

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

STEADYMED LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-00006  
Patent 8,497,393

---

**Patent Owner Preliminary Response Under  
35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION .....1**

**II. DEVELOPMENT OF REMODULIN® .....1**

**III. THE '393 PATENT .....3**

**IV. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '393 PATENT AND RELATED APPLICATIONS ALREADY ADDRESS PETITIONER'S ARGUMENTS .....7**

**A. Moriarty and Phares were both considered by the Examiner during prosecution of the '393 patent .....7**

**B. The Examiner considered Moriarty during prosecution of the '393 patent and ultimately found no anticipation.....8**

**C. The Examiner considered Phares combined with Moriarty during prosecution of the '393 patent and ultimately found no obviousness .....10**

**D. The Examiner considered Phares alone and in combination with Moriarty during prosecution of a related continuation application and found no anticipation or obviousness .....11**

**E. The Board should exercise its discretion to decline to institute trial.....14**

**V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....15**

**VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW.....24**

**VII. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT RAISES ISSUES ALREADY ADDRESSED IN PROSECUTION .....25**

**VIII. GROUND 1: THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO PROVIDE ANY EVIDENCE THAT A SINGLE EMBODIMENT OF PHARES WOULD INHERENTLY RESULT IN THE SAME PRODUCT AS THAT CLAIMED IN ANY OF CLAIMS 1-5, 7-9, 11-14 OR 16-20 OF THE '393 PATENT .....27**

**A. Petitioner cannot pick and choose from unrelated portions of Phares to establish anticipation .....29**

**B. Phares does not anticipate step (c) of the '393 patent claims .....31**

C.	Petitioner has not shown that step (c) would necessarily lead to the same final product if made from different starting treprostinil materials .....	33
<b>IX.</b>	<b>THE FDA ACCEPTED A NEW PURITY SPECIFICATION WHEN PATENT OWNER IMPLEMENTED CLAIMS 1 AND 10 OF THE '393 PATENT.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b><u>GROUND 2 AND 3</u> OF THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE TRANSLATOR'S AFFIDAVIT FOR KAWAKAMI VIOLATES RULE 1.68 .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b><u>GROUND 2</u> SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS THAT ANY OF CLAIMS 1-5, 7-9, 11-14, OR 16-20 ARE OBVIOUS.....</b>	<b>39</b>
A.	Petitioner fails to establish a motivation to combine Moriarty with Kawakami with a reasonable expectation of success.....	40
B.	Moriarty in view of Phares does not render the '393 patent obvious .....	43
<b>XII.</b>	<b><u>GROUND 3</u> SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT IT WOULD BE OBVIOUS TO COMBINE THE REFERENCES WITH A REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS .....</b>	<b>45</b>
A.	Ege is not relevant to the '393 patent.....	46
B.	Moriarty in view of Phares with Ege Fails To Establish Obviousness.....	47
1.	Petitioner fails to provide a motivation to combine Moriarty, Phares, and Ege or an expectation of success for obtaining the free-acid product of claims 6, 10, 15, and 21 .....	48
2.	Petitioner fails to provide a motivation to combine Moriarty, Phares and Ege or an expectation of success for obtaining the salt product of claim 22 .....	50
C.	Moriarty in view of Kawakami with Ege.....	51
1.	Petitioner fails to provide a motivation to combine Moriarty, Kawakami and Ege or an expectation of success	

for obtaining the free-acid product of claims 6, 10, 15, and 21 .....	51
2. Petitioner fails to provide a motivation to combine Moriarty, Kawakami, and Ege or an expectation of success for obtaining the salt product of claim 22.....	52
D. Petitioner provides no evidence that the product of the '393 patent would be "inherently produced" .....	53
<b>XIII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS WOULD REBUT ANY POSSIBLE CASE OF OBVIOUSNESS.....</b>	<b>55</b>
A. Long-felt unmet need .....	55
B. Unexpected results .....	56
C. Commercial Success .....	56
D. Copying.....	57
<b>XIV. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>58</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

AERO PRODS. INT'L, INC. V. INTEX REC. CORP.,  
466 F.3D 1000 (FED. CIR. 2006) ..... 16

*IN RE ARKLEY*,  
455 F.2D 586 (CCPA 1972)..... 28

ATLAS POWDER CO. V. IRECO INC.,  
190 F.3D 1342 (FED. CIR. 1999) ..... 54

BIAGRO W. SALES, INC. V. GROW-MORE, INC.,  
423 F.3D 1296 (FED. CIR. 2005) ..... 16

CIAS, INC. V. ALLIANCE GAMING CORP.,  
504 F.3D 1356 (FED. CIR. 2007) ..... 23

DSW, INC. V. SHOE PAVILION, INC.,  
537 F.3D 1342 (FED. CIR. 2008) ..... 16

GECHTER V. DAVIDSON,  
116 F.3D 1454 (FED. CIR. 1997) ..... 16

GLAXO INC. V. NOVOPHARM LTD.,  
52 F.3D 1043 (FED. CIR. 1995) ..... 28, 31, 35, 36

*IN RE RIJCKAERT*,  
9 F.3D 1531 (FED. CIR. 1993) ..... 28

PHILLIPS V. AWH CORP.,  
415 F.3D 1303 (FED. CIR. 2005) ..... 16

RICHARDSON V. SUZUKI MOTOR,  
868 F.2D 1226 (FED. CIR. 1989) ..... 27

SANOFI-SYNTHELABO V. APOTEX INC.,  
550 F.3D 1075 (FED. CIR. 2008) ..... 28

# 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.