

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC, PAR PHARMACEUTICAL,
INC., and WOCKHARDT BIO AG
Petitioners,

v.

JAZZ PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00547¹
Patent 7,765,107 B2

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

¹ Case IPR2015-01820 has also been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENT.....	1
A.	The ACA (Exs. 1003-1006) was publicly accessible prior to the critical date	1
1.	FDA was required to make Exs. 1004-1006 available to the public prior to or at the ACM, and there is no evidence that FDA violated the law.....	2
2.	Ex. 1003 further corroborates the availability of Exs. 1004-1006 at the ACM	4
3.	The dates on Exs. 1004-1006, coupled with corroborating evidence, establish public availability prior to the critical date	4
4.	The Totality of Internet Archive evidence shows that Exs. 1004-1006 were publicly available before the critical date.....	5
a)	Internet Archive evidence corroborates the Federal Register notice and FDA website.....	5
b)	Jazz’s Internet Archive evidence does not prove that Exs. 1004-1006 were not publicly available until after the critical date.....	6
5.	The ACA was readily accessible by persons interested in the subject matter before the critical date	7
a)	A POSA here is interested in drug distribution, safety and abuse, and would have been motivated to look at the Federal Register for relevant notices.....	8
b)	A POSA exercising reasonable diligence would have been able to locate the ACA	10
B.	Claim Construction.....	12
1.	Jazz’s proposed narrowing of “periodic reports” has no basis.....	12
2.	Jazz seeks to unduly restrict “information identifying patients”	15

IPR2015-00547—Patent No. 7,765,107
Petitioners’ Reply to Patent Owner’s Response

3.	Jazz also seeks to unduly restrict “said [prescription] request data contains information identifying . . . credentials of the medical doctor”	17
C.	Jazz has failed to rebut Petitioners’ showing that the ACA would have rendered the claims of the ’107 patent obvious.....	19
1.	The claimed “periodic reports” would have been obvious based on the ACA	19
2.	The claimed “prescription request data” containing “information identifying patients” and “information identifying prescribers” would have been obvious based on the ACA	20
III.	CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACA = “Advisory Committee Act”— i.e., Exs. 1003–1006.

ACM = “Advisory Committee Meeting”—i.e., the June 6, 2001 meeting of the Peripheral and Central Nervous System Drugs Advisory Committee.

FACA = “Federal Advisory Committee Act”

FDA = “U.S. Food and Drug Administration”

IPR = “*inter partes* review proceeding”

OMI = “Orphan Medical, Inc.” (predecessor to patent owner Jazz Pharmaceutical, Inc.)

POSA = “person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention”

I. INTRODUCTION

In its July 28, 2015 Institution Decision on U.S. Patent No. 7,765,107 (“the ’107 patent”), the Board correctly found that the ACA was accessible to the public prior to the critical date and that there was a reasonable likelihood that the ACA rendered obvious each claim of the ’107 patent. Paper No. 25 (“Decision”) at 41. This is because, of course, the ACA is a public disclosure of the proposed risk management system for Xyrem—the very same system covered by the ’107 patent. Faced with its own prior art, Jazz argues, with the barest of evidence, that the ACA somehow was *not* a printed publication, and that POSAs would not have been able to find it. Paper No. 46 (“Response”) at 5-24. And as a last-ditch effort to save the ’107 patent, Jazz argues that specific, preferred embodiments in the specification constitute limitations on the claims—something that has no basis in the patent specification, file history, or standards of claim construction. Response at 24-36. The Board should thus cancel each challenged claim of the ’107 patent.

II. ARGUMENT

A. **The ACA (Exs. 1003-1006) was publicly accessible prior to the critical date**

As the Board noted, the key inquiry as to whether the ACA was publicly accessible as prior art is whether it “has been disseminated or otherwise made available to the extent that persons interested and ordinarily skilled in the subject matter or art exercising reasonable diligence, can locate it.” Decision at 24

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.