

metal-covered tip and makes no mention of compression or drainage.

In response, defendants do not suggest that the Mazza article anticipated the '777 patent. They contend, however, that its contents, in combination with other prior art, rendered Diomed's invention obvious. In support of that argument, they aver that the laser apparatus depicted in the Mazza article necessarily incorporates an uncoated section close to its tip and that, furthermore, the elements of contact, compression and drainage are all inherent in Mazza's procedure. With respect to the latter contention, defendants rely upon extrinsic evidence including the Mazza video and alleged similarities between the procedures of Mazza and Puglisi. For reasons that are set forth in more detail below, the Court concludes that the Mazza article did not render the '777 patent obvious.

**f. Biegeleisen Article**

Finally, Diomed avers that a 1989 article by Biegeleisen entitled "Use of the venoscope for the treatment of varicose veins" did not anticipate the '777 patent because Biegeleisen's process entails use of an angioscope with a crystal tip rather than a laser. Furthermore, plaintiff contends that the article fails to disclose direct contact with the vessel wall, compression, drainage or any decrease in vessel diameter.

Defendants apparently concede that the Biegeleisen article