

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MAKO SURGICAL CORP.,  
Petitioner

v.

BLUE BELT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00630  
Patent No. 6,205,411 B1

---

**PETITIONER MAKO SURGICAL CORP.'S REPLY  
TO PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

Mail Stop **Patent Board**  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. DIGIOIA QUALIFIES AS § 102(B) PRIOR ART.....4

    A. There is No Support for Knee, Hand and Wrist, Elbow, Shoulder, and Foot and Ankle Joints in the Parent ‘933 Application .....5

    B. Examiner’s Rejection is Consistent with Obviousness.....8

III. IF NOT § 102(B) PRIOR ART, DIGIOIA QUALIFIES AS § 102(A) PRIOR ART.....9

    A. A *Prima Facie* Case is Made Out Due to Authorship Differences.....10

    B. Jaramaz’ Declaration is Not Sufficient to Overcome the *Prima Facie* § 102(a) Case.....11

IV. CLAIMS 1, 10, AND 17 WERE OBVIOUS IN LIGHT OF DIGIOIA .....17

    A. It Would Have Been Obvious to Output A Position for Implantation Based on DiGioia .....17

    B. DiGioia Discloses a Preoperative Planner that Outputs a Model .....23

    C. DiGioia Discloses Creating a Three-Dimensional Model .....23

V. CONCLUSION.....25

**Table of Authorities**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	9
<i>Aventis Pharma Deutschland GmbH v. Lupin, Ltd.</i> , 499 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	22
<i>Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 636 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	4
<i>Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	9
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	5
<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	7
<i>In re Aoyama</i> , No. 00-1213, 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 33139 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 18, 2000) .....	9
<i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982) .....	10, 11
<i>In re Lukach</i> , 442 F.2d 967 (C.C.P.A. 1971) .....	7
<i>In re Ruschig</i> , 379 F.2d 990 (C.C.P.A. 1967) .....	6
<i>In re Smith</i> , 458 F.2d 1389 (C.C.P.A. 1972) .....	8
<i>Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS</i> , 723 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013), <i>cert. denied</i> , 134 S. Ct. 1501 (2014) .....	4, 5
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.</i> , 230 F.3d 1320, 56 USPQ2d 1481 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	6, 8

*Rozbicki v. Chiang*,  
590 F. App'x 990 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....7

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

M.P.E.P. § 2132.01(I) .....10

**Exhibit List for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,205,411**

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
U.S. Patent No. 6,205,411 (“the ’411 patent”)	1001
Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 6,205,411	1002
Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,976	1003
Declaration of Robert D. Howe	1004
A.M. DiGioia et al., “HipNav: Pre-operative Planning and Intraoperative Navigational Guidance for Acetabular Implant Placement in Total Hip Replacement Surgery,” 2nd CAOS Symposium, 1996 (“DiGioia”)	1005
Anthony M. DiGioia III et al., “An Integrated Approach to Medical Robotics and Computer Assisted Surgery in Orthopaedics,” <i>Proc. 1st Int’l Symposium on Medical Robotics and Computer Assisted Surgery</i> , pp. 106-111, 1995 (“DiGioia II”)	1006
E.Y.S. Chao et al., “Simulation and Animation of Musculoskeletal Joint System,” <i>Transactions of the ASME</i> , Vol. 115, pp. 562-568, Nov. 1993 (“Chao”)	1007
R.V. O’Toole III et al., “Towards More Capable and Less Invasive Robotic Surgery in Orthopaedics,” <i>Computer Vision, Virtual Reality and Robotics in Medicine Lecture Notes in Computer Science</i> , Vol. 905, pp. 123-130, 1995 (“O’Toole”)	1008
Russell H. Taylor et al., <i>An Image-Directed Robotic System for Precise Orthopaedic Surgery</i> , <i>IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation</i> , Vol. 10, No. 3, June 1994 (“Taylor”)	1009
<i>*Petitioner’s Exhibits 1001 – 1009 were previously filed and are simply listed based on 37 C.F.R. § 42.63.</i>	
Deposition Transcript of Dr. Cleary	1010
Deposition Transcript of Dr. Jaramaz – Filed Under Seal	1011

# 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.