

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MALLINCKRODT HOSPITAL PRODUCTS IP)
LTD., INO THERAPEUTICS LLC and IKARIA,)
INC.)

C. A. No.: 15-170-GMS

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

PRAXAIR DISTRIBUTION, INC. and)
PRAXAIR, INC.,)

Defendants.)

**PRAXAIR’S RESPONSIVE CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF REGARDING U.S. PATENT NO. 8,846,112**

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP
Melanie K. Sharp (No. 2501)
James L. Higgins (No. 5021)
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 571-6681
msharp@ycst.com
jhiggins@ycst.com

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Michael J. Abernathy
Sanjay K. Murthy
Maria E. Doukas
Jennifer M. Dienes
77 West Wacker Drive, Fifth Floor
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 324-1000

Attorneys for Praxair Distribution, Inc. and Praxair, Inc.

Dated: April 14, 2016

Mallinckrodt Hosp. Prods. IP Ltd.
Exhibit 2035
Praxair Distrib., Inc. et al., v. Mallinckrodt Hosp. Prods. IP Ltd.
Case IPR2016-00778

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	1
II. ARGUMENT	2
1. The Claims Were Not Amended to Distinguish Prior Art	2
2. The Term “Pharmaceutically Acceptable Nitric Oxide Gas” Is Not the “Essence of the Invention”	6
3. Plaintiffs’ Proposed Construction is Not the Plain and Ordinary Meaning of “Pharmaceutically Acceptable Nitric Oxide Gas”	9
4. Defendants Are Not Required to Provide any Alternative Construction	10
III. CONCLUSION	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	6, 7, 8
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	3, 6, 7, 8
<i>Fantasy Sports Props., Inc. v. Sportsline.com, Inc.</i> , 287 F.3d 1108 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	5, 6
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 13–2034, 2015 WL 7306206 (D. Del. Nov. 3, 2015)	10
<i>Goldenberg v. Cytogen, Inc.</i> , 373 F.3d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	10
<i>Helsinn Healthcare S.A. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs.</i> , Civil Action No. 11-3962 (MLC), 2015 WL 1817109 (D.N.J. Apr. 22, 2015).....	6
<i>LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 798 F.Supp.2d 541 (D. Del. 2011).....	10
<i>Merck & Co., Inc. v. Ranbaxy Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 07–229, 2008 WL 5727540 (D. Del. Feb. 29, 2008)	10
<i>Nuance Commc’ns, Inc. v. ABBYY USA Software House, Inc.</i> , Nos. 14-1629, -1630, at 8 (Fed Cir. Feb. 22, 2016).....	11
<i>O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10, 11
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd.</i> , 457 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	9
<i>Symantec Corp. v. Computer Assocs. Int’l, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	8

Tris Pharma, Inc. v. Actavis Laboratories FL, Inc.,
Civil Action No. 14-1309, 2016 WL 125495 (D. Del. Jan. 8, 2016).....10

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Mallinckrodt Hospital Products IP Ltd.'s, INO Therapeutics LLC's and Ikaria Inc.'s (collectively "Plaintiffs") proposed construction of "pharmaceutically acceptable nitric oxide gas" in U.S. Patent No. 8,846,112 ("the '112 Patent") is flawed for multiple reasons.

First, this term only appears in the preamble of the asserted claims and does not provide an antecedent basis for any limitation appearing in the body of the claims. Plaintiffs try to skirt this fact by arguing that the term is limiting because it was supposedly added "to overcome a prior art rejection during prosecution." (D.I. 70 at 6.) Not so. As Defendants pointed out in their Opening Claim Construction Brief, the patentee added this term to address an issue of priority, not to distinguish the claimed invention from any prior art cited by the Examiner. (D.I. 71 at 7.)

While Plaintiffs cite Federal Circuit authority that relying on the preamble during prosecution to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art may transform the preamble into a claim limitation, they notably cite no Federal Circuit authority that addressing an issue of priority achieves that same result. (D.I. 70 at 6.)

Second, Plaintiffs' argument that the preamble is the "essence of the invention" ignores the file history. (D.I. 70 at 6.) A limitation cannot qualify as the "essence of the invention" if the patentee did not even deem it necessary to claim it in the first instance. Here the file history confirms that the patentee initially claimed a generic "pharmaceutical product." (Ex. F, '112 Patent File History, Office Action Response dated Dec. 23, 2013 at 11.)¹ It only added the limitation "pharmaceutically acceptable nitric oxide gas" after the Examiner objected that the "priority documents" did not disclose the originally claimed "pharmaceutical product." Rather than suggest that the former term had some special meaning (as Plaintiffs now propose), the

¹ Exhibit A through C were attached to Plaintiff's Opening Claim Construction Brief.

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.