

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NUVASIVE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

WARSAW ORTHOPEDIC, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2013-00395
Patent 8,444,696 B2

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, LORA M. GREEN, and STEPHEN C. SIU,
Administrative Patent Judges.

GREEN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION
35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Petitioner, NuVasive Inc. (“NuVasive”), filed a Corrected Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–6 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,444,696 B2 (“the ’696 patent”). Paper 7 (“Pet.”). Patent Owner, Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc. (“Warsaw”), did not file a Patent Owner

Preliminary Response. We determined that the information presented in the Petition demonstrated that there was a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in challenging claims 1-6 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, the Board instituted trial on December 20, 2013, as to the challenged claims of the '696 patent. Paper 12 ("Institution Decision"; "Dec. Inst.").

Patent Owner filed a Response (Paper 24, "PO Resp."), but did not file a motion to amend. Petitioner subsequently filed a Reply. Paper 25 ("Reply"). An oral hearing was held on July 31, 2014. The transcript of the hearing has been entered into the record. Paper 35.

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(c). This final written decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a). Based on the record before us, we conclude that Petitioner has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1–6 of the '696 patent are unpatentable.

B. Related Proceedings

Petitioner filed concurrently with the instant Petition another petition for an *inter partes* review of the '696 patent. That proceeding, IPR2013-00396, involves claims 7–12 of the patent. Petitioner indicates further that Patent Owner has asked the district court for permission to add the '696 patent to the case *Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc. v. NuVasive Inc.*, Case No. 3:12-cv-02738-CAB (S.D. Cal.). Pet. 1.

C. The '696 Patent

The '696 patent issued on May 21, 2013, with Gary Karlin Michelson as the listed inventor. The '696 patent is drawn to an interbody spinal fusion implant that is "configured to restore and maintain two adjacent vertebrae of the spine in correct anatomical angular relationship." Ex. 1002, 1:20–23.

As taught by the '696 patent, the cervical and lumbar areas of the human spine are lordotic in a healthy state, that is, they are “curved convex forward.” *Id.* at 1:25–27. In degenerative conditions of the spine, the lordosis may be lost. *Id.* at 1:27–28. Surgical treatment of such degenerative conditions often involves spinal fusion, where adjacent vertebrae are joined together through an area of shared bone. *Id.* at 1:36–40.

The '696 patent discloses spinal implants that are sized to fit within the disc space that is created when the disc material between two adjacent vertebrae is removed, and that conform “wholly or in part to the disc space created.” *Id.* at 1:61–64. The implants have upper and lower surfaces that form a support structure for the adjacent vertebrae, and, in a preferred embodiment, the upper and lower surfaces “are disposed in a converging angular relationship to each other such that the implants of the present invention have an overall ‘wedged-shape’ in an elevational side view.” *Id.* at 1:67–2:4.

As taught by the '696 patent, the various faces of the implant may be curved to allow the implant “to conform to the shape of the vertebral surfaces adjacent to the area of the disc removal.” *Id.* at 2:23–25. That is, “the upper and/or lower surfaces may be convex, and/or the front and/or rear surfaces may be convex.” *Id.* at 2:26–27. The '696 patent teaches further that the “upper and lower surfaces conforming to the contours of the vertebral endplates, which contours include but are not limited to being relatively flat or convex.” *Id.* at 2:52–55. The surfaces of the implants may have openings, which may or may not pass all the way through the implant, but that connect through a central chamber. *Id.* at 2:27–31. The opening may be of random size, shape, and/or distribution. *Id.* at 2:31–32.

Figure 14 of the '696 patent is reproduced below:




Figure 14, above, is a left side elevational view of a lordotic interbody spinal fusion implant. *Id.* at 5:11–12. The implant shown in Figure 14 has insertion end 320 and trailing end 330. *Id.* at 9:18–19. In addition,

the implant . . . includes a first terminal part defining a first bearing surface adapted to bear against an endplate of the vertebrae V_1 , and an opposite second bearing surface adapted to bear against an endplate of the vertebrae V_2 . The implant . . . also includes a second terminal part opposite the first terminal part. The second terminal part defines a third bearing surface adapted to bear against the endplate of the vertebrae V_1 and a fourth bearing surface adapted to bear against the endplate of the vertebrae V_2 .

Id. at 9:20–29.

The '696 patent also discloses an embodiment with ratcheting. Figure 9 of the patent is reproduced below:




Figure 9 is a side elevational view of a lordotic interbody spinal fusion implant. *Id.* at 4:63:67. As seen in Figure 9, the ratchetings are oriented in the direction of the insertion end, 220, allowing for one-way insertion of the implant, and the bone engaging end, 252, prevents the implant from backing out once implanted. *Id.* at 8:40-49.

D. Illustrative Claim

Petitioner challenges claims 1–6 of the '696 patent. Claims 1 and 4 are independent claims. Claim 1 is illustrative, and reads as follows:

1. A spinal fusion implant for insertion between a first vertebra and a second vertebra adjacent the first vertebra, the first vertebra having a generally vertically extending first peripheral wall and a first endplate and the second vertebra having a generally vertically extending second peripheral wall and a second endplate, wherein the implant comprises:

a first terminal part defining a trailing face, a first bearing surface adapted to bear against a portion of the first endplate, and an opposite second bearing surface adapted to bear against a portion of the second endplate, said trailing face extending between said first bearing surface and second bearing surface,

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.