

Filed on behalf of:

INO Therapeutics LLC

By:

Dominick A. Conde
dconde@fchs.com
(212) 218-2100

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Praxair Distribution, Inc.

Petitioner,

v.

INO Therapeutics LLC

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00526
U.S. Patent No. 8,795,741

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY
PATENT OWNER PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 6

 A. The Development of the '741 Patent 6

 1. The Original INOT22 Protocol Was Carefully
 Constructed and Reviewed, and Did Not Contain
 the Claimed Exclusion Criteria 6

 2. Unanticipated Serious Adverse Events Initially
 Occurred During the INOT22 Study..... 9

 3. Based on the Unexpected Serious Adverse Events
 Early in the Trial the INOT22 Protocol Was
 Amended and the Rate of SAEs Was Significantly
 Reduced..... 10

 B. The '741 Prosecution History 11

 1. The PTO Considered Many References 11

 2. Praxair Relies on the Same Statements Ikaria
 Overcame During Prosecution 13

 C. The '741 Patent Claims 19

III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL 20

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 20

V. LEGAL STANDARD 23

VI. A SKILLED ARTISAN WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN
MOTIVATED TO EXCLUDE CHILDREN OR NEONATES
HAVING LVD OR REASONABLY EXPECT THOSE
CHILDREN OR NEONATES WOULD HAVE
EXPERIENCED SAES 27

 A. There was no motivation to implement the claimed
 exclusion based on studies with adults because left

	ventricular dysfunction in children and neonates is much different than in adults.....	29
B.	A skilled artisan would not have reasonably expected that the claimed excluded children or neonates would have SAEs as initially occurred in the INOT22 Study	32
VII.	GROUND 1: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>BERNASCONI</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>LOH</i> AND <i>GOYAL</i>	35
A.	Praxair fails to show that <i>Bernasconi</i> , <i>Lob</i> or <i>Goyal</i> include the claimed exclusion criteria	37
B.	Praxair’s Assertions that warnings in the art are applicable to the claimed exclusion criteria are unsupported.....	44
C.	Praxair fails to raise any new arguments or supplement the record to address issues overcome during prosecution.....	46
D.	Praxair fails to show that elements in dependent claims 4, 17-21, 35, and 42-44 are present in the prior art	49
VIII.	GROUND 2: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>BERNASCONI</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>LOH</i> , <i>INOMAX</i> [®] LABEL, <i>JULLANA</i> , and <i>GOYAL</i>	50
IX.	GROUND 3: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>BERNASCONI</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>LOH</i> , <i>MACRAE</i> , AND <i>GOYAL</i>	52
X.	GROUND 4: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>BERNASCONI</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>LOH</i> , <i>INOMAX</i> [®] LABEL, <i>JULLANA</i> , <i>MACRAE</i> , AND <i>GOYAL</i>	54
XI.	GROUND 5: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>ICHINOSE</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>NEONATAL GROUP</i> , <i>MACRAE</i> , <i>LOH</i> , <i>GERMANN</i> , AND <i>GOYAL</i>	54

XII. GROUND 6: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER *ICHINOSE* IN COMBINATION WITH *NEONATAL GROUP, MACRAE, LOH, INOMAX[®] LABEL, GERMANN, AND GOYAL* 57

XIII. PRAXAIR FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS TO COUNTER THE OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF UNEXPECTED RESULTS 57

XIV. CONCLUSION..... 59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	58
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	45
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	24, 58
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Tech. LLC</i> , No. 14-1301, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015).....	20
<i>In re Dembiczak</i> , 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	25
<i>Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 2014-1065 (Fed.Cir. April 19, 2015).....	46
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	24, 25, 58
<i>Leo Pharmaceutical Products, Ltd v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	24, 34
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	20, 21
<i>Rohm and Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	45

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103.....	24, 51, 52, 54, 57
35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	2, 23
35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	46

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.