

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MEDTRONIC, INC.
Petitioner

v.

NUVASIVE, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00504
Patent 8,361,156

**PATENT OWNER NUVASVE INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '156 PATENT CLAIMS AN IMPLANT WITH A UNIQUE COMBINATION OF STRUCTURES PARTICULARLY SUITED FOR A LATERAL, TRANS-PSOAS APPROACH	3
III.	STANDARD FOR GRANTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	7
IV.	THE PRIOR ART CITED BY MEDTRONIC UNDER ALL GROUNDS 1-5 FAILS TO DISCLOSE OR SUGGEST THE CLAIMED MAXIMUM LATERAL WIDTH EXTENDING ALONG A MEDIAL PLANE, AS RECITED IN CLAIM 1	8
	A. The references advanced in Ground 1 fail to disclose or suggest the claimed maximum lateral width extending along a medial plane, as required by independent claim 1.....	11
	B. The references advanced in Ground 2 fail to disclose or suggest the claimed maximum lateral width extending along a medial plane, as required by independent claim 1.....	14
	C. The references advanced in Ground 3 fail to disclose or suggest the claimed maximum lateral width extending along a medial plane, as required by independent claim 1.....	15
	D. The references advanced in Ground 4 fail to disclose or suggest the claimed maximum lateral width extending along a medial plane, as required by independent claim 1.....	16
	E. The references advanced in Ground 5 fail to disclose or suggest the claimed maximum lateral width extending along a medial plane, as required by independent claim 1.....	17
V.	THE PRIOR ART CITED BY MEDTRONIC UNDER ALL GROUNDS 1-5 FAILS TO DISCLOSE OR SUGGEST THE CLAIMED IMPLANT WHERE THE LONGITUDINAL LENGTH IS GREATER THAN 40 MM, AS RECITED IN CLAIM 5.....	18
	A. The references advanced in Grounds 1-2 and 4-5 fail to disclose or suggest the claimed implant having a longitudinal length greater than 40 mm, as required by independent claim 5.....	19

B. The “alternative” argument in Ground 3 relies upon an improper modification to Frey’s implant, and the resulting combination of references in Ground 3 would not provide the claimed implant having a longitudinal length greater than 40 mm, as required by independent claim 5..... 23

VI. THE PRIOR ART CITED BY MEDTRONIC UNDER ALL GROUNDS 1-5 FAILS TO DISCLOSE OR SUGGEST THE CLAIMED IMPLANT WHERE THE UPPER AND LOWER SURFACES ARE GENERALLY PARALLEL TO ONE ANOTHER, AS RECITED IN CLAIM 12..... 28

VII. MEDTRONIC FAILED TO SHOW WHY PROPOSED GROUNDS 1-5 ARE NOT REDUNDANT WITH ONE ANOTHER 30

VIII. MEDTRONIC FAILED TO SHOW WHY PROPOSED GROUNDS 1-5 ARE NOT REDUNDANT WITH THE OTHER GROUNDS SET FORTH IN THE COUNTERPART IPR CASE NO. IPR2013-00506..... 32

IX. CONCLUSION 34

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case Law

<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	7
<i>Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharm., Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	22
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	22
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981)	22
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900, 902 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	18, 24, 27
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810, 813 (CCPA 1959)	18, 27, 28

Decisions of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

<i>MicroStrategy, Inc. v. Zillow, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00034, (PTAB Apr. 2, 2013)	31, 32
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012)	31, 32

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103 (2012).....	7, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17
35 U.S.C. § 314 (2012).....	7
35 U.S.C. § 316 (2012).....	7

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.108 (2013).....	7
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	7, 8, 11, 18

...

EXHIBITS

Ex. #	Exhibit Description
NUVA 2001	U.S. Patent No. 7,905,840 to Pimenta et al.

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.