

1 NIMALKA R. WICKRAMASEKERA (SBN: 268518)
 nwickramasekera@winston.com
 2 STEPHEN R. SMERЕК (SBN: 208343)
 ssmerek@winston.com
 3 JASON C. HAMILTON (SBN: 267968)
 jhamilton@winston.com
 4 SHILPA A. COORG (SBN: 278034)
 scoorg@winston.com
 5 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
 333 S. Grand Avenue
 6 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543
 Telephone: (213) 615-1700
 7 Facsimile: (213) 615-1750

8 Attorneys for Defendants
 ALPHATEC HOLDINGS, INC. AND ALPHATEC SPINE, INC.
 9

10
 11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 12 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 13 **SAN DIEGO DIVISION**

14 NUVASIVE, INC., a Delaware
 corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 ALPHATEC HOLDINGS, INC., a
 18 Delaware corporation and
 ALPHATEC SPINE, INC., a
 19 California corporation,

20 Defendants.

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

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

[Magistrate: Hon. Mitchell D. Dembin]

**DEFENDANTS’ OPPOSITION TO
 PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION;
 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
 AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
 THEREOF**

**SPECIAL BRIEFING SCHEDULE
 ORDERED**

Date: June 21, 2018
 Time: 2:00 p.m.
 Place: Courtroom 4C

Complaint Filed: February 13, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1

2

3 **I. INTRODUCTION** 1

4 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS** 2

5 **III. ARGUMENT**..... 3

6 **A. NuVasive Is Unlikely To Succeed On The Merits** 3

7 **1. NuVasive has not met, and cannot meet, its burden to show that it**

8 **is likely to succeed on the merits.**..... 3

9 **2. NuVasive has not shown that it will likely withstand invalidity.**.... 7

10 **3. NuVasive has not met, and cannot meet, its burden to prove**

11 **assignor estoppel applies.** 11

12 **B. There Is No Irreparable Harm To Nuvasive** 13

13 **1. NuVasive’s delay shows there is no irreparable harm.** 13

14 **2. NuVasive’s purported harm is belied by its public statements.** 14

15 **3. NuVasive’s purported harms are unsupported.** 16

16 **4. Even if NuVasive prevailed, monetary relief would adequately**

17 **compensate NuVasive.**..... 20

18 **5. NuVasive fails to establish nexus.**..... 21

19 **C. The Balance Of Hardships Favors Alphatec**..... 25

20 **D. The Public Interest Will Be Disserved By Granting An Injunction** 25

21 **IV. CONCLUSION**..... 25

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

1

2

3

4

5 *Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.*,

6 452 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 17

7 *Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.*,

8 797 F.3d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 6

9 *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.*,

10 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 8

11 *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.*,

12 695 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 22

13 *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,

14 678 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 21

15 *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,

16 809 F.3d 633 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 21

17 *Automated Merch. Sys., Inc. v. Crane Co.*,

18 357 F. App’x 297 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 20

19 *Bio-Tech. Gen. Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.*,

20 80 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 17

21 *Blackberry Ltd. v. Typo Prods. LLC*

22 2014 WL 1318689 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 28, 2014) 21

23 *CA, Inc. v. New Relic, Inc.*,

24 2015 WL 1611993 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 8, 2015)..... 13

25 *California Lacrosse, Inc. v. Lacrosse Unlimited, Inc.*,

26 2017 WL 1427130 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2017) 14

27 *Carroll Touch, Inc. v. Electro Mech. Sys., Inc.*,

28 15 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1993) 13

Checkpoint Sys., Inc. v. All-Tag Sec. S.A.,

412 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 12

1 *Cordis Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corp.*,
 2 99 Fed. Appx. 928 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 25

3 *DNA Genotek Inc. v. Spectrum Sols. L.L.C.*,
 4 2016 WL 8738225 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2016)..... 2, 3

5 *Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prods. Co.*,
 6 717 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 19

7 *eBay Inc. v. MerkExchange, L.L.C.*,
 8 547 U.S. 388 (2006)..... 2

9 *Hansen Beverage Co. v. Vital Pharm., Inc.*,
 10 2008 WL 5427601 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 30, 2008) 1

11 *Heart Imaging Tech., LLC v. Merge Healthcare Inc.*,
 12 2013 WL 4432125 (M.D.N.C. Aug. 14, 2013) 16, 24

13 *High Tech Med. Instrumentation, Inc. v. New Image Indus., Inc.*,
 14 49 F.3d 1551 (Fed. Cir. 1995) 14, 21

15 *Hologic, Inc. v. Minerva Surgical, Inc.*,
 16 2016 WL 3143824 (D. Del. June 2, 2016) 21

17 *HWB, Inc. v. Braner, Inc.*,
 18 869 F. Supp. 579 (N.D. Ill. 1994)..... 12, 13

19 *Intel Corp. v. United States Int’l Trade Comm’n*,
 20 946 F.2d 821 (Fed. Cir. 1991) 13

21 *Litton Systems, Inc. v. Sundstrand Corp.*,
 22 750 F.2d 952 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 25

23 *M-I LLC v. FPUSA, LLC*,
 24 2015 WL 6738823 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2015) 21

25 *MAG Aerospace Industries, Inc. v. B/E Aerospace, Inc.*,
 26 816 F.3d at 1374 (_____) 13

27 *Malibu Boats, LLC v. Nautique Boat Co., Inc.*,
 28 997 F. Supp. 2d 866 (E.D. Tenn. Feb. 4, 2014) 24

Maxlinear, Inc. v. Silicon Labs. Inc
 2012 WL 12878678 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2012)..... *passim*

...

1 *Maxwell Techs., Inc. v. Nesscap, Inc.*,
 2 508 F. Supp. 2d 837 (S.D. Cal. 2007) 3, 4
 3 *Medtronic v. NuVasive*,
 4 No. 3:08-cv-1512 (S.D. Cal.)(April 1, 2010)..... 5
 5 *Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.*,
 6 870 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 13
 7 *Mentor Graphics Corp. v. Quickturn Design Sys., Inc.*,
 8 150 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 13
 9 *Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.*,
 10 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 21
 11 *Mikkelsen Graphic Eng’g Inc. v. Zund Am. Inc.*,
 12 2014 WL 12654766 (E.D. Wis. May 23, 2014)..... 12
 13 *Minsurg Int’l, Inc. v. Frontier Devices, Inc.*,
 14 2010 WL 5775680 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 5, 2010)..... 6
 15 *Mylan Institutional LLC v. Aurobindo Pharma Ltd.*,
 16 857 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 23
 17 *Nichia Corp. v. Everlight Ams., Inc.*,
 18 855 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 16
 19 *NuVasive, Inc. v. Globus Med., Inc.*,
 20 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97511 (D. Del. July 12, 2013)..... 4
 21 *Open Text, S.A. v. Box, Inc.*,
 22 36 F. Supp. 3d 885 (N.D. Cal. 2014)..... 22
 23 *PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Gilbert Inc.*,
 24 2014 WL 2532520 (N.D.N.Y. June 5, 2014) 19
 25 *Precision Links Inc. v. USA Prods. Grp., Inc.*,
 26 527 Fed. App’x 852 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 18
 27 *Prestige Flag Mfg. Co. v. Par Aide Prods. Co.*,
 28 2015 WL 11990931 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2015) 13
Prometheus Labs., Inc. v. Mayo Collaborative Servs.,
 2005 WL 7985065 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 22, 2005)..... 4

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.