

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Mr. J Kyle Bass and Mr. Erich Spangenberg,
Petitioners

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 Parties Review No.— IPR2016-00245

CORRECTED PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENTNO. 8,44,170
AND MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING..... 1

III. MANDATORY NOTICES 1

A. Real Party-In-Interest 1

B. Notice of Related Matters 2

C. Lead and Backup Counsel 2

D. Service Information 2

E. Payment of Fees 3

IV. THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW 3

V. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE..... 3

A. Overview of the ‘170 Patent..... 3

 1. The ‘170 Specification 3

 2. The ‘170 Patent Claims 4

B. Prosecution History of the ‘170 Patent..... 5

VI. LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART 7

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... 8

A. “speckled appearance” 8

B. “colored granules” 9

C. “pharmaceutically acceptable carrier” 9

VIII. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE CHALLENGE..... 10

IX. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-9 OF THE ‘170 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS OVER THE *PREVACID LABEL* IN VIEW OF *STAWSKI* UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103. 11

X. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 1-3, 5, 6, 8, AND 9 OF THE ‘170 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS OVER THE *PREVACID LABEL* IN VIEW OF *SERPELLONI* UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103...... 23

XI. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS DO NOT REBUT THE PRIMA FACIE CASE; THERE ARE NO UNEXPECTED RESULTS OVER THE CLOSEST PRIOR ART 31

XII. CONCLUSION.....333
TABLE OF EXHIBITS34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.,
687 F.3d 1362, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2012), cert denied, 133 S. Ct. 1736 (2013)12

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)11

In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC,
No. 2014-1301, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 1699, Slip. Op. at 21 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4,
2015)7

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398, 406-07 (2007) 11, 26

Par Pharm. Inc. v. TWI Pharms., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186, No. 2014-1391, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 22737, at *24 (Fed. Cir.
Dec. 3, 2014)12

RULES

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)3
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)7
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....1
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.103(a) and 42.15(a)3

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.