

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PHARMACOSMOS A/S,  
Petitioner,

v.

LUITPOLD PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2015-01490; Patent 7,754,702 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	2
III.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	4
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	5
	A. “substantially non-immunogenic carbohydrate component” .....	6
	1. “substantially non-immunogenic” requires an incidence of adverse events lower than iron dextran .....	7
	2. Determination of “substantially non-immunogenic carbohydrate component” requires a large enough cohort .....	9
	B. “iron sorbitol complex” does not include “iron polyglucose sorbitol carboxymethyl ether complex” .....	10
	C. “iron carboxymaltose complex” .....	14
VI.	GROUND 1 – Claims 1-3, 10-13, 23, 25, 27, and 41-43 are not anticipated by Geisser .....	15
	A. Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden to Demonstrate that Geisser Teaches Every Element of Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 25, 27, 41, 42, or 43 .....	15
	B. Petitioner has not demonstrated that Geisser inherently discloses the claimed “substantially non-immunogenic carbohydrate component” .....	17
VII.	GROUND 2 – Claim 28 is not anticipated by Groman .....	18
	A. Groman Does Not Anticipate Claim 1 or Claim 28 .....	18

- B. Groman Does Not Teach Administration of “a single dosage unit of at least about 0.6 grams of elemental iron” .....20
- VIII. GROUND 3 – Claims 17 and 47 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Geisser and Groman .....22
  - A. Geisser and Groman are directed to structurally different iron carbohydrate complexes .....22
  - B. There was no motivation to combine Geisser and Groman and the combination offers no reasonable expectation of success .....26
    - 1. The combination of Geisser and Groman does not teach or suggest an administration of the single dosage unit in “about 15 minutes or less” recited in claim 17 .....27
    - 2. Claim 47 .....28
- IX. GROUND 4 – Claims 1, 14, and 15 are not anticipated by van Zyl-Smit.....29
  - A. van Zyl-Smit does not teach a “substantially non-immunogenic carbohydrate component” .....29
  - B. van Zyl-Smit’s sample size is not large enough to reveal a “substantially non-immunogenic” property .....31
  - C. The results of van Zyl-Smit are not generalizable to iron polymaltose .....33
- X. GROUND 5 – Claim 30 is not rendered obvious by the combination of van Zyl-Smit and Funk.....35
  - A. Petitioner’s conclusions on Funk are incorrect .....35
  - B. There was no motivation to combine van Zyl-Smit and Funk and the combination offers no reasonable expectation of success. ....39
- XI. CONCLUSION.....40

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

*Atofina v. Great Lakes Chemical Corp.*, 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....21

*Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.*, 471 F.3d 1369, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006). .....16

*In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC*, 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....5

*In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....5

*Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd.*, 457 F.3d 1284, 1290 (Fed. Cir 2006).....13

*Pharmacosmos A/S v. Luitpold Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, IPR2015-01493, Decision Granting Institution, Paper 11, January 8, 2016 .....7

*Pharmacosmos A/S v. Luitpold Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, IPR2015-01495, Decision Denying Institution (Paper 11) January 8, 2016.....23

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....5

**STATUTES**

21 CFR § 314.53 .....16

35 U.S.C. § 112 (pre-AIA).....18

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(8).....1

35 U.S.C. 316(e) .....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....5

37 C.F.R. § 42.120 .....1

**EXHIBITS RELIED ON**

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,754,702 (“the ’702 patent”)
1003	Translation of International Patent Publ. No. WO 2004/037865 (“Geisser”)
1004	U.S. Patent Appl. Publication No. 2003/0232084 (“Groman”)
1005	Declaration of Robert Linhardt
1006	van Zyl-Smit and Halkett, Nephron 92:316-323 (2002) (“van Zyl-Smit”)
1011	Spinowitz et al. Kidney Int’l. 68:1801-1807 (2005) (“Spinowitz”)
1017	U.S. Patent No. 6,599,498 (“the ‘498 patent”)
1021	Excerpt of Prosecution History of European Patent Application EP1973549
1022	Neiser et al. Port. J. Nephrol. Hypert. 25(3):219-224 (2011) (“Neiser”)
1023	British Pharmacopoeia Monograph for Iron Sorbitol (2003)
1026	Funk, et al. Hyperfine Interactions 136:73-95 (2001) (“Funk”)
1035	Neiser et al., Biometals 1-21 (2015)
1042	Excerpts of the File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,895,612
1048	Danielson, Journal of the American Society of Nephrology 15:593-598 (2004)
2003	Ferrosig Drug Product Data Sheet, Revised July 2003
2012	Fishbane, Am. J. Kidney Dis. 2003 41(5 Suppl):18-26
2015	Volhardt, Organic Chemistry, W.H. Freeman Co 2007 p. 1096-138

# 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.