
United States Court Of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

NUVASIVE, INC.,
Appellant,
v.
WARSAW ORTHOPEDIC, INC.,
Cross-Appellant,

2015-1049, -1050

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2013-00206

WARSAW ORTHOPEDIC, INC.,
Appellant,
v.
NUVASIVE, INC.,
Appellee,

2015-1058

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2013-00208

NUVASIVE'S CORRECTED OPENING BRIEF

Frank E. Scherkenbach
Fish & Richardson P.C.
One Marina Park Drive
Boston, MA 02110-1876
(617) 542-5070

Michael J. Kane
Stephen R. Schaefer
Fish & Richardson P.C.
3200 RBC Plaza
60 S. Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 335-5070

Craig E. Countryman
Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
(858) 678-5070

February 19, 2015

WARSAW2067

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Appellant NuVasive, Inc., certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party represented by me is: NuVasive, Inc.
2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is: N/A.
3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party represented by me are: N/A.
4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court are:

Fish & Richardson P.C.: Frank E. Scherkenbach, Stephen R. Schaefer, Michael Hawkins, Stuart Nelson, Michael J. Kane, Craig E. Countryman

Dated: February 19, 2015

/s/ Craig E. Countryman
Craig E. Countryman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Certificate of Interest	i
Statement of Related Cases	v
Statement of Jurisdiction	vi
Statement of the Issues	vii
Introduction	1
Statement of the Facts	3
I. <u>The Prior Art</u> : Methods for Performing Lateral Spinal Surgery With Various Tools and an Oversized Implant Were Well-Known.....	3
II. <u>The '997 Patent</u> : Dr. Michelson Attempts to Claim Modifying Posterior Implants for Use in a Lateral Procedure With Prior Art Tools.....	10
III. The <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Proceedings.....	15
A. The Board Institutes Review on Most of the Requested Grounds, But Finds The Grounds Based on Intervening Art Redundant.	15
B. The Board Takes Inconsistent Positions, Invalidating Some Claims, But Not Others.....	17
C. The Board's Denial of Rehearing.....	19
Summary of the Argument.....	20
Legal Standards	21
Argument.....	22
I. The Court Should Reverse the Board's Decision on Claims 9-16.....	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
A. The Board Legally Erred By Applying a Rigid Analysis That Was Improperly Limited to the Express Disclosures of Michelson '247.	22
B. The Board Wrongly Found Michelson '247 Did Not Suggest an Implant Extending Substantially the Full Direction of Insertion.	27
C. Claims 9-16 Would Have Been Obvious to the Skilled Artisan Under the Correct Analysis.	30
II. The Court Should Reverse the Board's Decision on Claims 24-30.	31
III. Alternatively, the Court Should Vacate and Remand with Instructions for the Board to Consider the Grounds It Deemed Redundant.	33
A. The Board's Final Written Decision Should Have Considered NuVasive's Other Grounds Because They Were No Longer Redundant.	33
B. This Court Has Jurisdiction to Address the Board's Failure to Address All NuVasive's Proposed Grounds of Invalidity.	35
Conclusion.	39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

In re Cuozzo Speed Techs.,
 ___ F.3d ___, 2015 WL 448667 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015) 29, 37

Dann v. Johnston,
 425 U.S. 219 (1976) 21

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
 550 U.S. 398 (2007)*passim*

In re Paulsen,
 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... 24

Randall Mfg. v. Rea,
 733 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2013)21, 23, 26

In re Sovish,
 769 F.2d 738 (Fed. Cir. 1985)..... 24

St. Jude Medical v. Volcano Corp.,
 749 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2014) 36, 37

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(2) 36

35 U.S.C. § 314..... 36

35 U.S.C. § 315..... 36, 38

35 U.S.C. § 318(a) 38

35 U.S.C. §§ 319, 141(c)..... 35

Other Authorities

Charles A. Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Edward H. Cooper, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 3932.1 (3d ed. 2012) 37

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.