

Filed on behalf of: Mallinckrodt Hosp. Prods. IP Ltd.

Entered: June 30, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PRAXAIR DISTRIBUTION, INC. AND NO<sub>x</sub>BOX LIMITED,  
*Petitioner*

v.

MALLINCKRODT HOSPITAL PRODUCTS IP LTD.,  
*Patent Owner*

---

Case IPR2016-00777  
U.S. Patent No. 8,282,966

---

Before STEVEN AMITRANI, *Trial Paralegal*.

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The '966 Patent Claims Novel Methods for Providing Inhaled Nitric Oxide to Children and Neonates.....	2
A.	The Development of the '966 Patent .....	2
1.	The Prior Use of iNO in Neonates and Children Only Excluded Those Dependent on Right-to-Left Shunting, Not Those With Preexisting LVD .....	3
2.	The Original INOT22 Study Protocol Did Not Exclude Neonates with Non-RTL-Dependent LVD.....	7
3.	Unanticipated SAEs Occurred During the INOT22 Study, the Study Was Amended, and the Rate of SAEs Was Significantly Reduced.....	9
B.	The '966 Patent Prosecution History .....	12
III.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	13
IV.	The Board Should Exercise its Discretion to Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314 and 325.....	13
A.	The Board Should Deny Institution Because Petitioner Was Aware, or Should Have Been Aware, of the Allegedly New References Cited in the Instant Petition .....	15
B.	The Board Should Deny Institution Because Petitioner Delayed in Filing the Present Petition and Unfairly Benefited from its Delay.....	20
C.	Petitioner Advances the Same or Substantially the Same Prior Art and Arguments As in the First Petition.....	24
V.	The Petition Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood that the Petitioner Will Prevail with respect to the Challenged Claims.....	29
A.	Petitioner Has Not Established A Motivation to Combine Teachings.....	30

1.	There Was No Known Problem to Establish a Reason to Combine References .....	31
2.	Dr. Lawson’s Conclusory Expert Testimony is Insufficient to Create a Motivation to Combine References .....	32
3.	Petitioner Continues to Ignore the Overwhelming Evidence of Non-Obviousness.....	35
4.	Petitioner Provides No Motivation to Combine Specific Disclosures to Arrive at the Claimed Inventions.....	37
B.	A POSA Would Not Have Relied Upon the Disclosure of <i>Greenough</i> .....	39
1.	A POSA Would Have Rejected the Statements in <i>Greenough</i> In Favor of the Instructions in the Label.....	39
2.	A POSA Would Have Rejected the Statements in <i>Greenough</i> As Conclusory and Unsupported .....	40
3.	A POSA Would Have Rejected the Statements in <i>Greenough</i> As Inherently Contradictory.....	42
4.	A POSA Would Have Disregarded the Statements in <i>Greenough</i> As Inconsistent with the Body of Dr. <i>Greenough</i> ’s Work.....	46
C.	A POSA Would Not Have Relied Upon the Disclosure in <i>Jaypee</i> .....	46
D.	Petitioner Misreads and Misrepresents the Disclosure of the Prior Art to a POSA.....	50
E.	The Board Should Afford Petitioner’s Expert Declaration Minimal Weight .....	54
VI.	The Principles of Administrative <i>Res Judicata</i> Preclude Petitioner from Filing the Present Petition.....	57
VII.	Conclusion .....	61

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	34
<i>Alza Corp. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 464 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	34
<i>Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2015-01710, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2016) .....	19
<i>B&amp;B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1293 (2015).....	58, 60, 61
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00581, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 14, 2014) .....	21
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , No. IPR2014-00628, Paper No. 21 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014) .....	19
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	57
<i>Great W. Cas. Co. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , No. IPR2016-00453, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. June 9, 2016) .....	14
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , No. IPR2013-00324, Paper No. 19 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2013) .....	20
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	32
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	30
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	31

Case IPR2016-00777  
U.S. Patent No. 8,282,966

<i>Mars Inc. v. Nippon Conlux Kabushiki-Kaisha</i> , 58 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	60
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00436, Paper No. 17 (P.T.A.B. June 19, 2014) .....	29
<i>NetApp Inc. v. Crossroads Sys., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2015-00772, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 3, 2015).....	21
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. IPR2016-00134, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2016).....	passim
<i>Panasonic Corp. v. Optical Devices, LLC</i> , No. IPR2014-00302, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. July 11, 2014) .....	35
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , No. IPR2015-00118, Paper No. 14 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 28, 2015) .....	22
<i>Schott Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Co.</i> , No. IPR2013-00358, Paper No. 106 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 20, 2014) .....	54, 57
<i>Streck, Inc. v. Research &amp; Diagnostic Sys., Inc.</i> , 665 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	33
<i>Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.</i> , 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	54, 57
<i>Ube Maxell Co. v. Celgard, LLC</i> , No. IPR2015-01511, Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 7, 2016).....	25, 27
<i>Unilever, Inc. v. Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , No. IPR2014-00506, Paper No. 17 (P.T.A.B. July 7, 2014) .....	16
<i>United States v. Utah Constr. &amp; Mining Co.</i> , 384 U.S. 394 (1966).....	58
<i>Velander v. Garner</i> , 348 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	54
<i>Yorkey v. Diab</i> , 601 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	54

# 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.