

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

JAZZ PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM: Unassigned

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,765,107 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

I.	INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)).....	1
II.	OVERVIEW.....	1
	A. Background.....	3
	B. The ‘107 patent.....	7
	C. Summary of Argument	10
III.	GROUND FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....	11
	A. Roxane and Par have standing and are not estopped (37 C.F.R. § 42.302).....	11
	B. The ‘107 patent is directed to a covered business method.	12
	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	18
	b) The claims do not address any technical problem using any kind of a technical solution	21
IV.	Claim Construction.....	23
	A. “Exclusive Central Pharmacy”	24
	B. “Periodic reports generated”	24
V.	EACH OF THE REFERENCES CITED IS AVAILABLE PRIOR ART.....	24
	A. The ACA (ROX1003–ROX1006) qualifies as a “printed publication”	25
VI.	PERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”) & STATE OF THE ART.....	29
VII.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE	31
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1-6 are more likely than not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they recite mere abstract ideas	32
	1. Claims 1-6 are not statutory subject matter under § 101, because they recite mere abstract ideas.	32

2.	The Method Claims Only Reference General-Purpose Computer Components	38
3.	The Method Claims Do Not Include Meaningful Limitations Beyond the Abstract Idea Itself	41
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-6 are anticipated by the ACA	45
1.	Claim 1	47
2.	Claims 2 and 5	65
3.	Claims 3 and 6	67
4.	Claim 4	67
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-6 would have been obvious over the ACA	68
D.	Secondary considerations do not rebut the <i>prima facie</i> case.....	73
VIII.	PETITIONER WILL MORE LIKELY THAN NOT PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE CHALLENGED CLAIM	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))

Roxane Laboratories, Inc. and Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioners”) petition for covered business method patent (“CBM”) review and seek cancellation of claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 7,765,107 (“the ‘107 patent”) (ROX1001). According to Office records, the ‘107 patent is assigned to Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Jazz”). Jazz is currently asserting the ‘107 patent against Petitioners in litigation. (ROX1024-ROX1025.)

II. OVERVIEW

Claims 1-6 of the ‘107 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.

Because the compound sodium oxybate has been known at least since the 1970s, and is not the subject of patent protection, Jazz has sought to patent a broad and abstract method of distributing the drug. The challenged claims simply claim the abstract idea of centralizing retail drug distribution using an exclusive central pharmacy that encompasses the non-technical steps of interfacing with financial businesses (patient’s insurance company), rendering them incidental to a financial product or service. The claim preambles reciting a method for controlling abuse of a prescription drug does not change their abstract nature. All claim steps are

directed to non-technical drug distribution steps and define a complete method. The preambles do not change the claims' basic characteristic of covering the abstract idea of centralizing drug distribution.

Further, the claims are not directed to any technological invention. The claims' recitation of a generic computer processor and central database do 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 '107 patent claims are just that. The claims are drawn to abstract ideas, nothing more than artfully drafted to monopolize the abstract idea itself, as warned against in *Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 132 S. Ct. 1289, 1297 (2012). Challenged claims 1-6 claim the abstract idea of centralizing distribution of abuse-prone drugs to reduce their associated risks without any meaningful limitations. The claimed steps can be performed by a human intermediary with no computer operation. (ROX1007, ¶¶ 46-47.)

The challenged claims are also unpatentable as anticipated by and obvious in view of the relevant prior art. Published materials that were used in an FDA Advisory Committee Meeting (the "Advisory Committee Art" or the "ACA")

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.