V.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

D1 1 1 100

Plaintiff,

ALPHATEC HOLDINGS, INC., and ALPHATEC SPINE, INC.,

NUVASIVE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 18-CV-347-CAB-MDD

### ORDER RE MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTS VII AND VIII

[Doc. No. 32]

Defendants Alphatec Holdings, Inc., and Alphatec Spine, Inc. (together, "Alphatec") have filed a motion to dismiss the seventh and eighth claims in the Plaintiff NuVasive, Inc.'s complaint for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). The motion as been fully briefed and the Court deems it suitable for submission without oral argument. For the following reasons, the motion is granted.

#### I. Allegations in the Complaint

NuVasive is a medical device company that invented and developed a spinal fusion surgical procedure called eXtreme Lateral Interbody Fusion, or "XLIF." [Doc. No. 1 at ¶ 10.] XLIF was "the first spinal surgery using a lateral, transpsoas approach to the spine."



2 3

4 5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

[Id.] NuVasive invented both the XLIF procedure itself and the devices for performing lateral spinal surgery. [*Id.* at ¶ 11.]

In 2016 or 2017, Alphatec launched the Battalion™ Lateral System, which, like XLIF, is a lateral spinal fusion surgical procedure. [Id. at ¶¶ 42-43.] The 121-page complaint alleges that the Battalion Lateral System copies the XLIF system and that Alphatec is liable for willful infringement of six utility patents and two design patents related to the XLIF procedure or the devices used to perform it. Alphatec moves to dismiss only the two design patent infringement claims.

#### A. Claim VII – Infringement of Design Patent No. D750,252

NuVasive is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in United States Design Patent Number D750,252 (the "252 Patent") for an "Intervertebral Implant." [Doc. No. 1 at ¶ 500.] NuVasive calls the implants it makes pursuant to this patent "CoRoent®". The CoRoent® line of implants are specially designed for lateral insertion spinal fusion surgery. [Id. at ¶ 11.] These implants are "sized to span the entire width of the vertebral body to provide maximum vertebral body support. In comparison, implants inserted through non-lateral spinal fusion surgeries have a much smaller footprint and therefore provide weaker intervertebral support." [Id. at ¶ 21.]

The complaint alleges that Alphatec "directly infringes the '252 Patent by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States products and systems including, but not limited to the Battalion Lateral Spacer which is a component of the Battalion Lateral System, without the permission of NuVasive." [Id. at ¶ 505.] The complaint includes the following comparison of the '252 Patent and the Battalion Lateral Spacer:

# rig. 5

#### Battalion<sup>TM</sup> Lateral Spacer



Ex. V at 1.

[*Id.* at page 116.] Notably, the broken lines in the '252 Patent illustrations "form[] no part of the claimed design." [Doc. No. 1-16 at 2.] Thus, the patent does not claim the ridges on the top, the two apertures and connecting bridge, and the opening on the end reflected in figure 7 above.

The complaint also includes a comparison of the CoRoent® XLIF implant and the Battalion<sup>TM</sup> Lateral Spacer:

## NuVasive's CoRoent® XLIF Implant

Ex. B (XLIF Patient Education Brochure) at 6.

#### Alphatec's Battalion™ Lateral Spacer



Ex. V (Alphatec's webpage advertising the Battalion™ Lateral Spacer)

[Id. at ¶ 110.]

#### According to NuVasive:

An ordinary observer, familiar with the prior art, giving such attention as a purchaser usually gives, would be deceived by the resemblance and substantial similarity of the design of the Battalion™ Lateral Spacer and the claimed design in the '252 patent, and would thus be induced to purchase one supposing it to be the other, taking into account that the scope of a design patent claim does not cover functional features, that broken lines form no part of the claimed design, and unclaimed features are irrelevant.

[*Id.* at ¶ 509.]

#### B. Claim VIII – Infringement of Design Patent No. D652,519

NuVasive is also the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to United States Design Patent Number D652,519 (the "519 Patent") for a "Dilator." [*Id.* at ¶¶ 515, 516.] The XLIF surgical procedure uses sequential dilators, "which are a series of successively larger dilators used to create and then incrementally widen an opening to the spine." [*Id.* at ¶ 19.] "The sequential dilators include directional electrodes at their distal ends which electrically stimulate nerves in the psoas muscle." [*Id.*]

The complaint alleges that "Alphatec directly infringes the '519 Patent, by making using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States products and systems including, but not limited to, the Initial Dilator which is a component of the



Battalion<sup>TM</sup> Lateral System (the 'Battalion<sup>TM</sup> Initial Dilator'), without the permission of NuVasive." [*Id.* at ¶ 527.] The complaint includes the following comparison of the '519

Patent and the Battalion™ Initial Dilator:

'519 Patent	Battalion™ Initial Dilator
	10 30 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
	Ex. U (Alphatec Surgical Guide) at 5.

[*Id.* at page 116.] As with the '252 Patent, the "broken lines . . . form[] no part of the claimed design." [Doc. No. 1-17 at 2.]

According to NuVasive:

An ordinary observer, familiar with the prior art, giving such attention as a purchaser usually gives, would be deceived by the resemblance and substantial similarity of the design of the Battalion<sup>TM</sup> Initial Dilator and the claimed design in the '519 patent, and would thus be induced to purchase one supposing it to be the other, taking into account that the scope of a design patent claim does not cover functional features, that broken lines form no part of the claimed design, and unclaimed features are irrelevant.

[Id. at ¶ 531.]

#### II. Legal Standard on Motions to Dismiss

To survive a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its



# DOCKET

## 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.

