

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, INC.,<sup>1</sup>  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01117  
Patent 8,642,012 B2

---

Before TONI R. SCHEINER, DEBORAH KATZ, and  
GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SCHEINER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

---

<sup>1</sup> “[E]ffective May 7, 2015, the name of Hyperion Therapeutics, Inc., was changed to Horizon Therapeutics, Inc. . . . Accordingly, Horizon Therapeutics, Inc. . . . is the Patent Owner of U.S. Patent No. 8,642,012.”  
Paper 5, 2.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) on April 29, 2015, requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–12 of U.S. Patent No. 8,642,012 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’012 patent”). Horizon Therapeutics, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 8, “Prelim. Resp.”) on August 5, 2015. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314, which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted “unless . . . there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.”

Upon consideration of the information presented in the Petition and the Preliminary Response, we conclude that Petitioner has established a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in its challenges to claims 1–12 of the ’012 patent. Accordingly, we institute an *inter partes* review.

### A. *Related Proceedings*

Patent Owner filed suit against Petitioner, alleging infringement of the ’012 patent and U.S. Patent No. 8,404,215 B1 (“the ’215 patent”) in *Hyperion Therapeutics, Inc. v. Par Pharmaceutical, Inc.*, Case No. 2:14-CV-384-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.). Pet. 7; Paper 5, 3. In addition, concurrently with the Petition under consideration here, Petitioner filed a petition challenging the claims of the ’215 patent (IPR2015-01127), but represents that that patent is not related to the ’012 patent. Pet. 7.

*B. The Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability*

Petitioner asserts the challenged claims are unpatentable on the following grounds. Pet. 12–60:<sup>2</sup>

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Brusilow '91, <sup>3</sup> Sherwin, <sup>4</sup> Comte, <sup>5</sup> and Shiple <sup>6</sup>	§ 103	1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner supports its challenge with a Declaration, executed April 29, 2015, by Neal Sondheimer, M.D., Ph.D. (“Sondheimer Declaration”) (Ex. 1002).

<sup>3</sup> Saul W. Brusilow, *Phenylacetylglutamine May Replace Urea as a Vehicle for Waste Nitrogen Excretion*, 29 PEDIATRIC RESEARCH 147–150 (1991) (“Brusilow '91”) (Ex. 1012).

<sup>4</sup> Carl P. Sherwin et al., *The Maximum Production of Glutamine by the Human Body as Measured by the Output of Phenylacetylglutamine*, 37 J. BIOL. CHEM. 113–119 (1919) (“Sherwin”) (Ex. 1016).

<sup>5</sup> Blandine Comte et al., *Identification of phenylbutyrylglutamine, a new metabolite of phenylbutyrate metabolism in humans*, 37 J. MASS SPECTROM. 581–590 (2002) (“Comte”) (Ex. 1025).

<sup>6</sup> George J. Shiple & Carl P. Sherwin, *Synthesis of Amino Acids in Animal Organisms. I. Synthesis of Glycocoll and Glutamine in the Human Organism*, 44 J. AMER. CHEM. SOC. 618–624 (1922) (“Shiple”) (Ex. 1017).

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Brusilow '91 , Sherwin, Shiple, and Fernandes <sup>7</sup>	§ 103	5
Brusilow '91, Sherwin, Shiple, and the '647 patent <sup>8</sup>	§ 103	2, 9
Brusilow '91, Sherwin, Shiple, Kasumov, <sup>9</sup> and the '979 patent <sup>10</sup>	§ 103	6, 11
Brusilow '91 and Simell <sup>11</sup>	§ 103	1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12
Brusilow '91, Simell, and Fernandes	§ 103	5
Brusilow '91, Simell, and the '647 patent	§ 103	2, 9
Brusilow '91, Simell, and Kasumov	§ 103	6, 11

<sup>7</sup> INBORN METABOLIC DISEASES: DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT 219–220 (John Fernandes et al. eds., Springer Verlag 3d ed. 2000) (“Fernandes”) (Ex. 1011).

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Patent No. 4,284,647, issued August 18, 1981 to Brusilow et al. (“the '647 patent”) (Ex. 1018).

<sup>9</sup> Takhar Kasumov et al., *New Secondary Metabolites of Phenylbutyrate in Humans and Rats*, 32 DRUG METABOLISM AND DISPOSITION 10–19 (2004) (“Kasumov”) (Ex. 1015).

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,968,979, issued October 19, 1999 to Brusilow (“the 979 patent”) (Ex. 1026).

<sup>11</sup> Olly Simell et al., *Waste Nitrogen Excretion Via Amino Acid Acylation: Benzoate and Phenylacetate in Lysinuric Protein Intolerance*, 20 Pediatric Research 1117–1121 (1986) (“Simell”) (Ex. 1005).

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Brusilow '91	§ 103	1–4, 7, 9, 10, 12
Brusilow '91, Kasumov, and the '979 patent	§ 103	6, 11

*C. The '012 Patent (Ex. 1001)*

The '012 patent, titled “Methods of Treatment Using Ammonia-Scavenging Drugs,” is directed to “treatment of patients with nitrogen retention states, in particular urea cycle disorders (UCDs) . . . [by] administer[ing] compounds that assist in elimination of waste nitrogen from the body.” Ex. 1001, 1:18–25. These compounds—or “nitrogen scavenging drugs”<sup>12</sup>—include glyceryl tri-[4-phenylbutyrate] (HPN-100) and phenylbutyric acid (PBA)—both of which are prodrugs that are converted *in vivo* to phenylacetic acid (PAA). *Id.* at 3:61–66.

“For patients with nitrogen retention states such as UCD . . . the body’s intrinsic capacity for waste nitrogen excretion is less than the body’s waste nitrogen production based on a normal diet that contains significant amounts of protein.” *Id.* at 2:22–25. “As a result, nitrogen builds up in the body . . . and usually results in excess ammonia in the blood . . . [which] has various toxic effects.” *Id.* at 2:25–28.

---

<sup>12</sup> The terms “ammonia scavenger” and “nitrogen scavenger” are used interchangeably in the '012 patent. Ex. 1001, 4:6–7.

# 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.