

Paper No. ____
Date: February 16, 2016

Filed on behalf of:

Pozen Inc.

Pernix Therapeutics Holdings, Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GRAY SQUARE PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC

Petitioner,

v.

POZEN INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00191
U.S. Patent No. 7,332,183

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE PARTIES	4
	A. Pozen and Pernix	4
	B. Gray Square Is a Shell Company Formed by a Hedge Fund Manager.....	4
III.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE INVENTION.....	5
	A. The '183 Patent and TREXIMET®.....	5
	B. TREXIMET® Was Developed to Treat Rebound Migraine	6
	C. The '183 Patent's Inventors Identified and Solved a Problem Previously Unrecognized in the Art	7
	D. The Prior Art Fails to Recognize the Problem Solved by the '183 Patent's Inventors and Teaches Dosage Forms That Are Contrary to the '183 Patent.....	9
	1. The '499 Patent	9
	2. The '779 Patent	11
	3. The '907 Patent	13
	4. The '325 Patent	15
	5. The '125 Patent	17
	6. The Bandelin Reference and EP '182.....	18
IV.	CHALLENGED CLAIMS AND CLAIM INTERPRETATION	19
	A. The Challenged Claims	19
	B. Claim Interpretation	20
	C. Construction of " <i>Dissolution of said naproxen occurs independently of said triptan</i> "	21

V.	INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. §325(d).....	24
VI.	PETITIONER’S PROPOSED OBVIOUSNESS GROUNDS ARE FLAWED.....	27
A.	Legal Background	27
B.	Ground 1	29
	1. A skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine the ’499 and ’779 Patents, and because those patents do not recite all of the required elements, that person would not have reached the challenged claims	30
	2. Petitioner’s Arguments Regarding Ground 1 Are Unsupported	33
C.	Ground 2.....	38
	1. A skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine the ’499 and ’907 Patents, and because those patents do not recite all of the required elements, that person would not have reached the challenged claims	39
	2. Petitioner’s Arguments Regarding Ground 2 Are Unsupported By Its References	42
D.	Ground 3.....	45
	1. A skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine the ’325 and ’907 Patents, and because those patents do not recite all of the required elements, that person would not have reached the challenged claims	45
	2. Petitioner’s Arguments Regarding Ground 3 Are Unsupported By Its References	48
E.	Ground 4.....	51

1.	A skilled artisan would not have been motivated to combine the '499 and '125 Patents, and because those patents do not recite all of the required elements, that person would not have reached the challenged claims	52
2.	Petitioner's Arguments Regarding Ground 4 Are Unsupported By Its References	54
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	28
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	21
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VII LLC v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01680, Paper 18 (Feb. 11, 2016).....	31, 33, 40, 41, 47, 53, 54
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VII LLC, v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01241 (Dec. 8, 2015), Paper 22	33, 41, 48, 54
<i>Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Inc. v. Pozen, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00802, Paper 28.....	35
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	32, 33
<i>Excelsior Med. Corp. v. Lake</i> , IPR2013-00494, Paper No. 10 (Feb. 6, 2014).....	24
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	27
<i>Hulu LLC v. Intertainer, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01456, Paper No. 8 (Mar. 6, 2015)	24
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	21
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	21
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	27
<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litig.</i> , 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	28, 31, 39, 46

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.