

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.
Petitioner

v.

POZEN INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-00802
Patent No. 8,557,285

PRELIMINARY PATENT OWNER RESPONSE
37 C.F.R. § 42.107

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

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. ARGUMENT	4
A. Ground 1 Should Be Denied Because The Plachetka Publication Is Not Prior Art	4
1. Petitioner Has Not Provided Any Evidentiary Support Regarding the Priority Analysis.....	5
2. Claim Construction	6
a. “Comprising . . . Naproxen Surrounded by a Coating”	7
b. “inhibits”	9
c. “at least a portion of said esomeprazole”	10
d. “enteric coating”	10
e. “unit dosage form”	11
3. The Claims of The ’285 Patent Are At Least Entitled to The Same Filing Date as The ’216 Application	12
a. The ’216 Application Discloses The “Coordinated Release” Recited in The ’285 Patent Claims.....	15
b. Petitioner Ignores Express Teaching in The ’216 Application of “A Portion” of Acid Inhibitor Subject to Immediate-Release	18
c. Coatings that “Inhibit” Release Have Written Description Support in The ’216 Application	20
d. When Properly Construed The Claims of The ’285 Are Limited To Oral Dosage Forms.....	24
e. When Properly Construed The Claims of The ’285 Are Entitled to At Least the Filing Date of the ’216 Application	24

Table of Contents
(continued)

	Page
4. Petitioner’s Ground 1 Has No Likelihood of Success and Should Be Denied	25
B. The Claims of The ’285 Patent Are Non-Obvious	26
1. Petitioner Fails To Set Forth A <i>Prima Facie</i> Case of Obviousness	27
2. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate a Motivation To Combine or a Reasonable Expectation of Success	29
3. Petitioner’s References Have Been Repeatedly Considered During Examination	39
4. The Formulations Claimed in the ’285 Patent Exhibit Unexpected Results.....	41
5. Petitioner’s Ground 2 Has No Likelihood of Success and Should Be Denied	42
C. The Petition Should Be Denied For Failing To Identify All Real-Parties-In-Interest	43
1. Legal Standard	44
2. The Unnamed Co-Defendants Have the Ability to Exert Control Over This Proceeding	44
3. Tacit Permission to use Dr. Kibbe Should Act as an Estoppel.....	48
4. The Petition’s Filing Date Should Be Vacated and the Petition Dismissed as Untimely	48
IV. CONCLUSION.....	50

Table of Authorities

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	6
<i>Anova Food, LLC., v. Sandau & Kowalski</i> , No. IPR2013-00114 (LMG), Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. June 25, 2013)	33
<i>Capon v. Eshhar</i> , 418 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	23
<i>CIAS, Inc. v. Alliance Gaming Corp.</i> , 504 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	8
<i>Eiselstein v. Frank</i> , 52 F.3d 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	23
<i>Galderma S.A. v. Allergan Indus., SAS</i> , IPR2014-01422, 2015 WL 1022410 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 5, 2015).....	49
<i>Gen. Foods Corp. v. Mass. Dep’t of Pub. Health</i> , 648 F.2d 784 (1st Cir. 1981).....	48
<i>In re Haruna</i> , 249 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	36
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	26
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	6
<i>Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.</i> , 242 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	37
<i>In re Kaslow</i> , 707 F.2d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	23

Table of Authorities
(continued)

Page(s)

<i>LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	23
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	36
<i>Outside the Box Innovations, LLC v. Travel Caddy, Inc.</i> , 695 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	8
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	13
<i>Purdue Pharma LP v. Faulding Inc.</i> , 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	12
<i>RPX Corp. v. Virnetx Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00171, Paper No. 49 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2014)	47
<i>Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	31
<i>In re Skvorecz</i> , 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	8, 9
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	7, 8
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880 (2008).....	44
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	31
<i>Yorkey v. Diab</i> , 601 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	5

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.