

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NUVASIVE, INC.
Petitioner

v.

WARSAW ORTHOPEDIC, INC.
Patent Owner

Patent Number: 8,444,696
Issue Date: May 21, 2013

ANATOMIC SPINAL IMPLANT HAVING
ANATOMIC BEARING SURFACES

Case IPR2013-00395

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Claim interpretations.....	1
A. “opening” (claims 1, 2, 4 and 5).....	1
B. “upper and lower bearing surfaces” (claims 1, 3, 4 and 6).....	1
III. Grounds 3-4: Senter teaches “upper and lower bearing surfaces . . . being convex”	2
IV. Grounds 3-4: One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify Senter’s implant to include Brantigan ‘035’s ratchetings to improve Senter’s stated objective to “inhibit dislocation (movement) of the implant ... after implantation.”	4
V. Grounds 3-4: One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify Senter’s implant to include the openings of Brantigan ‘035 for receiving “bone growth material” to promote bone growth.	7
VI. Ground 5: One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify Michelson ‘037’s implant to include the convex surfaces of Wagner because there is no indication that Michelson ‘037’s implant is intended only for use in treating a degenerative disc having lost its bi-convex appearance.	9
VII. Ground 5: One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify Michelson ‘037’s implant to include both Brantigan ‘035’s ratchetings and Wagner’s convex curvature to improve Michelson ‘037’s stated objective to “resist dislodgement.”	10
VIII. Ground 5: One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Michelson ‘037, Wagner, and Brantigan ‘035 as there is no requirement that all teachings of a prior art reference must be incorporated if one feature is incorporated.....	11

IX. Grounds 3-4 and 5: Warsaw’s arguments against the combining of prior art features is directly contradicted by any argument that supports the written description requirement for the claims. 13

X. Grounds 3-4 and 5: Warsaw’s secondary considerations arguments for patentability based on commercial success cannot pass scrutiny. 14

XI. Conclusion 15

EXHIBIT LIST

IPR2013-00395

NUVASIVE1001	Declaration of Dr. John W. Brantigan, M.D.
NUVASIVE1002	U.S. Patent No. 8,444,696 to Michelson (“the ‘696 patent”)
NUVASIVE1003	Select Prosecution History of the ‘696 patent (Serial No. 13/235,998)
NUVASIVE1004	U.S. Patent No. 5,645,596 to Kim et al. (“Kim”)
NUVASIVE1005	PCT Publication WO 89/09035 to Brantigan (“Brantigan ‘035”)
NUVASIVE1006	U.S. Patent No. 5,192,327 to Brantigan (“Brantigan ‘327”)
NUVASIVE1007	PCT Publication WO93/01771 to Senter et al. (“Senter”)
NUVASIVE1008	PCT Publication WO90/00037 to Michelson (“Michelson ‘037”)
NUVASIVE1009	U.S. Patent No. 5,306,309 to Wagner et al. (“Wagner”)
NUVASIVE1010	Select prosecution history of <i>inter partes</i> reexamination proceedings on U.S. Patent No. 8,021,430 (Control No. 95/002,380)
NUVASIVE1011	Plaintiffs’ Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions re U.S. Patent No. 8,444,696, from <i>Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc. et al. v. NuVasive</i> , S.D. Cal., Case No. 3:12-cv-02738-CAB (MDD)
NUVASIVE1012	Affidavit of Frank E. Scherkenbach in Support of <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission

...

Case IPR2013-00395
U.S. Patent No. 8,444,696
Our Ref. 13958-0113IP1

NUVASIVE1013	Reserved
NUVASIVE1014	Reserved
NUVASIVE1015	First surface feature shape example Introduced during deposition of Dr. Charles Branch
NUVASIVE1016	Annotated Second surface feature shape example Introduced during deposition of Dr. Charles Branch
NUVASIVE1017	Second Declaration of Dr. John W. Brantigan, M.D.
NUVASIVE1018	Transcript of the Deposition of Dr. Charles Branch

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.