

Case IPR2013-00396
U.S. Patent No. 8,444,696
Our Ref. 101.0051-06IR2

Patent Owner Response

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 IPR2013-00396

WARSAW'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. BACKGROUND.....4

 A. Prosecution of the ‘696 patent.....4

 B. Spinal fusion implants.....4

 C. Summary of the ‘696 patent.....4

 D. Michelson ‘037, like Steffee and Kim, was of record during the prosecution of the ‘696 patent.....9

 E. The rejections presented in the inter partes reexamination of the ‘430 patent are not germane because claims 7-12 of the ‘696 patent are substantially narrower than those of the ‘430 patent.....10

 F. During prosecution of the ‘998 application resulting in the ‘696 patent, the Examiner made a thorough review of the art references of record, and allowed claims 7-12 over these art references.....11

III. OBJECTION TO THE INCLUSION OF DRAWINGS IN THE CORRECTED PETITION ‘396 THAT ARE NOT CLEARLY MARKED AS BEING MODIFIED FIGURES OF THE CITED REFERENCES.....13

IV. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 7 AND 10 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE REJECTION BASED ON THE ASSERTED COMBINATION OF STEFFEE, MICHELSON ‘037, AND KIM.....14

 A. Claim construction of independent claims 7 and 10.....14

 B. Standard of nonobviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....19

 C. Statements regarding “obvious choices,” “add-ons,” or “basic design choices.”.....22

D. Independent claims 7 and 10 are patentable over the asserted combination of Steffee, Michelson '037, and Kim.....	23
V. CONCLUSION.....	47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<u>Application of Sporck</u> , 301 F.2d 686 (C.C.P.A. 1962)	22
<u>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l. Corp.</u> , 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	20
<u>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</u> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	19
<u>In re Gurley</u> , 27 F.3d 551, 553 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	21
<u>In re Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.</u> , 496 F.3d 1374, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	21
<u>In re Kahn</u> , 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	19
<u>In re Ochiai</u> , 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	20
<u>In re Royka</u> , 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A. 1974)	20
<u>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</u> , 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	14
<u>KSR v. Teleflex</u> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	19, 20, 21
<u>Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co.</u> , 332 F.2d 406 (6th Cir. 1964)	21, 22

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102	2
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	2, 3, 19, 20, 21, 22, 46, 47
35 U.S.C. § 120	4

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.56	12
37 C.F.R. § 1.97(d)	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	14

37 C.F.R. § 42.1201

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.