

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LUPIN LTD. AND LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.
Petitioner

v.

POZEN INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-01774
Patent No. 8,852,636

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION1
- II. BACKGROUND2
- III. DENIAL OF INSTITUTION OF IPR2015-008026
- IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART8
- V. CLAIM INTERPRETATION8
 - A. “Unit Dosage Form”8
- VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING9
 - A. Ground 1: The Petition has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-6 and 13-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over the ’556 Patent Alone, or in the Alternative, in View of Chandramouli9
 - 1. Ground 1A: The Petition Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-6 and 13-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over the ’556 Patent Alone10
 - a. The ’556 Patent Does Not Describe a Combination Tablet of Naproxen and Esomeprazole10
 - b. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Create a Combination Tablet With Immediate-Release Esomeprazole With a Reasonable Expectation of Success13
 - 2. Ground 1B: The Petition has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-6 and 13-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over the ’556 Patent in View of Chandramouli17

- B. Ground 2: The Petition has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-6 and 13-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over the '556 Patent or Alternatively, Over the '556 Patent in View of the '225 Patent18
- C. Ground 3: The Petition has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-6 and 13-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over the '118 Patent in View of the '225 Patent.....23
- D. Ground 4: The Petition has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-6 and 13-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over the '118 Patent in View of the '225 Patent and the '192 Patent.....28
- E. Ground 5: The Petition has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-6 and 13-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over the '225 Patent in View of Chandramouli and WO '18529
- F. The Petition Fails to Offer Evidence Refuting Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness31
 - 1. Surprising and Unexpected Results32
 - 2. Long Felt But Unresolved Need36
 - 3. Licensing37
 - 4. Copying37
- VII. CONCLUSION.....38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n, 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....32

Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Inc. v. Pozen, Inc., IPR2015-00802, Paper No. 28
(P.T.A.B. Oct. 9, 2015).....2

In re Haruna, 249 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2001)22

In re Huai-Hung Kao, 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....32

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007)13

McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc., 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)37

Micron Tech., Inc. v. Bd. of Trs. of the Univ. of Ill., IPR2013-00005,
Paper No. 54 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 10, 2014).....33

Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc., 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed.
Cir. 2008).....32

In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998)37

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....32

Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc., 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)23

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 3131

35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....7

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.1071

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

EX. NO.	DESCRIPTION
2001	License Agreement between Patent Owner Pozen Inc. and exclusive licensee Horizon Pharma, Inc.
2002	Norman & Hawkey, <i>What you need to know when you prescribe a proton pump inhibitor</i> , <i>Frontline Gastroenterology</i> , 1-7 (2011) (“Norman 2011”)
2003	Chiverton et al., <i>Does misoprostol given as a single large dose improve its antisecretory effect?</i> , <i>Aliment Pharmacol Ther.</i> 3(4):403-07 (1989) (“Chiverton 1989”)
2004	Cederberg et al., <i>Omeprazole: Pharmacokinetics and Metabolism in Man</i> , <i>Scand. J. of Gastroenterology</i> 24:33-40 (1989) (“Cederberg 1989”)
2005	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 6,926,907 (“the ’907 patent”)
2006	Excerpt from the Compact American Medical Dictionary, 138, “duodenum” (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston/New York, 1998)
2007	Wolfe et al., <i>Gastrointestinal Toxicity of Nonsteroidal Antiinflammatory Drugs</i> , <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i> , 340(24):1888-99 (1999) (“Wolfe 1999”)
2008	Stedman & Barclay, <i>Review article: comparison of the pharmacokinetics, acid suppression and efficacy of proton pump inhibitors</i> , <i>Aliment Pharmacol. Ther.</i> 14:963-78 (2000) (“Stedman 2000”)
2009	Bell & Hunt, <i>Progress with Proton Pump Inhibition</i> , <i>Yale J. Biology & Med.</i> , 65:649-57 (1992) (“Bell 1992”)
2010	Sachs et al., <i>Review article: the control of gastric acid and Helicobacter pylori eradication</i> , <i>Aliment Pharmacol. Ther.</i> 14:1383-401 (2000) (“Sachs 2000”)
2011	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,858,636 (“the ’636 patent”)

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.