

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LANNETT HOLDINGS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB,
Patent Owner.

Case: IPR2015-01629
U.S. Patent No. 6,750,237

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	35 U.S.C. § 315(b) Bars the Petition	1
	A. The Petition Was Filed More Than One Year After Petitioner Was Served With an Infringement Complaint	1
	B. No Exception Applies to the Applicability of § 315(b)	3
	1. Service of Process Complied With the Local and Federal Rules.....	3
	2. Patent Owner Had Standing to Bring the First Action	4
	3. The First Infringement Action Was Not Dismissed	5
III.	Claim Construction.....	7
	A. Petitioner Inappropriately Incorporates Dr. Gizurason’s Declaration in an Attempt to Circumvent the Page Limit	7
	B. The Terms “Zolmitriptan,” “Buffer,” “Buffered,” and “in a Buffer” Should Be Given Their Plain and Ordinary Meanings	8
	1. “Zolmitriptan”	8
	2. “Buffer,” “Buffered,” and “in a Buffer”	13
	C. The Preamble Is Limiting.....	16
IV.	Grounds Based on Anticipation.....	18
	A. Chauveau Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-8, 13, 15, or 16.....	19
	1. Chauveau’s Disclosure of Excipients Does Not Disclose Buffers.....	19
	2. Chauveau Does Not Disclose Sterile Pharmaceutical Formulations	22
	3. The Claimed pH Range Is Critical.....	23

4.	Chauveau Does Not Disclose All Claim Elements as Arranged in the Claims	26
B.	Rudolf Does Not Anticipate Claims 9, 10, or 13	28
1.	Rudolf Is Not Prior Art Under § 102(b)	28
2.	Rudolf Does Not Disclose All Claim Elements as Arranged in the Claims	28
C.	Marquess Does Not Anticipate Claims 1 or 3-15	31
1.	Marquess Is Not Prior Art.....	31
2.	Marquess Does Not Disclose All Claim Elements	32
a.	Marquess Does Not Disclose Zolmitriptan	32
b.	Marquess Does Not Disclose Any Buffered Formulation or One Having a pH of 4.5 to 5.5	34
c.	Marquess Does Not Disclose a Sterile Formulation	36
d.	Marquess Does Not Disclose a pH of 5.....	36
e.	Marquess Does Not Disclose an Intranasal Administration Device.....	37
V.	Grounds Based on Obviousness	37
VI.	Conclusion	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	34
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Cable & Wireless Internet Servs., Inc.</i> , 344 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	32
<i>Apple Inc. v. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</i> , IPR2014-00319, Paper 12 (PTAB June 12, 2014)	6, 7
<i>In re Arkley</i> , 455 F.2d 586 (C.C.P.A. 1972)	18, 27, 30
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	23, 25, 26
<i>Baxter Int’l, Inc. v. McGaw, Inc.</i> , 149 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	3
<i>Bowles v. Russell</i> , 551 U.S. 205 (2007)	2
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014)	7
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2014-00914, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 2, 2015)	31
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Custom Media Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2014-01272, Paper 9 (PTAB Jan. 30, 2015)	28
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>Daicel Corp. v. Celanese Int’l Corp.</i> , IPR2014-01514, Paper 11 (PTAB Apr. 1, 2015)	22

<i>Fidelity Nat'l Info. Servs., Inc. v. DataTreasury Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2014).....	8
<i>Flir Sys., Inc. v. Canvs Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00773, Paper 7 (PTAB Sept. 4, 2014).....	2
<i>GlaxoSmithKline LLC v. Banner Pharmacaps, Inc.</i> , No. 11-cv-00046, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112440 (D. Del. Aug. 9, 2013)	10
<i>Graves v. Principi</i> , 294 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	5
<i>Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 302 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	9
<i>KSR Int. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	38
<i>Lemus v. DOJ</i> , 571 F. App'x 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	3
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casual Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012)	38
<i>Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co.</i> , 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	27
<i>Macauto U.S.A. v. BOS GmbH & KG</i> , IPR2012-00004, Paper 18 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2013)	5
<i>In re Meyer</i> , 599 F.2d 1026 (C.C.P.A. 1979).....	20, 21
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. Nissan Chem. Indus., Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01069, Paper 24 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2015).....	21
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	18, 27, 29

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.