

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS VII LLC
Petitioner

v.

POZEN INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-01241
Patent No. 6,926,907

PRELIMINARY PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

37 C.F.R. § 42.107

(REDACTED VERSION)

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	3
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	6
IV.	CLAIM INTERPRETATION	7
	A. The Petition Incorrectly Interprets “Unit Dosage Form”	7
	B. The Petition Incorrectly Interprets “Acid Inhibitor”	8
	C. “Coordinated Release” Does Not Require Further Interpretation	12
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY CFAD’S PETITION BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS	13
	A. Ground 1: Petitioner Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 13, 22, and 23 Are Obvious over Gimet in View of Chiverton	13
	B. Ground 2: Petitioner Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1-5 and 7-23 Are Obvious over Gimet in View of Goldman in Further View of Remington	15
	C. Ground 3: Petitioner Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1-5, 7-18, 21, and 23 Are Obvious over Goldman in View of Remington in Further View of Abe	22
	D. Ground 4: Petitioner Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1, 5, and 6 Are Obvious over Goldman in View of Remington in Further View of Fitton	23
	E. Petitioner Fails to Offer Evidence Refuting Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness	25
	1. Long Felt But Unresolved Need	30
	2. Surprising and Unexpected Results	31
	3. Licensing	33
	4. Copying	34

F. Each of Grounds 1-4 Should Be Denied34

G. Each of Grounds 2 and 3 Should Be Denied as to Claims 5 and
15; Ground 4 Should Be Denied as to Claim 535

VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY CFAD’S PETITION BECAUSE IT
WAS FILED FOR AN IMPROPER PURPOSE40

VII. CONCLUSION.....48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	11
<i>Beckman Instruments, Inc. v. LKB Produkter AB</i> , 892 F.2d 1547 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	39
<i>Bumble Bee Foods, LLC v. Kowalski</i> , IPR2014-00224, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2014)	15
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014)	27
<i>Coalition For Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Biogen IDEC Int’l GmbH</i> , IPR2015-01086, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. July 3, 2015)	42
<i>Coalition For Affordable Drugs VI LLC v. Celgene Corp.</i> , IPR2015-01169, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 2, 2015)	46
<i>Consumer Watchdog v. Wis. Alumni Research Found.</i> , 753 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	43
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	25
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	27
<i>Excelsior Med. Corp. v. Lake</i> , IPR2013-00494, Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 6, 2014)	22
<i>Fid. Nat’l Info. Servs., Inc. v. DataTreasury Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 13, 2014)	28, 29
<i>In re Haruna</i> , 249 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	39

<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	15
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25, 27
<i>Hulu LLC v. Intertainer, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01456, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 6, 2015)	21
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	16
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Inc., Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012)	24
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	34
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. Bd. of Trs. of the Univ. of Ill.</i> , IPR2013-00005, Paper No. 54 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 10, 2014)	31
<i>Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00243, Paper No. 6 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2014)	16
<i>Prism Pharma Co. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00315, Paper No. 14 (P.T.A.B. July 8, 2014)	22
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	25
<i>In re Payne</i> , 606 F.2d 303 (C.C.P.A. 1979)	39
<i>In re Rouffet</i> , 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	33
<i>Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38

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.