalidity 6
 - D. Inequitable Conduct 6
- IV. NON-INFRINGEMENT 7
 - A. Alphatec’s Accused Products Do Not Infringe Claims 1, 3, 9, or 10 of the ’832 Patent 7
 - 1. Alphatec’s dilators do not “create a tissue distraction corridor in a lateral, trans-psoas path to a lumbar spine.” 8
 - 2. Alphatec’s accused system does not include dilators with “a stimulation electrode that outputs electrical stimulation for nerve monitoring.” 10
 - B. Alphatec’s Accused Products Do Not Infringe Claims 21, 22, 24, 25, or 27 of the ’780 Patent..... 12
 - 1. Alphatec’s dilators do not “create a tissue distraction corridor along a lateral, trans-psoas path to the lumbar spine.” 12
 - 2. Alphatec’s accused system does not “deliver electrical stimulation for nerve monitoring.” 12
 - 3. Alphatec’s accused outer dilator is not “slidably engageable” with an exterior of its inner dilator. 13
 - 4. Alphatec’s retractors arms do not “move relative to” one another “in response to pivoting movement.” 14
 - C. Alphatec’s Accused Products Do Not Infringe the ’270 Patent 18
 - D. NuVasive’s Cases Do Not Support Summary Judgment of Infringement..... 19
- V. INVALIDITY 20
 - A. NuVasive’s Arguments Fail as a Matter of Law 23
 - 1. Dr. Branch opined that each asserted claim as a whole is obvious. 23

1	2.	Dr. Branch provides detailed opinions on motivation to combine each reference beyond them being in the same field of endeavor.	23
2			
3	3.	Dr. Branch’s opinions are not conclusory or unsupported.	26
4	4.	Dr. Branch’s motivation to combine opinions are tied to the elements of the asserted claims.	27
5	5.	Though not needed to support obviousness, Dr. Branch provided motivation to combine the teachings of Branch and Maeda to reach a three-bladed retractor.	28
6			
7	6.	It is undisputed that sequential dilation, stimulated sequential dilation, and/or stimulated sequential dilation was known.	30
8			
9	7.	Releasably attached intradiscal shim elements were well-known to the POSA.	31
10	VI.	INEQUITABLE CONDUCT	32
11	A.	There Are Genuine Issues of Material Fact Regarding Inequitable Conduct During Prosecution of the ’227 and ’531 Patents	35
12			
13	1.	Kanter is material.	35
14	2.	Kanter is non-cumulative.	37
15	3.	There is evidence of specific intent to deceive.	38
16	4.	NuVasive made a materially misleading statement to the PTO.	39
17	B.	There Are Genuine Issues of Material Fact Regarding Inequitable Conduct During Prosecution of the ’832 Patent	40
18	1.	Leu is material.	40
19	2.	Leu is non-cumulative.	42
20	3.	There is evidence of specific intent to deceive.	43
21	C.	There Are Genuine Issues of Material Fact Regarding Inequitable Conduct During Prosecution of the ’859 Patent	44
22			
23	1.	XLIF Surgical Techniques, Jacobson, Friedman, Kanter, Leu, and Maeda are material.	44
24	2.	XLIF Surgical Techniques, Jacobson, Friedman, Kanter, Leu, and Maeda are non-cumulative.	46
25	3.	There is evidence of specific intent to deceive.	46
26			
27	D.	NuVasive’s Cases Do Not Support Summary Judgment of No Inequitable Conduct	48
28	VII.	CONCLUSION	49

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

ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.,
346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 15, 16, 17

Altair Instruments, Inc. v. Kelley W. Enterprises,
LLC, No. CV 15-8115-R, 2016 WL 9023017 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 16,
2016) 19

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.,
477 U.S. 242 (1986)..... 5

In re Applied Materials, Inc.,
692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 5

Carl Zeiss Vision Int’l GMBH v. Signet Armorlite, Inc.,
No. 07-cv-0894 DMS (POR), 2011 WL 6372785 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 19,
2011) 48

Celotex Corp. v. Catrett,
477 U.S. 317 (1986)..... 5

Centillion Data Sys., LLC v. Qwest Commc’ns Int’l Inc.,
631 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 11

Critikon, Inc. v. Becton Dickinson Vascular Access,
120 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 6

DeMarini Sports, Inc. v. Worth, Inc.,
239 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 17

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.,
251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 2, 6, 20

Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.,
737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 29, 30

1 *IPS Grp., Inc. v. Duncan Sols., Inc.*,
 2 No. 15-CV-1526-CAB-MDD, 2017 WL 3530968 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 16,
 3 2017), *aff'd sub nom.*, *Duncan Parking Techs., Inc. v. IPS Grp., Inc.*,
 4 914 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 5

5 *In re Katz Interactive*,
 6 No. 07–ML–01816–RGK, 2009 WL 8635983 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 14,
 7 2009) 48

8 *Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Google LLC*,
 9 2020 WL 485909, --- F.3d ---- (Fed. Cir. 2020)..... 25

10 *Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.*,
 11 No. 02CV2060–B(CAB), 2007 WL 1877983 (S.D. Cal. June 27,
 12 2007) *passim*

13 *M. Eagles Tool Warehouse, Inc. v. Fisher Tooling Co.*,
 14 439 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 2, 6

15 *In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.*,
 16 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 25, 27

17 *Matsushita Elec. Inds. Co., Ltd., v. Zenith Radio Corp.*,
 18 475 U.S. 574 (1986)..... 5

19 *Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.*,
 20 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 9

21 *In re NuVasive, Inc.*,
 22 693 F. App’x 893 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 8, 9

23 *NuVasive, Inc. v. Iancu*,
 24 752 F. App’x 985 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... *passim*

25 *Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps S., LLC*,
 26 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 6

27 *Omega Patents, LLC. v. CalAmp Corp.*,
 28 920 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 11, 13

Paragon Podiatry Lab., Inc. v. KLM Labs., Inc.,
 984 F.2d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1993) 6

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.