

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., and ROXANE LABORATORIES,
INC.
Petitioners

v.

JAZZ PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM: Unassigned

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF U.S.
PATENT NO. 7,668,730 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 321 AND § 18 OF THE LEAHY-
SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT**

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

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)).....	1
II. OVERVIEW	1
A. Background	3
B. The '730 patent.....	7
C. Summary of Argument.....	9
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....	10
A. Par and Roxane have standing and are not estopped. (37 C.F.R. § 42.302).....	10
B. The '730 patent is directed to a covered business method.....	11
1. The Patent Claims Cover a “Financial Product or Service”	12
2. The Patent Does Not Claim a “Technological Invention”	16
a) The claimed subject matter does not contain any novel or unobvious technological features.....	17
b) The claims do not address any technical problem using any kind of a technical solution	20
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	22
A. “Exclusive Central Pharmacy” and “Exclusive Computer Database”	22
B. “Generating with the computer processor periodic reports via the exclusive computer database”	22
V. EACH OF THE REFERENCES CITED IS AVAILABLE PRIOR ART	23
A. The ACA (PAR1003 – PAR1006) qualifies as a “printed publication”	23
VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART & STATE OF THE ART	28
VII. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE	29
A. Ground 1: Claims 1-11 are more likely than not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they recite mere abstract ideas.....	30

1.	Claims 1-11 are not statutory subject matter under § 101, because they recite mere abstract ideas.	31
2.	Even Assuming These Method Claims Apply to a Computer System, They Only Impliedly Reference a General Purpose Computer.....	39
3.	The Method Claims Do Not Include Meaningful Limitations Beyond the Abstract Idea Itself.....	42
4.	The Preliminary Examination Instructions in view of the <i>Alice</i> decision confirm that the '730 Patent does not recite patentable subject matter.....	45
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-11 are anticipated by the ACA.....	47
1.	Claim 1.....	50
2.	Claim 2.....	62
3.	Claim 3.....	62
4.	Claims 4 and 5.....	63
5.	Claim 6.....	64
6.	Claim 7.....	64
7.	Claim 8.....	65
8.	Claim 9.....	66
9.	Claim 10.....	66
10.	Claim 11.....	67
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-11 would have been obvious over the ACA.....	67
D.	Secondary considerations do not rebut the <i>prima facie</i> case.....	73
VIII.	IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	78
IX.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)).....	78
X.	CONCLUSION.....	79

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a))

Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioners”) petition for covered business method patent (“CBM”) review and seek cancellation of claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,668,730 (“the ’730 patent”) (PAR1001). According to USPTO records, the ’730 patent is assigned to Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Jazz is currently asserting the ’730 patent against Petitioners. (*See* PAR1025 and PAR1026.)

II. OVERVIEW

Claims 1-11 of the ’730 patent are unpatentable because they: (i) claim ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101; (ii) are anticipated by the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); and (iii) are obvious over the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103, even in view of secondary considerations of nonobviousness.

The challenged claims simply recite methods for centralized distribution of retail goods, specifically drugs, through a central pharmacy, rendering them incidental to a financial product or service. And these claims are directed to methods and not any technological invention. The claims’ recitation of a generic computer processor does not change this conclusion. Moreover, the claimed distribution methods are not novel or nonobvious and do not solve a technological problem with any technological solution. CBM review is, therefore, appropriate.

By law, no patent should issue if it claims: “A prior art method X,” which is simply an abstract idea, and nothing more. Yet the ’730 patent claims just that. Even in their best possible light, the claims are merely drawn to abstract ideas, and nothing more, artfully drafted in an effort designed to monopolize the abstract idea itself, as warned against in *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, No. 13-298, 573 U.S. ___ (2014) and *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 132 S. Ct. 1289, 1297 (2012). For example, challenged claims 1-11 are directed to the abstract idea of centralizing distribution of hazardous or abuse-prone drugs to reduce the abuse risks associated with the drugs without any meaningful limitations. And, the claimed steps can be performed by a human intermediary without any computer operation. (PAR1007, ¶50.)

The challenged claims are also unpatentable as being anticipated by and obvious in view of the relevant prior art. For example, published materials that were used in an FDA Advisory Committee Meeting (the “Advisory Committee Art” or “ACA”) disclose every limitation of the challenged claims more than a year before the ’730 patent’s earliest effective filing date. Accordingly, the challenged claims are anticipated. Alternatively, the challenged claims would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”) at the time of the invention over the same art, even in view of any available alleged objective indicia of nonobviousness.

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.