

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.
Petitioner

v.

POZEN INC.
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,557,285
Issue Date: October 15, 2013

Title: PHARMACEUTICAL COMPOSITIONS FOR
THE COORDINATED DELIVERY OF NSAIDS

Inter Partes Review No. Unassigned

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,557,285 AND
MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	v
EXHIBIT LIST	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	1
A. Real Party-In-Interest - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	1
B. Related Matters - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	1
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	2
D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	2
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A)	3
IV. OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)	4
V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR – 37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)	12
A. Background of the ‘285 Patent.....	12
1. The ‘285 Patent Family and Predecessor Applications	12
2. The ‘285 Patent Specification.....	13
3. The Prosecution History Of The ‘285 Patent	17
4. The Litigation.....	20
5. Horizon’s Citizen Petition and FDA Response	21
B. THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	24
C. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	24
1. “Comprising ...Naproxen Surrounded by a Coating”	26
2. “Inhibit”	28

3.	“at least a portion of said esomeprazole”	30
D.	The ‘285 Patent Claims are Invalid.....	31
1.	Ground 1: The Effective Filing Date is No Earlier than May 16, 2005 and the Plachetka Publication Anticipates Claims 1 – 4 and Renders them Obvious	31
a.	The Disclosure in the Pre-2003 Applications.....	31
b.	No Disclosure in the Pre-2003 Applications Supports the ‘285 Patent Claims	35
c.	The ‘285 Patent Claims 1 – 4 May Not Claim Priority to the Pre-2003 Applications and the Plachetka Publication is Invalidating Prior Art.....	40
2.	Ground 2: Even if Entitled to a June 1, 2001 Priority Date, Claims 1 – 4 of the ‘285 Patent are Obvious Over Depui, Daneshmend, Lundberg and Clissold	43
a.	The Primary References	43
i.	WO 97125064 (“Depui”)	43
ii.	WO 00/78293 (“Lundberg”)	44
iii.	WO 00/26185 (“Phillips”).....	45
iv.	Clissold.....	46
b.	With Both Motivation and a Reasonable Expectation of Success, the Presence of Only Two Options – Coated or Uncoated – Made Uncoated Esomeprazole Obvious to Try.....	47
c.	The Prior Art Did not “Teach Away” from Esomeprazole Formulations Without an Enteric Coating.....	49
3.	Secondary Considerations fail to Overcome the Evidence Of Obviousness	54
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (<i>en banc</i>)	33
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 1699 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015).....	24
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	52
<i>Leapfrog Enters. Inc. v. Fisher-Price Inc.</i> , 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	55
<i>Macuato USA v. BOS GMBH & KG</i> , IPR2012-00010 Paper 18, Jan. 24, 2012	3
<i>Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.</i> , 122 F.3d 1476 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	55

Rules, Regulations and Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	6, 40
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	1
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	24
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a).....	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.8	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	2

D.N.J. L. Pat. R. 4.1 – 4.6	24
Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i)	3

Other Authorities

<i>Morrison & Boyd, Organic Chemistry</i> , (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 3d ed. 1992)	30
Pilbrant and Cederberg, “Development of an Oral Formulation of Omeprazole,” <i>Scand. J. Gastroenterol.</i> , 20(Suppl. 108):113-120 (1985)	47, 51
Sachs <i>et al.</i> , “Review Article: The Control of Gastric Acid and Helicobacter Pylori Eradication,” <i>Aliment Pharmacol. Ther.</i> , 14:1383-1401 (2000).....	50
<i>The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary</i> (Oxford Univ, Press, N.Y., 1991)	30
<i>The Random House Dictionary of the English Language</i> , p. 732 (Random House, Inc., N.Y. 1966).....	30
Warren and Marshall, “Unidentified Curved Bacilli on Gastric Epithelium in Active Chronic Gastritis,” <i>Lancet</i> , I:1273-1275 (1983).....	50

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.