

**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 IPR2015-00891  
U.S. Patent No. 8,573,210

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 4

    A. Inhaled Nitric Oxide (“iNO”)..... 4

    B. The ’210 Patent ..... 5

    C. The ’210 Patent Claims ..... 9

    D. Petitioner’s Prior Art ..... 10

III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL ..... 13

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 13

V. LEGAL STANDARD ..... 14

VI. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW  
BECAUSE THE PETITION RELIES ON SUBSTANTIALLY  
THE SAME PRIOR ART AND ARGUMENTS  
PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO THE OFFICE..... 16

VII. GROUND 1: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE  
REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER  
THE ’083 PATENT IN COMBINATION WITH THE ’510  
PATENT, THE FR ’804 PUBLICATION, THE INOMAX  
LABEL, AND THE IR STANDARD ..... 21

    A. The Challenged Claims ..... 21

    B. Petitioner’s Contentions ..... 23

    C. Petitioner Fails to Show that the Prior Art Teaches or  
Suggests All the Limitations of Independent Claim 1 ..... 26

        1. Petitioner Fails to Provide Any Reason to  
Repurpose the Valve of the ’510 Patent to  
Communicate with a Control Module that Delivers  
a Gas Comprising NO to a Patient..... 27

2.	Petitioner Fails to Provide Any Reason to Store Gas Type as Disclosed in the FR '804 Publication or Gas Concentration as Disclosed in the '083 Patent in the Valve Memory of the '510 Patent .....	30
3.	The IR Standard and the INOMAX Label Do Not Make Up for the Deficiencies in the '510 Patent, the FR '804 Publication, and the '083 Patent .....	38
D.	Petitioner Fails to Show that a POSA Would Have Had a Reason to Combine the Relied-Upon Prior Art .....	40
E.	Petitioner Fails to Show that the Prior Art Renders Obvious the Claims that Depend from or Otherwise Incorporate the Limitations of Claim 1 .....	44
1.	Claims 6, 9, and 12 .....	44
2.	Claim 7 .....	46
3.	Claim 13 .....	47
VIII.	GROUND 2: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER THE '083 PATENT IN COMBINATION WITH THE '510 PATENT, THE FR '804 PUBLICATION, THE INOMAX LABEL, THE IR STANDARD, AND THE '533 PATENT .....	48
IX.	GROUND 3: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER THE '083 PATENT IN COMBINATION WITH THE '510 PATENT, THE FR '804 PUBLICATION, THE INOMAX LABEL, THE IR STANDARD, AND THE '398 PATENT .....	50
X.	CONCLUSION.....	57

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	14
<i>Hartness Int’l Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng’g Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	44, 49, 51
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	13
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	15
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	14, 15
<i>N. Am. Vaccine, Inc. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 7 F.3d 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	8
<i>OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am. Induction Techs., Inc.</i> , 701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	30
<i>Standard Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	8
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	15

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (pre-AIA) .....	passim
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	2, 14
35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....	2, 16

### Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1).....	11
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	13

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	2, 14

**P.T.A.B.**

<i>BSP Software LLC v. Motio, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00307, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2013).....	3, 40
<i>Cardiocom LLC v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00439, Paper 26 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 16, 2014) .....	41
<i>Cardiocom, LLC v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00460, Paper 23 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 16, 2014) .....	42
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co. v. Monsanto Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2014-00333, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 11, 2014).....	40
<i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01027, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 22, 2014) .....	2, 16
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012) .....	49
<i>Merial Ltd. v. Virbac</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 22, 2015) .....	16
<i>Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00243, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 18, 2014) .....	3, 42
<i>Nestlé Healthcare Nutrition, Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00094, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2015) .....	2, 30, 43
<i>SpaceCo Bus. Solutions, Inc. v. Moscovitch</i> , IPR2015-00127, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2015) .....	3, 35, 42

# 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.