



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
13/902,132 05/24/2013 Giorgio Calderari 23278.2.US.10 2532

53449 7590 12/06/2013
PATENT CORRESPONDENCE
ARNALL GOLDEN GREGORY LLP
171 17TH STREET NW
SUITE 2100
ATLANTA, GA 30363

EXAMINER

GEMBEH, SHIRLEY V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1628

NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE

12/06/2013

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@agg.com

Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd., et al.
v.
Helsin Healthcare S.A., et al.

DETAILED ACTION

The present application, filed on or after March 16, 2013, is being examined under the first inventor to file provisions of the AIA.

Status of Claims

Claims 12-41 are pending and are under examination in this office action. Claims 1-11 have been cancelled. Claims 16-41 are newly added.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/25/13 is acknowledged and has been reviewed.

1. The response filed on **10/9/13** has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/9/13 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. The rejection of claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is withdrawn due to the amendment of the claims.

The rejection of Claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baroni et al. (WO 2004/073714). Is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment to the claims.

The rejection of Claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Baroni et al. (WO 2004/073714) is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment to the claims.

Claim Objections

Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 27 is a duplicate of claim 26. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention(s) absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and effective filing dates of each claim that was not commonly owned as of the effective filing date of the later invention in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 102(b)(2)(C) for any potential 35 U.S.C. 102(a)(2) prior art against the later invention.

Claims 12, 14-16, 18-24, 26-33, 35-41 are rejected under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger et al. (US 5,202,333) in view of Barton (Citrate Buffer Calculation, 2000, 2pgs and Castillo et al., US 6,284,749 further in view of Gambhir, US 5,854,270 and as evidenced by Matsumoto (All references have already been made of record).

With regards to claims 12, 16, 24 and 33, Berger et al. teaches a method of treating and or reducing chemotherapy induced nausea and vomiting with a pharmaceutical solution for reducing emesis in cancer patients (see col. 1, lines 33-40, as required by instant claims 14, 18, 26-26, 35), comprising palonosetron in a pharmaceutical acceptable carrier (see col. 2, lines 20 to 25 and col. 12, lines 41-52 and col. 3, lines 17-21) in a single unit dosage form (see col. 13, lines 1-5) for intravenous

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.