

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SHIRE DEVELOPMENT LLC

Petitioner

v.

LCS GROUP, LLC

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,318,813 to Sanfilippo

Issue Date: November 27, 2012

Title: Method of Treating Binge Eating Disorder

Inter Partes Review

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review for U.S. Patent No. 8,318,813 Under
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123**

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

CFAD Ex. 1031
IPR2015-00990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....1

 A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)1

 B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)1

 C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)1

 D. Service Information.....2

II. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.1032

III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....2

IV. CHALLENGE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) AND RELIEF
REQUESTED2

V. SUMMARY OF THE '813 PATENT3

 A. Brief Description3

 B. Summary of the Prosecution History of the '813 Patent4

VI. STATE OF THE ART5

VII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART9

VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION9

IX. MANNER OF APPLYING CITED PRIOR ART TO EVERY
CLAIM FOR WHICH IPR IS REQUESTED.....11

 A. The Cited References Qualify as Prior Art11

 1. Appolinario (Ex.1020)12

 2. Mickle (Ex.1023)12

 3. Marrazzi (Ex.1024)12

 4. Grilo (Ex.1025)12

 5. Ong (Ex.1017).....13

6.	DSM-IV-TR (Ex.1010).....	13
7.	Dukarm (Ex.1019)	13
B.	Ground 1: Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12, and 13 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Appolinario in View of Mickle.....	13
1.	Appolinario Teaches that Centrally Acting Anti-Obesity Agents Can Be Used to Treat BED Diagnosed According to DSM-IV-TR.....	13
2.	Mickle Discloses LDX Dimesylate as a Centrally Acting Anti-obesity Agent Having Desirable Properties	15
3.	Appolinario in View of Mickle Renders the Treatment of BED with LDX Dimesylate Obvious	16
C.	Ground 2: Claims 6 and 7 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Appolinario in View of Mickle and Marrazzi.....	24
D.	Ground 3: Claim 11 Is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Appolinario in View of Mickle and Grilo	25
E.	Ground 4: Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12, and 13 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ong in View of DSM-IV-TR and Mickle.....	26
1.	The Combination of Ong and DSM-IV-TR Teaches the Diagnosis of BED and Its Treatment Using Stimulants	26
2.	Ong Motivates the POSA to Search for an Improved Stimulant, and Mickle Provides the Solution	28
3.	Ong in View of DSM-IV-TR and Mickle Renders the Treatment of BED with LDX Dimesylate Obvious	29

F.	Ground 5: Claims 6 and 7 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ong in View of DSM-IV-TR, Mickle, and Marrazzi	37
G.	Ground 6: Claim 11 is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ong in View of DSM-IV-TR, Mickle, and Grilo.....	38
H.	Ground 7: Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12, and 13 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dukarm in View of DSM-IV-TR and Mickle	39
	1. The Combination of Dukarm and DSM-IV-TR Teaches the Diagnosis of BED and Its Treatment Using d-Amphetamine	39
	2. Mickle Addresses the Specific Problem Raised by Dukarm Regarding the Use of d-Amphetamine	41
	3. Dukarm in View of DSM-IV-TR and Mickle Renders the Treatment of BED with LDX Dimesylate Obvious	42
I.	Ground 8: Claims 6 and 7 Are Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dukarm in View of DSM-IV-TR, Mickle, and Marrazzi	50
J.	Ground 9: Claim 11 Is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dukarm in View of DSM-IV-TR, Mickle, and Grilo.....	51
X.	APPLICANT’S ARGUMENTS DURING PROSECUTION DO NOT DEMONSTRATE NONOBVIOUSNESS OF THE CLAIMS	52
A.	A POSA Would Have Extended Dukarm’s Teachings of the Use of Stimulants in the Treatment of BN to the Treatment of BED	53
B.	Given the Positive Attributes of LDX Dimesylate, a POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Use It to Treat BED.....	55

XI.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS ARGUED BY APPLICANT DURING PROSECUTION DO NOT REFUTE OBVIOUSNESS.....	57
A.	Examples 1, 2, and 5 of the '813 Patent Do Not Demonstrate that LDX Dimesylate Shows Surprising and Unexpected Efficacy for Treating BED	57
B.	Applicant's Arguments Regarding Long-Felt Need Do Not Support Nonobviousness.....	59
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	60

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.