

Filed on behalf of: Insys Pharma, Inc

By: Gerald J. Flattmann (CFAD-Insys@paulhastings.com)  
Naveen Modi (CFAD-Insys@paulhastings.com)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS XI LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

INSYS PHARMA, INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01800  
Patent 8,486,972

---

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response  
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review  
of U.S. Patent No. 8,486,972**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	2
III. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	4
A. Ross_US2006 (Ex. 1005) Was Considered by the Office .....	4
B. Substantially the Same Information as That Contained in Ross_GB (Ex. 1003) Was Considered by the Office .....	5
C. The '496 Publication (Ex. 1006) Was Considered by the Office .....	9
D. CFAD's Newly Presented Reference Is Deficient.....	9
E. Conclusion.....	10
IV. CFAD Advances Flawed Obviousness Analyses.....	10
A. Ground 1: Claims 1 and 3 Are Not Obvious Over Ross_GB (Ex. 1003), Ross_US2006 (Ex. 1005), and the '862 Patent (Ex. 1004) .....	11
1. CFAD Fails to Explain How the References Disclose or Suggest the Features of Claims 1 and 3.....	12
2. CFAD Fails to Explain Why One of Ordinary Skill Would Have Combined the Asserted References .....	16
3. CFAD Resorts to Non-Analogous Art and Conclusory Allegations of Obviousness .....	20
B. Ground 2: Claim 2 Is Not Obvious Over Ross_GB (Ex. 1003), Ross_US2006 (Ex. 1005), the '862 Patent (Ex. 1004), and the '496 Publication (Ex. 1006).....	25
1. CFAD Fails to Explain How the References Disclose or Suggest the Features of Claim 2 .....	26
2. CFAD Fails to Explain Why One of Ordinary Skill Would Have Combined the Asserted References .....	28

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
C. CFAD’s Grounds Rely on Improper Hindsight .....	30
D. CFAD Fails to Adequately Address Secondary Considerations Set Forth During Prosecution .....	32
1. CFAD’s Argument That Secondary Considerations Are Not Commensurate With the Scope of the Claims Is Deficient .....	32
2. CFAD’s Argument That Fast Onset of Five Minutes Was Not Unexpected Due to a Fentanyl Nasal Spray Is Deficient.....	34
3. CFAD’s Argument That Fast Onset of Five Minutes Was Not Unexpected Due to Allegedly Newly Identified References Is Deficient .....	36
4. CFAD’s Attempt to Compare Blood Concentration Between Subsys <sup>®</sup> and a Nasal Spray Is Deficient.....	40
E. CFAD Fails to Adequately Address Additional Evidence of Secondary Considerations .....	42
1. Commercial Success .....	42
2. Failure of Others .....	44
3. Long-Felt Need .....	44
4. Skepticism .....	46
5. Unexpected Results .....	46
V. CFAD’s Claim Construction Analysis Is Deficient .....	47
VI. Conclusion .....	50

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	42
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese &amp; Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	27, 30
<i>Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ Inc.</i> , 795 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	21
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	11, 20, 33, 34
<i>Dynamic Drinkware v. Nat’l Graphics</i> , No. 15-1214 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 4, 2015) .....	34
<i>Excelsior Med. Corp. v. Lake</i> , IPR2013-00494, Paper 10 (Feb. 6, 2014) .....	4
<i>In re Fay</i> , 347 F.2d 597 (C.C.P.A. 1965) .....	24
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kan. City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....	10
<i>Hulu LLC v. Intertainer, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01456, Paper 8 (Mar. 6, 2015) .....	4
<i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (Mar. 23, 2015) .....	11, 42
<i>Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. et al. v. Richmond</i> , IPR2014-00938, Paper 20 (Dec. 16, 2014) .....	47, 48
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	11

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	33
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	10, 11, 19
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	23
<i>Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Moral GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	46
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	23, 46
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	44
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	23, 24
<i>Prism Pharma Co. v. Choogwae Pharma Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00315, Paper 14 (July 8, 2014) .....	4
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	33
<i>Schott Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Co., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00367, Paper 62 (May 26, 2015).....	21
<i>Standard Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	23
<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	42
<i>Syntex (USA) LLC v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 407 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	44

# 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.