

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Mr. J. Kyle and Mr. Erich Spangenberg
Petitioner

v.

ALPEX PHARMA
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,440,170
Issued: May 14, 2013
Filed: PCT January 30, 2009
Inventors: F. Stroppolo and S. Ardalan
Title: "Orally Disintegrating Tablets with Speckled Appearance"

Inter Partes Review: No. IPR2016-00245

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY PATENT OWNER
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '170 PATENT	2
A.	The Invention Accurately Understood	3
B.	The Claimed Language Properly Construed	5
1.	Orally Disintegrating Tablets	5
2.	“Colored Granules”	8
III.	SHORTCOMINGS OF PETITIONERS’ REFERENCES	10
A.	The Prevacid Label	11
1.	The Prevacid Label Fails to Describe the ‘170 Patent’s Orally Disintegrating Tablets (ODT)	11
2.	The Prevacid Label Fails to Describe the ‘170 Patent’s “Colored Granules”	12
B.	Stawski	13
1.	Stawski Fails to Describe the ‘170 Patent’s ODT	13
2.	Stawski Fails to Described the ‘170 Patent’s “Colored Granules”	14
C.	Serpelloni	14
1.	Serpelloni Fails to Describe the ‘170 Patent’s ODT	14
2.	Serpelloni Fails to Describe the ‘170 Patent’s “Colored Granules”	15
IV.	NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE ‘170’ PATENT CLAIMS 1-9 DEFINE SUBJECT MATTER OBVIOUS FROM THE PREVACID LABEL IN VIEW OF STASKI OR SERPELLONI	15
A.	The Hypothesized Combination of Stawski with the Prevacid Label Is Fatally Deficient	16
1.	Not All the Claimed Elements Are Described	16
2.	Considered in Its Entirety Stawski Would Have Led Away from the ‘170 Patent’s Claimed Invention	17

3. The Hypothesized Reference Combination Would Have Rendered the Prevacid Label Unsatisfactory for Its Intended Purpose	20
B. The Hypothesized Combination of Serpelloni with the Prevacid Label is Fatally Defective	21
1. Not All the Claimed Element Are Described	22
2. Considered in Its Entirety Serpelloni Would Have Led Away from the 170' Patent's Claimed Invention	22
3. The Hypothesized Reference Combination Would Have Rendered the Prevacid Label Unsatisfactory for Its Intended Purpose	23
C. Petitioners' Expert Declaration is Ineffectual	24
D. Dependent Claims 2-9	25
V. CONCLUSION	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>In re Suitco Surface</i> , 603 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	6
<i>In re Buszard</i> , 504 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	6
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 538, 416 (2007)	16
<i>Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.</i> , 425 U.S. 273, 282 (1976)	16
<i>Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.</i> , 396 U.S. 57, 62-63 (1969)	16
<i>Great Atlantic & P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equip. Corp.</i> , 340 U.S. 147, 152 (1950)	16
<i>Kropa v. Robie</i> , 187 F.2d 150, 152 (CCPA 1951)	17
<i>In re Stencel</i> , 828 F.2d 751, 4 USPQ2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	17
<i>W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983), <i>cert. denied</i> , 469 U.S. 851 (1984)	18
<i>United States v. Adams</i> , 383 U.S. 39 (1966)	21
<i>In re Haruna</i> , 249 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	21

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 47.107(a), Patent Owner Alpex (“Alpex”) presents this Preliminary Response (“Preliminary Response”) to the Petition for Inter Partes Review (“Petition”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,440,170 (“the ‘170 Patent”) which was filed November 24, 2015 by Bass and Spangenberg (“Petitioners”).

Petitioners have not argued that any of claims 1-9 of the ‘170 Patent defines subject matter anticipated by the prior art. Rather, Petitioners have patched together combination of reference teachings which putatively would have made Alpex’s claimed invention unpatentable. The Petition contends two grounds for deciding against the ‘170 Patent, namely: ground 1 to the effect that ‘170 Patent claims 1-9 are unpatentable for obviousness on a combination of teachings from two references Petitioners call “the *Prevacid Label*” and “Stawski”; and ground 2 to the effect that ‘170 Patent claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are unpatentable for obviousness on a combination of teachings from “the *Prevacid Label*” and another reference Petitioners call “Serpelloni”.

However, grounds 1 and 2 are fatally defective because Petitioners have simply not established a case of *prima facie* obviousness over either the *Prevacid Label* in view of Stawski, or the *Prevacid Label* in view of Serpelloni. Alpex submits that the attempted reference combinations are unavailing because (i) neither involves references which in the aggregate describe all the elements of the ‘170 Patent claims, (ii) in any event, even if combined, the references would have led away from the ‘170 Patent invention as claimed, and (iii) in reality, the references cannot be properly combined under the law because the modifications to the *Prevacid Label* which Petitioners propose in both instances results in making the *Prevacid Label* unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

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.