

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AKER BIOMARINE AS
Petitioner

v.

NEPTUNE TECHNOLOGIES AND BIORESSOURCES INC.
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2014-00003
U.S. Patent No. 8,278,351

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,278,351**

Table of Contents

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
III. BACKGROUND.....	2
A. The '351 Patent.....	2
B. Technology Overview.....	3
IV. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	7
V. CONSTRUCTION OF THE TERMS IN THE '351 PATENT.....	9
VI. THE '351 PATENT CLAIMS ARE ENTITLED TO A PRIORITY DATE OF JULY 27, 2001 BASED ON THE PROVISIONAL APPLICATION	14
VII. BEAUDOIN DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY OF CLAIMS 1, 4-6, 9, 12, 13, 19-24, 27-29, 32, 35, 36, OR 42-46.....	16
A. Beaudoin Does Not Expressly or Inherently Anticipate Claims 1 and 24	17
1. Beaudoin Requires a Heating Step To Obtain Krill Extracts	17
2. The Heating Step Distinguishes Beaudoin From the '351 Patent	22
3. Petitioner's Recreation Evidence Fails to Prove Beaudoin Inherently Discloses the Claimed Phospholipids.....	25
a. Petitioner's Recreations Deviated From Beaudoin.....	26
b. The Claimed Phospholipid Was Not Detected in All Recreation Samples	29
c. Petitioner Failed to Assess Key Characteristics of its Recreation Samples	30
4. Beaudoin Does Not Disclose An Extract "Suitable for Human Consumption"	31
B. Beaudoin Does Not Expressly or Inherently Anticipate Claims 5 and 28	36
VIII. THE COMBINATION OF FRICKE, BERGELSON, YASAWA, ITANO, AND THE WHO BULLETIN DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 1-6, 9, 12, 13, 19-29, 32, 35, 36, OR 42-46.....	38
A. The Cited References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Features of Claims 1 and 24	39
1. Claimed Phospholipid.....	39

2.	“Suitable for human consumption”	42
3.	“krill extract”	46
B.	Claims 2, 3, 25, and 26 Are Nonobvious	47
C.	Claims 9 and 32 Are Nonobvious	50
D.	Claims 12, 13, 35, and 36 Are Nonobvious	51
E.	One of Ordinary Skill In the Art Would Not Combine Fricke, Bergelson, Yasawa, Itano, and the WHO Bulletin.....	53
1.	One of Skill Would Not Combine Fricke or Bergelson with Yasawa, Itano, or the WHO Bulletin	54
2.	Petitioner’s Combination Includes Krill and Non-Krill References That A Person of Skill Would Not Combine	54
3.	One of Skill Would Not Combine Itano With Lipid Extraction References	57
IX.	CONCLUSION	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ArcelorMittal France v. AK Steel Corp.</i> , 700 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7
<i>Bettcher Indus. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	8
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
<i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	29
<i>Glaxo Group Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 376 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8
<i>Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.</i> , 52 F.3d 1043 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	29
<i>In re Armodafinil Patent Lit.</i> , 939 F. Supp. 2d 456 (D. Del. 2013)	22, 30
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	9
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	53
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	9
<i>K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , Case No. 2013-1549 (Fed. Cir. May 27, 2014)	44
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	9
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007)	8

<i>Leo Pharma. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	8, 9
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Teva Pharm. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 882 F. Supp. 2d 643 (D. Del. 2012)	25, 31
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	13
<i>Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	16
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 593 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	7
<i>Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	1, 59
35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	1, 8, 59

Other Authorities

M.P.E.P. § 2141.02.....	53
M.P.E.P. § 2142.....	53
M.P.E.P. § 2145.....	56

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	9
37 C.F.R. § 42.120	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.23(a)	1

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.