

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NUVASIVE, INC.
Petitioner

v.

WARSAW ORTHOPEDIC, INC.
Patent Owner

Patent Number: 8,251,997 B2
Issue Date: August 28, 2012
Title: METHOD FOR INSERTING AN ARTIFICIAL
IMPLANT BETWEEN TWO ADJACENT VERTEBRAE
ALONG A CORONAL PLANE

Case IPR2013-00206

WARSAW'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,251,997	2
A.	Summary of the '997 Patent.....	3
1.	Advantages over prior art implants and methods	4
2.	Dr. Michelson's claimed implant.....	5
3.	Dr. Michelson's "true" lateral method.....	7
III.	BOARD'S DECISION TO INSTITUTE REVIEW	8
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
A.	"a path having an axis lying in a coronal plane passing through a lateral aspect and a medial aspect of the two adjacent vertebrae and anterior to the transverse processes"	10
B.	"elongated portion"	12
V.	PETITIONER'S PRIOR ART DOES NOT DISCLOSE A DIRECT OR "TRUE" LATERAL APPROACH FOR PERFORMING INTERBODY SPINAL FUSION, MUCH LESS THE CLAIMED IMPLANT.....	14
A.	The State of the Relevant Prior Art.....	15
B.	Jacobson	19
1.	Jacobson does not disclose direct lateral.	19
2.	Jacobson does not disclose the insertion of an implant.	24
C.	Brantigan	26
1.	Brantigan does not disclose the lateral insertion of an implant.	26
a.	Figure 10 does not disclose the direct lateral insertion of an implant.	27

b.	Brantigan uses the term “lateral” to mean lateral to the midline of the vertebral body.....	29
2.	Brantigan does not disclose an implant with a length that occupies all or substantially all of the transverse width of adjacent vertebral bodies.....	31
a.	Brantigan’s disclosure of the “shape and size” of plug 11 show it does not occupy substantially the full transverse width of adjacent vertebral bodies.....	32
b.	Brantigan’s Figure 10 does not depict an implant of the claimed length.	35
c.	Brantigan teaches that its implant can be rotated within the disc space.....	37
d.	The periphery of implant 11 is designed to sit on the center of the vertebral body.	37
3.	Claim 24 - “the length of said implant being sized to occupy the <u>full</u> transverse width of the vertebral bodies of the two adjacent vertebrae”.....	38
4.	The parties’ prior litigation	39
D.	Michelson ’247	40
1.	Figure 5 does not teach an implant that occupies the entire depth of a vertebral space.	40
2.	Michelson ’247 teaches an implant that should be recessed in the intervertebral space.	42
3.	Claim 24 - “the length of said implant being sized to occupy the <u>full</u> transverse width of the vertebral bodies of the two adjacent vertebrae”.....	46
E.	The Leu Reference	47
F.	The Claimed “Elongated Portion(s)”	49

..

VI.	A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART WOULD NOT COMBINE THE REFERENCES AS SUGGESTED BY PETITIONER	50
A.	Jacobson, Leu, and Brantigan	50
B.	Jacobson, Leu, and Michelson	53
VII.	SECONDARY INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	55
A.	Teaching Away.....	55
B.	Commercial Success.....	56
C.	Industry Praise.....	58
D.	Copying	59
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	60

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Asyst Techn., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	58
<i>August Tech. Corp. v. Camtek, Ltd.</i> , 655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	15
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	14
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese and Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	14
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	57, 60
<i>Geo. M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Intern. LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	58
<i>Graybill v. U.S. Postal Serv.</i> , 782 F.2d 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	39
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	10, 12
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	55
<i>Luben Indus. v. United States</i> , 707 F.2d 1037 (9th Cir. 1983)	40
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharma. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	56
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semi. Int’l, Inc.</i> , 763 F. Supp. 2d 671 (D. Del. 2010).....	40

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.