

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LOWER DRUG PRICES FOR CONSUMERS, LLC

PETITIONER

V.

FOREST LABORATORIES HOLDINGS LIMITED

PATENT OWNER

CASE NO.: IPR2016-00379

PATENT NO. 6,545,040

FILED: JANUARY 24, 1992

ISSUED: 4/8/2003

INVENTORS: XHONNEUX AND VAN LOMMEN

TITLE: METHOD OF LOWERING THE BLOOD PRESSURE

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,545,040**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
PETITIONER’S EXHIBIT LIST	vi
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Summary of the IPR Challenge.....	1
B. Summary of Prior Art and Grounds Presented	4
C. Petitioner’s Experts	6
II. Background Science	7
A. Stereochemistry and Terminology	8
B. Stereochemistry in Biology and New Drug Research.....	11
C. β -blocking Drugs.....	12
D. Chromatography and Stereochemical Separations.....	14
III. The ’040 Patent.....	16
A. Claims of the ’040 Patent.....	16
B. Prior Art Background—the ’362 Patent (Van Lommen).....	19
C. The ’040 Patent Specification	23
D. ’040 Patent Prosecution History.....	24
E. Foreign Counterparts to the ’040 Patent Invalidated	25
IV. The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (POSITA).....	25
V. Claim Construction.....	28
A. Ordinary and Customary Meaning.....	28

B.	Claim 1: “a composition consisting of . . .” and Claim 2: “a pharmaceutical composition consisting of . . .”	28
VI.	Detailed Explanation of the Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability	30
A.	Legal Standards	30
B.	Motivation to Combine the References Generally	32
C.	Ground 1: Claims 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are rendered obvious by the ’362 Patent in combination with the Handbook of Chromatography	37
D.	Ground 2: Claim 1 is rendered obvious by the ’362 Patent in combination with the Handbook of Chromatography, in further view of Okamoto	44
E.	Ground 3: Claim 1 is rendered obvious by the ’362 Patent in combination with the Handbook of Chromatography, in further view of Armstrong	50
F.	The alleged “unexpected results” do not overcome the prima facie case of obviousness.	54
G.	The Grounds presented in this petition are not redundant of issues considered during prosecution of the ’040 Patent	56
VII.	Mandatory Notices and Certifications	57
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104)	57
B.	Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a) and § 42.103(a))	57
C.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b))	57
1.	Real Parties-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	57
2.	Related Judicial Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))	58
3.	Lead and Back-up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	59

VIII. Conclusion59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Aventis Pharma Deutschland GMBH v. Lupin, Ltd.,
499 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2007) passim

Conoco, Inc. v. Energy & Environmental International, L.C.,
460 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 29

Gnosis S.p.A., v. Merck & CIE,
Case IPR2013-00117, Paper No. 71, (PTAB 2014)..... 56

Graham v. John Deer Co. of Kan. City,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 30, 31

In re GPAC,
57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1986) 26

In re Kao,
639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 56

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 31, 43, 49, 54

Merck & CIE v. Gnosis S.P.A.,
2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 21927, ___ F.3d ___
(Fed. Cir. Dec. 17, 2015) 56

Otsuka Pharmaceuticals. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 31

Spectrum Pharmacueticals, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
802 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 31

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103 30

Other Authorities

Manual of Patent Examining Procedures § 2111.03
(9th ed. 2015)..... 29

Manual of Patent Examining Procedures § 2141.03,
(9th ed. 2015)..... 26

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 28

37 C.F.R. § 42.103(a)..... 57

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)..... 57

37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a)..... 57

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)..... 57

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)..... 58

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.