

# EXHIBIT 9

TO THE DECLARATION OF BRIAN J.  
NISBET IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'  
OPPOSITION TO NUVASIVE'S MOTION  
FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
AND MOTION TO EXCLUDE

1 NIMALKA R. WICKREAMASEKERA (SBN: 268518)  
nwickramasekera@winston.com  
2 DAVID P. DALKE (SBN: 218161)  
ddalke@winston.com  
3 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
333 S. Grand Avenue  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543  
Telephone: (213) 615-1700  
5 Facsimile: (213) 615-1750

6 *Attorneys of record continued on next page*

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

NUVASIVE, INC., a Delaware corporation

Plaintiff,

v.

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

Defendants.

**Case No. 3:18-CV-00347-CAB-MDD**

[Assigned to Courtroom 4C – Honorable  
Cathy Ann Bencivengo]

[Magistrate: Hon. Mitchell D. Dembin]

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –  
ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY**

**SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER**

**OPENING REPORT OF BARTON L.  
SACHS, M.D., M.B.A., F.A.C.P.E.,  
F.A.C.H.E.**

Complaint Filed: February 13, 2018  
Jury Trial Demanded

OPENING EXPERT REPORT OF BARTON L. SACHS, M.D., M.B.A.,  
F A C P E F A C H E

1 provisional application; and (4) the later-filed non-provisional application contains a  
2 reference to the provisional application.

3 50. I understand that to comply with the written description requirement of 35  
4 U.S.C. § 112(a), the provisional application must contain a written description that  
5 includes the manner and process of making and using each invention claimed in the non-  
6 provisional application in full, clear, and exact terms, to allow an ordinarily skilled  
7 artisan to practice the invention claimed in the non-provisional application:

8 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and  
9 of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear,  
10 concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which  
11 it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the  
12 same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor or  
joint inventor of carrying out his invention.

13 (35 U.S.C. § 112(a).)

14 51. I understand that the written description requirement can be met by figures,  
15 diagrams, or drawings. I understand, however, that a person of ordinary skill in the art  
16 must be able to derive the claimed dimensions of the invention from the written  
17 description.

18 52. I also understand that the provisional application must describe each  
19 invention claimed in the non-provisional application sufficiently to convey to a person  
20 of ordinary skill in the art that the applicant possessed the claimed invention at the time  
21 the provisional application was filed. In other words, the provisional application must  
22 demonstrate that the applicant invented what is claimed in the non-provisional  
23 application on a claim-by-claim basis.

24 53. Further, I understand while the provisional application need not provide  
25 verbatim support for the claims in the non-provisional application, one skilled in the art  
26 reading the earlier application must be able to immediately discern the limitations in the  
27 claims as of the date of the provisional application.

28

1 “entitled to a priority date at least as early as March 29, 2004, which is the filing date of  
2 U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/557,536.” (Infringement Contentions dated June  
3 29, 2018 at 36.)

4 150. I disagree. None of the asserted claims of the '334 patent is entitled to  
5 March 29, 2004, as a priority date based on the disclosures in the Provisional  
6 Application.

7 151. In my opinion, the Provisional Application does not provide sufficient  
8 written description support for at least the following limitations:

Radiopaque Marker Limitations Not Supported by Provisional Application	
Claim Limitation	Claim
“... at least three radiopaque markers; wherein a first of the at least three radiopaque markers is at least partially positioned in said distal wall, a second of said at least three radiopaque markers is at least partially positioned in said proximal wall, and a third of said at least three radiopaque markers is at least partially positioned in said central region.”	Claim 1 (from which claims 16 and 18 depend)
“... further comprising a fourth radiopaque marker situated within said implant, said fourth radiopaque marker positioned in said central region at a position spaced apart from said third radiopaque marker.”	Claim 16

22 152. I refer to these limitations as the “radiopaque marker limitations.”

23 153. Additionally, it is my opinion that the asserted claims of the '334 patent  
24 are not entitled to a priority date of March 29, 2004, because the Provisional Application  
25 does not provide sufficient written description support for at least the following  
26 limitations:

Dimension Limitations Not Supported by Provisional Application	
Claim Limitation	Claim
“... wherein said implant has a longitudinal length greater than 40 mm extending from a proximal end of said proximal wall to a distal end of said distal wall ...”	Claim 1 (from which claims 16 and 18 depend)
“... wherein said longitudinal length is at least two and half times greater than said maximum lateral width ...”	Claim 1 (from which claims 16 and 18 depend)
“... wherein said maximum lateral width of said implant is approximately 18 mm.”	Claim 18

154. Collectively, I refer to these limitations as the “dimension” limitations.

**(a) The asserted claims are not entitled to a March 29, 2004 because the Provisional Application does not support the “radiopaque marker” limitations**

155. As noted above, there is nothing in the Provisional Application that discloses the radiopaque marker limitations in the claimed spinal implants.

156. Rather, support for the “radiopaque markers” limitations did not appear until March 29, 2005 when applicants filed U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 11/093,409 (the “409 application”) (NUVA\_ATEC0020856–910), which ultimately issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,918,891 (the “891 patent”). The ’334 patent is a continuation of the ’891 patent, and these patents substantively share the same specification, aside from minor changes describing related applications. (*See, e.g.*, ’334 patent at cover page, 1:4–13.)

157. In the ’409 application filed on March 29, 2005, the applicants added several paragraphs and statements that were not part of the Provisional Application, including multiple passages and figures describing how radiopaque markers could be

# 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.