

Paper No. ____
Date: February 2, 2016

Filed on behalf of: Amgen Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COMPLEX INNOVATIONS LLC,
Petitioner

v.

AMGEN INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00085
U.S. Patent No. 7,829,595 B2

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	4
	A. The '595 Patent	4
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
IV.	Claim Construction.....	9
V.	Law	9
	A. Evidence	9
	B. Burden of Proof.....	10
	C. Obviousness.....	10
VI.	References Relied Upon	12
	A. Van Wagenen	12
	B. HPE (3 rd Ed.).....	14
	C. General Knowledge of POSITA	16
VII.	Ground 1 – Van Wagenen, HPE, and General Knowledge of POSITA	19
	A. “General Knowledge of POSITA” is not a Patent or Printed Publication and May Not Establish the Presence of Claim Elements	20
	B. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate a Reason to Combine or a Reasonable Expectation of Success	21
	1. Petitioner Has Not Offered Any Reason to Select Cinacalcet Over Other Calcimimetic Compounds	23

2.	Petitioner Has Not Offered Any Reason to Select the Six Claimed Excipients over Many Other Options	24
3.	Petitioner Has Failed to Establish Any Reason Why a POSITA Would Have Selected the Specific Claimed Weight Ranges	28
a.	Active Ingredient Weight Range	28
b.	Excipient Weight Ranges	30
4.	Petitioner Has Failed to Establish a Reasonable Expectation of Success In Formulating a Pharmaceutical Composition	31
C.	Petitioner Applies the Wrong Burden of Proof.....	33
VIII.	Real Party In Interest	34
IX.	Conclusion	36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case

<i>2Wire, Inc. v. TQ Delta LLC</i> , IPR2015-00239, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. May 29, 2015)	25
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communications, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	27
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Abbvie Biotechnology Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01514, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 14, 2015)	32
<i>Bumble Bee Foods, LLC v. William R. Kowalski</i> , IPR2014-00224, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2014)	11, 22, 30
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VII LLC v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01241, Paper No. 22 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 8, 2015)	36
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VII LLC v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01344, Paper No. 22 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 17, 2015)	10
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , No. 15-446 (Jan. 15, 2016)	9
<i>Eizo Corp. v. Barco N.V.</i> , IPR2014-00358, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. July 23, 2014)	21
<i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	11
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013), <i>cert denied</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2740 (2014)	33, 34
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	28
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	22
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10

<i>In re Sang Su Lee</i> , 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	1, 9, 20, 21
<i>Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014)	29
<i>KSR Int’l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	11
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharms., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	9, 20, 21
<i>RPX Corp. v. Virnetx, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00171, Paper 52 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2014)	34
<i>TRW Auto. U.S. LLC v. Magna Elecs. Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00293, Paper No. 19 (P.T.A.B. July 1, 2014)	12, 30, 31
<i>TRW Auto. U.S. LLC v. Magna Elecs. Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-1351, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 10, 2015).....	34, 36
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11, 23, 25

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	1, 9, 20
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....	34, 36
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	10
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	3, 33

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.