

BIN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

NUVASIVE, INC.,

Plaintiff and  
Counterclaim-Defendant,

v.

GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.,

Defendant and  
Counterclaim-Plaintiff.

C. A. No. 1:10-CV-00849-LPS

REDACTED VERSION

**NUVASIVE, INC.'S ANSWERING BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO  
GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.'S MOTIONS FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

William J. Marsden, Jr. (#2247)  
marsden@fr.com  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
222 Delaware Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P. O. Box 1114  
Wilmington, DE 19899-1114  
Phone: 302-652-5070  
Fax: 302-652-0607

Michael J. Kane, mjk@fr.com  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
3300 Dain Rauscher Plaza  
60 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Phone: 612-335-5070  
Fax: 612-288-9696

Frank E. Scherkenbach, scherkenbach@fr.com  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
One Marina Park Drive  
Boston, MA 02210  
Phone: 617-542-5070  
Fax: 617-542-8906

Todd G. Miller, miller@fr.com  
Michael A. Amon, amon@fr.com  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
Phone: 858-678-5070  
Fax: 858-678-5099

Dated: October 29, 2013

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS ..... 1

III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ..... 1

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS ..... 3

A. NuVasive’s XLIF Procedure..... 3

B. NuVasive’s XLIF Patent Portfolio..... 4

C. NuVasive’s Patented Surgical Technique..... 6

D. Globus’ Entry Into the Lateral Market..... 10

1. Globus’ 2010 MARS 3V Retractor System..... 11

2. Globus’ 2012 MARS 3V Retractor System..... 12

V. LEGAL STANDARD FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ..... 12

VI. ARGUMENT ..... 13

A. As a Matter of Law, Nuvasive Did Not Grant an Implied License to the Asserted Patent to Any Surgeon..... 13

1. In *Wang*, a customer licensed a manufacturer to make the customer’s patented design ..... 15

2. In *De Forest*, the government was licensed subject only to an agreement to negotiate appropriate compensation, if any, at a later date ..... 18

3. Globus Has No Cases Supporting Its Argument That Training Customers Creates An Implied License ..... 19

B. Globus’ 2010 MARS 3V Retractor System and 2012 Redesigned Retractor System Both Meet the “rigidly coupled” Limitation of the ’801 Patent ..... 20

C. The 2012 Redesigned MARS 3V Retractor System Satisfies the “Closed Position” limitation of the ’801 patent, Precluding Summary Judgment For Globus. .... 22

D.	The Court Should Deny Globus’ Motion for Summary Judgment of No Willfulness .....	26
1.	Legal Standard .....	26
2.	Globus’ implied license defense is objectively unreasonable .....	27
3.	The reexaminations of the asserted patents do not factor against a finding of willfulness .....	28
4.	Globus failed to prove that there is no genuine issue of material fact as to the objective reasonableness of its remaining defenses for the asserted patents .....	29
E.	Globus is not entitled to Summary Judgment On NuVasive’s Damages Claim .....	30
1.	The Asserted Patents Claim Systems and Methods for Inserting Spinal Implants .....	31
2.	Globus Achieves Revenue for the Use of the Infringing System and Performance of the Infringing Methods via Sales of Implants and Disposables .....	32
3.	NuVasive Apportions to Exclude Any Revenue Not Directly Attributable to the Claims of the Asserted Patents .....	33
VII.	CONCLUSION .....	35

..

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

*A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Constr. Co.*,  
960 F.2d 1020 (Fed.Cir.1992).....19

*Abraxis Bioscience, Inc. v. Mayne Pharma, Inc.*,  
467 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....13

*Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*,  
477 U.S. 242 (1986).....12

*Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*,  
920 F. Supp. 2d 1079 (N.D. Cal. 2013) .....30

*Bandag Inc. v Al Bolster’s Tire Stores, Inc.*,  
750 F.2d 903 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....14

*Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. v. W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc.*,  
682 F.3d 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....27, 28, 30

*Caterpillar Inc. v. Sturman Indus., Inc.*,  
387 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....12

*Charles Mach. Works, Inc. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.*,  
723 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....25

*Cook Inc. v. Endologix, Inc.*  
2012 WL 3779198 (S.D. Ind. August 30, 2012).....30

*CSB-System Intern. Inc. v. SAP America, Inc.*,  
2012 WL 1439059 (E.D. Pa. April 25 2012).....30

*De Forest Radio Tel. Co. v. United States*,  
273 U.S. 236 (1927).....15, 18, 19

*Felix v. American Honda Motor Corp., Inc.*,  
562 F.3d 1167 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....21, 24

*Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.*,  
344 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....21, 24

*Georgia-Pacific Corporation v. United States Plywood Corp.*,  
318 F. Supp. 1116 (S.D.N.Y. 1970).....2

...

*Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. BP Chemicals Ltd.*,  
78 F.3d 1575, 1584 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....28

*iLOR, LLC v. Google, Inc.*,  
631 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....27

*In re Seagate Tech., LLC*,  
497 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....26, 27, 30

*Leggett & Platt, Inc. v. Hickory Spring Mfg. Co.*,  
285 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....13

*Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*,  
52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), *aff'd*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996) .....13

*Met-Coil Sys. Corp. v. Korners Unlimited, Inc.*,  
803 F.2d 684 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....14

*Optical Disc Corp. v. Del Mar Avionics*,  
208 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....13

*Plumley v. Mockett*,  
836 F. Supp. 2d 1053 (C.D. Cal. 2010) .....29

*Powell v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.*,  
663 F.3d 1221 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....30

*Robert Bosch, LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.*,  
719 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....27

*Safoco, Inc. v. Cameron Intern. Corp.*,  
2009 WL 2424108 (S.D. Tex. July 31, 2009).....28, 29

*Saint-Gobain Autover USA, Inc. v. Xinyi Glass North Amer., Inc.*,  
707 F. Supp. 2d 737 (N.D. Ohio 2010).....27

*St. Clair Intellectual Property Consultants, Inc. v. Matsushita Elecs. Industrial Co., Ltd.*,  
2009 WL 1649675 (D. Del. June 10, 2009).....28

*St. Clair Intellectual Property Consultants, Inc. v. Palm, Inc.*,  
2009 WL 1649751 (D. Del. June 10, 2009).....29

*Tarkus Imaging, Inc. v. Adobe Systems, Inc.*,  
2012 WL 2175788 (D. Del. June 14, 2012).....22

*Tesco Corp. v. Weatherford Intern. Inc.*,  
750 F. Supp. 2d 780 (S.D. Tex. 2010) .....28, 29

# 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.