

**Opposition To Patent Owner's Contingent Motion To Amend for *Inter Partes*
Review of USPN 7,932,268**

Filed on behalf of Coalition for Affordable Drugs VIII, LLC

By: Dr. Gregory Gonsalves

Reg. No. 43,639

2216 Beacon Lane

Falls Church, Virginia 22043

(571) 419-7252

gonsalves@gonsalveslawfirm.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS VIII, LLC, Petitioner

v.

TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Patent Owner, based on Electronic Records of PTO

U.S. Patent 7,932,268 to Rader

IPR Trial No. IPR2015-01836

**Petitioner's Opposition To Patent Owner's Contingent Motion To
Amend**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Opposition To Patent Owner’s Contingent Motion To Amend for *Inter Partes* Review of USPN 7,932,268

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW OF WHY PATENT OWNER’S MOTION TO AMEND SHOULD BE DENIED1

II. PATENT OWNER’S MOTION IS FACIALLY DEFICIENT BECAUSE IT LACKS THE REQUIRED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.1

III. PATENT OWNER DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT THE ‘268 PATENT IS ENTITLED TO CLAIM PRIORITY TO CERTAIN CLINICAL TRIALS.....2

IV. PATENT OWNER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE PRIOR ART.4

A. Substitute Claims 9-14 Are Obvious Over The Prior Art.....5

1. Claim 9 Is Obvious Over *Wetterau* In View Of *ICH-E4, Chang, Guidance For Industry 2002, Reigner* and the ‘653 Patent11

2. Substitute Claim 10 Is Obvious Over the Same Prior Art16

3. Substitute Claims 11 and 12 Are Obvious Over the Same Prior Art16

4. Substitute Claim 13 Is Obvious Over the Same Prior Art17

5. Substitute Claim 14 Is Obvious Over the Same Prior Art17

B. There Is No Nexus Between The Alleged Indicia Of Nonobviousness And The Substitute Claims.....18

1. The Dosing Method That Was Alleged By Patent Owner To Have Unexpected Results Is Not Required By The Claims.18

2. The Long-Felt, But Unmet, Need Alleged By Patent Owner Has No Nexus To The Claimed Invention.....20

Opposition To Patent Owner’s Contingent Motion To Amend for *Inter Partes* Review of USPN 7,932,268

3. The Failure Of Others Alleged By Patent Owner Has No Nexus To The Claimed Invention.....21

4. The Praise Of Others Alleged By Patent Owner Has No Nexus To The Claimed Invention.....22

5. The Alleged Commercial Success Of Juxtapid Has No Nexus To The Claimed Invention.....23

C. The Substitute Claims Are Not Patentable Over The Combinations Of Chang and The Pink Sheet Or Chang and Stein.....23

V. CONCLUSION.....25

**Opposition To Patent Owner's Contingent Motion To Amend for *Inter Partes*
Review of USPN 7,932,268**

**EXHIBIT LIST PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(e) AND
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS**

Opposition To Patent Owner’s Contingent Motion To Amend for *Inter Partes* Review of USPN 7,932,268

Ex. No.	Description
1001	Certified U.S. Patent No. 8,618,135 to Rader.
1002	Declaration of Randall M. Zusman, M.D.
1003	Declaration of Michael Mayersohn, Ph.D.
1004	<p>Affidavit of Christopher Butler, Office Manager, Internet Archive, authenticating Internet Archive URLs (June 16, 2015) (attaching as Ex. A:</p> <p><i>PPD News & IR Presentations (2004/04/15)</i> (available at https://web.archive.org/web/20040415065142/http://ppdi.com/PPD_6_12.htm)).</p>
1005	<p>Affidavit of Christopher Butler, Office Manager, Internet Archive, authenticating Internet Archive URLs (June 12, 2015) (attaching as Ex. A:</p> <p><i>PPD News Releases(2004/02/13)</i> (available at https://web.archive.org/web/20040213233245/http://www.ppdi.com/PPD_U6.htm?ID=126662);</p> <p><i>PPD News & IR Presentations(2003/12/12)</i> (available at https://web.archive.org/web/20031212193444/http://ppdi.com/PPD_6_12.htm);</p> <p><i>PPD News & IR Presentations (2004/06/04)</i> (available at https://web.archive.org/web/20040604203252/http://www.ppdi.com/PPD_6_12.htm)).</p>
1006	Certified U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/550,915.
1007	U.S. Patent No. 8,618,135 (highlighting dosing information not present in U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/550,915).
1008	U.S. Patent Application No. 13/046,118.
1009	<i>In re Application of: Rader</i> , U.S. Patent Application No. 13/046,118, Amendment and Response to Oct. 2, 2012 Office Action (Mar. 4, 2013).

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.