

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

RESEARCH CORPORATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2016-00204  
Patent No. RE 38,551

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Development of the Inventions and the '551 Patent.....	6
III. Petitioner Fails to Show that Any Claim of the '551 Patent Is Unpatentable Over Kohn 1991, Silverman, and the '729 Patent .....	9
A. Petitioner fails to show that a POSA would have selected a functionalized amino acid (FAA) as a lead compound.....	9
B. Petitioner fails to show that a POSA would have selected Compound 31 as a lead compound. ....	14
1. The FAA prior art taught that heteroaromatic FAAs were preferred. ....	15
2. A POSA would not have selected a compound containing a nitrogen-oxygen bond as a lead compound. ....	17
3. Petitioner and Dr. Wang rely on impermissible hindsight to select Compound 31 as a lead compound.....	19
C. Petitioner fails to show that a POSA, even if looking to FAAs and selecting Compound 31, would have modified Compound 31 into any of the compounds of claims 1–9, and would have done so with a reasonable expectation of success. ....	23
1. A POSA would not have been motivated to modify the amino moiety at the $\alpha$ -carbon of Compound 31.....	24
2. A POSA modifying Compound 31 would have had no motivation to use bioisosterism at the $\alpha$ -carbon. ....	27
3. A POSA would not have had any reasonable expectation of success in employing bioisosterism to modify Compound 31.....	33

- a) Petitioner and Dr. Wang’s analysis relies on hindsight and fails to acknowledge the unpredictability of bioisosterism. .... 33
    - b) The evidence shows that a POSA would not have reasonably expected success in substituting methoxyamino with methoxymethyl. .... 36
  - 4. Petitioner relies on information not available in the prior art to assert motivation and reasonable expectation of success in modifying Compound 3l. .... 42
  - 5. A POSA would not have been motivated to isolate the R-isomer. .... 43
- D. Petitioner fails to show that any prior art discloses the therapeutic composition of Claim 10, and that a POSA would have achieved the therapeutic composition of Claim 10 with a reasonable expectation of success. .... 45
- E. Petitioner fails to show that a POSA would have achieved the methods of treatment of Claims 11–13 with a reasonable expectation of success. .... 49
- IV. Objective Indicia Confirm that the Inventions of Claims 1-13 Are Not Obvious ..... 51
  - A. Vimpat<sup>®</sup>’s unexpected results have received extensive industry praise. .... 52
  - B. Vimpat<sup>®</sup>’s development was marked by skepticism and failure of others. .... 54
  - C. Vimpat<sup>®</sup> met a long-felt need. .... 56
  - D. Vimpat<sup>®</sup> is a commercial success. .... 58
  - E. Sixteen generic drug companies have sought to market copies of Vimpat<sup>®</sup> . .... 60
- V. Conclusion ..... 61

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	58
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	53
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	51
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	10, 21
<i>In re Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	55
<i>Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	9
<i>Innopharma Licensing, Inc. v. Senju Pharm. Co., Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00902, Paper 90 (PTAB July 28, 2016) .....	51, 58
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	5, 47
<i>J.T. Eaton &amp; Co. v. Atl. Paste &amp; Glue Co.</i> , 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	58
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , __ F.3d __, 2016 WL 3974202 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	1
<i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	51
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	<i>passim</i>

<i>Pressure Prods. Med. Supplies, Inc. v. Greatbatch Ltd.</i> , 599 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	54
<i>Procter &amp; Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	56
<i>In re Rosuvastatin Calcium Patent Litig.</i> , 703 F.3d 511 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	54
<i>In re Soni</i> , 54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	52
<i>Spectrum Pharms. Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 802 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	44
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , __ F.3d __ (Fed. Cir. 2016), 2016 WL 3902668 .....	51, 59
<i>Windsurfing Int'l, Inc. v. AMF, Inc.</i> , 782 F.2d 995 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	60
<i>In re Youngblood</i> , No. 98-1518, 1999 WL 504243 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	57

# 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.