

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DEPUY SYNTHES SALES, INC,
Petitioner,

v.

ACANTHA LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00329
Patent RE43,008 E

Before MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK, MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, and
TIMOTHY J. GOODSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FITZPATRICK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314; 37 C.F.R. § 42.108

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, DePuy Synthes Sales, Inc., filed a Petition to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–5, 9–22, and 29–37 of U.S. Patent No. RE43,008 E (Ex. 1001, “the ’008 patent”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 311(a). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Patent Owner, Acantha, LLC, filed a Preliminary Response pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 313. Paper 9 (“Prelim. Resp.”).¹

We have authority to determine whether to institute an *inter partes* review. 35 U.S.C. § 314(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a). Upon consideration of the Petition, and for the reasons explained below, we determine that there is not a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail with respect to any challenged claim. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Accordingly, we deny the Petition.

A. Related Matters

The ’008 patent issued December 6, 2011, from an application filed July 15, 2003. The ’008 patent is a reissue of U.S. Patent No. 6,261,291 B1 (“the ’291 patent”), which had issued July 17, 2001, from an application filed July 8, 1999. The ’008 patent has 105 claims, with claims 1–28 having issued in the original ’291 patent and claims 29–105 being added during reissue.

¹ In the body of the Preliminary Response, Patent Owner refers to itself as Acantha, *Inc.* Prelim. Resp. 1. This appears to be a typographical error, as the Preliminary Response is captioned with Acantha, LLC, as the Patent Owner and was filed by attorneys representing Acantha, LLC. *Id.* at 61. Also, in its mandatory notices, Patent Owner identifies itself as Acantha, LLC. *See* Papers 6, 8.

The parties identify *Acantha LLC v. DePuy Synthes Sales, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 1:15-cv-01257 (E.D. Wis.), as a related judicial matter. Pet. 1; Paper 6, 2. Additionally, Petitioner has filed two separate petitions for *inter partes* review challenging other claims of the '008 patent. See Cases IPR2016-00333; IPR2016-00334.

B. The '008 Patent

The '008 patent relates to orthopedic implant assemblies for joining bone segments and methods of using such assemblies. Ex. 1001, 1:11–13. The specification explains that “[a] variety of medical conditions may necessitate the joining of bone segments together, as for example, in the treatment of broken bones, spinal disorders, or the fusion of vertebrae following the removal of a spinal disk.” *Id.* at 1:14–17. The assemblies may be rods or plates that are attached to the bone with screws. *Id.* at 1:17–21. “However, one disadvantage has been the tendency of the implants to loosen or detach from the bone over time.” *Id.* at 1:24–25.

The '008 patent describes an improved implant assembly designed to minimize detachment from bone. Generally, the implant assembly includes “a stabilizing element [e.g., a plate], a securing element [e.g., a screw] which attaches the stabilizing element to the patient’s bone, and a stopping member in the stabilizing element which defines at least in part a passageway and which inhibits or prevents the securing element from loosening or backing out of the bone.” *Id.* at 1:32–38.

Figure 1 of the '008 patent is reproduced below.




FIG. 1

Figure 1 illustrates orthopedic implant assembly 10 for attachment to a patient's bone 15. *Id.* at 4:16–20. The assembly includes stabilizing element 11 having bores 13, each of which may receive securing element 14 (here, a screw). *Id.*

Figures 2 and 3 are reproduced below.




FIG. 2




FIG. 3

Figures 2 and 3 illustrate exploded and sectional views, respectively, of a portion of the implant assembly of Figure 1. *Id.* at 4:34–37. Bore 13 includes first (i.e., anterior) opening 16, second (i.e., posterior) opening 17, and transverse passageway 18 extending between the openings. *Id.* at 4:26–

31. The bore also includes groove 21 that receives and retains annular collar 12. *Id.* at 4:31–34. The collar is c-shaped and defines passageway 22, as more easily seen in Figure 2. *See id.* at Fig. 2, refs. 12, 22.

The screw (securing element 14) has elongated body 23 and integral head 24. *Id.* at 4:45–48. The head has a flat anterior surface (not labelled) and curved posterior surface 26. *Id.* at 4:55–58. In a “preferred embodiment,” the collar is positioned in the groove before the screw is advanced through the transverse passageway of the bore. *Id.* at 2:14–17. In such an embodiment, the screw is posteriorly advanced through the collar 12, such that the curved posterior surface of the head applies a radially expanding force against an inner surface of the collar to expand the inner diameter of the collar. *Id.* at 4:67–5:6, Fig. 4. As the head passes beyond the collar, it enters posterior section 25 of passageway 18, and the collar returns to the unexpanded configuration. *Id.* at 5:13–19, Fig. 5. The flat anterior surface of the head has a diameter larger than that of the unexpanded inner diameter of the collar. *Id.* at 5:19–22, Fig. 5. “Thus, the anterior surface of the head will butt up against the posterior surface of the collar without expanding the collar, to prevent the securing element from being anteriorly displaced” (i.e., backing out of the bone). *Id.* at 5:23–27.

Posterior section 25, which ultimately houses the head of the screw, is longer than the head, thus allowing the head to be displaceable longitudinally (i.e., anterior-posterior) within the posterior section of the transverse passageway. *Id.* at 5:43–48, Fig. 5. Also, the elongated body of the screw has a smaller diameter than that of the second (i.e., posterior) opening 17 of the bore, thus allowing the body to be displaceable side-to-

side (i.e., medial-lateral) within the second opening 17. *Id.* at 5:48–52, Fig. 5. As a result of these tolerances, the screw is angularly displaceable, as illustrated in FIG. 6. Thus, the '008 patent discloses that the securing member (screw) may be inserted into the bone at angles other than strictly perpendicular. *Compare id.* at Fig. 5, with Fig. 6.

C. The Challenged Claims

Petitioner challenges claims 1–5, 9–22, 29–37. Pet. 1. Of these, claims 1, 21, and 36 are independent. Claim 1 is illustrative and reproduced below.

1. An orthopedic implant assembly, comprising
 - a) a stabilizing element having an anterior surface, a posterior surface, and at least one bore, the bore having a first opening in the anterior surface, a second opening in the posterior surface smaller than the first opening, and a transverse passageway extending from the first opening to the second opening;
 - b) a biased stopping member defining at least in part a reversibly expandable passageway having a smaller diameter configuration and a larger diameter configuration; and
 - c) a securing element having an elongated body, and a head at one end of the body and integral therewith, the head having a maximum diameter greater than the smaller diameter configuration of the passageway defined by the biased stopping member and greater than the second opening in the stabilizing element, so that the head is retained within the transverse passageway between the biased stopping member and the second opening in the stabilizing element.

D. Asserted Prior Art

The '008 patent issued December 6, 2011, from an application filed July 15, 2003. The '008 patent is a reissue of the '291 patent, which had

issued July 17, 2001, from an application filed July 8, 1999.

The Petition asserts the following references as prior art to the claims of the '008 patent:

- (1) Errico,² pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and (e)(2);³
- (2) Koshino,⁴ pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and (e)(2); and
- (3) Campbell,⁵ pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)(2).

Pet. 5.

E. Asserted Grounds

The Petition identifies the following asserted grounds of unpatentability:

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Errico and Koshino	§ 103(a)	1–5, 9–22, 29–37
Errico and Campbell	§ 103(a)	36, 37

Pet. 5–6.

² U.S. Patent No. 5,876,402, filed Mar. 29, 1996, issued March 2, 1999. Ex. 1003.

³ The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), Pub. L. No. 112-29, took effect on March 18, 2013. Because the application from which the '008 patent issued was filed before that date, our citations to 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are to their pre-AIA version.

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 5,879,389, filed Apr. 1, 1996, issued March 9, 1999. Ex. 1004.

⁵ U.S. Patent No. 6,258,089 B1, filed May 19, 1999, issued July 10, 2001. Ex. 1005.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Claim Construction

“A claim in an unexpired patent shall be given its broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which it appears.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). Pursuant to that standard, the claim language should be read in light of the specification, as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Suitco Surface, Inc.*, 603 F.3d 1255, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010). Thus, we generally give claim terms their ordinary and customary meaning. *See In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (“The ordinary and customary meaning is the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question.”) (internal quotation marks omitted). Any special definition for a claim term must be set forth with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision. *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Neither party proposes an explicit construction for any term that requires construction for purposes of this Decision. One claim term, however, was expressly defined by applicants. In that regard, the '008 patent states: “The term *integral* should be understood to mean the securing element is a one-piece unit, with the head secured to the body so that there is no relative movement between the head and the body.” Ex. 1001, 2:9–12 (emphasis added). Each of claims 1 and 21 recites “a securing element having an elongated body, and a head at one end of the body and integral therewith.” Claim 36 recites “a securing member with an elongated body and an enlarged integral portion having a maximum transverse dimension.” We interpret the term “integral” in claims 1, 21, and 36 as defined in the

specification.

B. Obviousness in View of Errico and Koshino

Petitioner contends that claims 1–5, 9–22, and 29–37 would have been obvious over Errico and Koshino. Pet. 5. In assessing obviousness, “the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved.” *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966). Additionally, secondary considerations such as “commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented. As indicia of obviousness or nonobviousness, these inquiries may have relevancy.” *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 17–18.

1. *Errico (Ex. 1003)*

Errico discloses an implant assembly “for use in stabilizing and immobilizing vertebral bodies” and which allows for “polyaxial” (multiple angled) placement and locking of screws. Ex. 1003, 4:12–14.

Figure 6 of Errico is reproduced below.




FIG.6

Figure 6 illustrates the implant assembly as fully assembled (except that it omits the bone to which the assembly would be attached). *Id.* at 5:24–25. The assembly includes plate 100 having an upper (anterior) surface and lower (posterior) surface. *Id.* at 5:24–25. With reference to Figure 3a, the plate includes multiple holes 110, 112, extending between the upper and lower surfaces. *Id.* at Fig. 3a. One such hole is shown in Figure 6 above; it is shaped roughly akin to that of an upside-down lampshade. The interior of the hole includes a groove or annular recess 182 within which is positioned c-shaped snap ring 180. Errico's snap ring 180 can function precisely in the same manner as that of the collar 12 in the '008 patent. *Id.* at 6:6–12. However, Errico's screw 120 lacks an integral head that deflects the snap ring outwardly when the screw is advanced posteriorly into the hole, as conceded by Petitioner and as applicants argued during prosecution. Pet. 13; Ex. 1002, 122–23, 555. Instead, the snap ring 180 is deflected by a different component of the Errico assembly—coupling element 132—which is advanced posteriorly with the screw during implantation. *Id.* at 7:41–55.

Errico's screw consists of head portion 122, neck 124, and shaft 126.

Ex. 1003, 6:16–17; see also Fig. 4 (illustrating the screw in isolation). The head is semi-spherical in shape, which Errico states requires a section of a sphere that is greater in extent than a hemisphere and which exhibits an external contour that is equidistant from a center point of the head. *Id.* at 6:26–31.

The head is mounted within the coupling element, which has “interior semi-spherical volume 140 which is ideally suited for holding the head portion 122 of the screw 120, and permitting the screw to rotate [(i.e., angulate) prior to the screw being fully advanced into bone] through a range of angles.” *Id.* at 7:8–11, Fig. 5, ref. 140. The coupling element has an outer surface 134 corresponding to that of holes in the plate (i.e., roughly that of an upside-down lampshade). *Id.* at 6:58–67. However, the outer surface is not circumferentially continuous. *Id.* at 7:25–30. It includes axial slot 149, which allows the coupling element to be expanded to facilitate insertion of the head portion of the screw into the semi-spherical interior volume. *Id.* at 7:30–34, Fig. 5. The axial slot also allows the coupling element to be contracted when inserted into a hole of the plate. *Id.* This contraction “crush[es] against the head 122 upon the application of an inwardly directed radial force,” thereby locking the angle with which the screw has been advanced. *Id.*; *id.* at 5:5–7.

2. Koshino (Ex. 1004)

Koshino discloses an implant for hard tissue (e.g., bone) designed to be attached to such tissue in a way that avoids subsequent loosening of the implant. Ex. 1004 at 1:5–13, 1:22, 3:23–25. The implant is attached to hard tissue with one or more “fixation screws.” *Id.* at 4:52–55.

claims 21 and 36 include similar limitations.

Petitioner concedes that Errico alone does not disclose these limitations. Pet. 13. This is because, although the Errico screw includes an integral head, Errico does not disclose the screw head size limitations; instead it “includes an extra part – a coupling element that surrounds the screw head – to perform the same functions.” *Id.*

Citing declaration testimony of Bret A. Ferree, M.D., the Petition argues that using a screw head instead of Errico’s coupling element “is nothing more than an obvious choice in design, and one that would have been readily contemplated and implemented by a POSA at the time of the invention, for both mechanical and clinical reasons, with a reasonable expectation of success.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 37–38). The cited testimony, however, is not persuasive. In paragraph 37, Dr. Ferree simply testifies to the ultimate conclusion of law that the claims are obvious. Ex. 1006 ¶ 37. And paragraph 38 is virtually identical to the just-quoted conclusory argument set forth in the Petition. *Id.* at ¶ 38.

The Petition and declaration do offer additional arguments and testimony to support the proposed modification but they too are insufficient. First, the Petition states, with support from Dr. Ferree, that “it was known in the orthopedic industry at the time of the filing of the ’008 patent that it was desirable for orthopedic implants to be limited to the minimum number of components necessary” due to “cost of manufacturing, inventory, ease of use, crevice corrosion, and simplicity of surgery.” Pet. 13–14 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 39). Limiting the number of components may be desirable, if the reduction can be achieved without compromising design goals. Yet, Errico

expressly teaches a more complex structure because of the benefits it provides. Those benefits include that the screw can be angulated in countless directions to provide a surgeon flexibility during implantation (Ex. 1003, 7:22–24), that the screw is locked into whatever angle ultimately is chosen by the “crush locking” of the interior semi-spherical volume of the coupling element against the semi-spherical head (*id.* at 5:5–7), that the coupling element fully mates with the hole in the plate regardless of the angle of the screw (*id.* at 6:62–67), and that the coupling element is secured just beneath (posterior to) the snap ring (*id.* at 7:51–55, Fig. 6).

The Petition next states, with support from Dr. Ferree, that a person of ordinary skill in the art “would understand that it is critical for the bone plate to have as thin a profile as possible” but that “[t]he coupling element in Errico . . . requires more space in the bore, and thus necessarily increases the profile (thickness) of the plate.” Pet. 14 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 41–42). However, neither the Petition nor Dr. Ferree cites evidence that using a coupling element requires more anterior-posterior space in the bore than using a screw head alone. *See* Pet. 14; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 41–42. In fact, the record evidence tends to show the opposite. In Koshino, as well as in the ’008 patent, a substantial gap exists above the screw head. *See* Ex. 1004, Fig. 6; Ex. 1001, Figs. 5–6. As discussed above, the ’008 patent describes this gap as desirable because it, along with transverse tolerance, accommodates angulation of the screw. Ex. 1001, 5:43–52.

Petitioner has not shown an apparent reason to combine the relied upon teachings of Errico and Koshino in the manner set forth in independent claims 1, 21, and 36. *See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 418

(2007) (requiring, for obviousness, “an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue”).

Additionally, Errico teaches away from the proposed combination because such a combination would render Errico inoperable for its intended purpose. *See In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 496 F.3d 1374, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (“Additionally, a reference may teach away from a use when that use would render the result inoperable.”). Errico seeks to provide an implantable plate “having a polyaxial coupling of the screw to the plate, whereby a single plate is compatible with a wide range of screw-in angles” and “which has a simple and effective locking mechanism for *locking the bone screw to the plate.*” Ex. 1003, 3:59–67 (emphasis added).

Modifying Errico as Petitioner proposes would destroy at least one of these features. In Errico, the coupling element facilitates angulation of the screw relative to the plate prior to full implantation and subsequent locking of the screw to the plate in a given angulation upon full implantation. The proposed combination would remove the coupling element without substituting anything that would preserve both features. Although the Petition explains how the proposed modified screw could angulate with respect to the plate (thereby allowing polyaxial coupling to the plate), the Petition does not explain how the proposed screw (or its head) could be locked to the plate at any particular angle. *See* Pet. 13–17.

Because Petitioner has not presented sufficient reasoning for why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have made the proposed combination and because Errico teaches away from such a combination, there is not a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail with respect

to any of the claims challenged as obvious over Errico and Koshino.

C. Obviousness in View of Errico and Campbell

Petitioner contends that claims 36 and 37 would have been obvious over Errico and Campbell. Pet. 6.

1. *Campbell (Ex. 1005)*

Campbell discloses a cervical plate and fixation system, designed to be attached to the spine with fixation screws in a manner that inhibits loosening of the device after implantation. Ex. 1005, 1:12–15; 2:10–26. Figure 20 of Campbell is reproduced below.




Figure 20 illustrates a sectional view of a portion of cervical plate 22 with “fastener” (screw) inserted. *Id.* at 4:22–26. The screw has elongated shank 42 with threads and “enlarged head 46 with a spherical profile 48 sized to allow the head to nest within spherical section 34 of the aperture.” *Id.* at 5:45–51 (spherical section 34 not labelled in Fig. 20).

2. *Petitioner’s Application of the Art to the Challenged Claims*

Independent claim 36 is directed to “[a] method of attaching an orthopedic implant assembly to a bone of a patient.” The claimed method

includes the following:

- a) providing a securing member [e.g., a screw] with an elongated body and an enlarged integral portion [e.g., a screw head] having a maximum transverse dimension . . .

and

- c) attaching the securing member to the patient's bone by advancing the securing member within the bore of the attachment member until the enlarged integral portion of the securing member passes the stopping member thereby displacing the stopping member to the first configuration and is disposed in the posterior bore portion, the stopping member then returning to the second configuration to retain the enlarged integral portion within the posterior bore portion; and wherein the enlarged integral portion of the securing member is retained within the posterior bore portion below the posterior surface of the stopping member.

Claim 37 depends from claim 36.

In challenging these claims, Petitioner proposes a combination similar to that of Errico and Koshino. Specifically, it proposes “to remove the coupling device from the Errico invention and to implement the configuration of the screw head disclosed in Campbell.” Pet. 53. Petitioner argues that a person of ordinary skill in the art would combine Errico and Campbell for the “same reasons” that person would combine Errico and Koshino. Pet. 52. As discussed above, however, we find those reasons unpersuasive. Additionally, for the same reasons that Errico teaches away from the proposed combination of Errico and Koshino, it also teaches away from the proposed combination of Errico and Campbell.

Because Petitioner has not presented sufficient reasoning for why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have made the proposed

combination and because Errico teaches away from such a combination, there is not a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail with respect to any of the claims challenged as obvious over Errico and Campbell.

III. CONCLUSION

There is not a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail with respect to any challenged claim. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 314(a); 37 C.F.R. § 42.108.

IV. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Petition is denied.

IPR2016-00329
Patent RE43,008 E

For Petitioner:

Calvin Griffith
cpgriffith@jonesday.com

Kenneth Luchesi
kluchesi@jonesday.com

For Patent Owner:

Jay Guiliano
jguiliano@polsinelli.com

Ryan Murphy
rmurphy@polsinelli.com