

Filed on behalf of:

INO Therapeutics LLC

By:

Dominick A. Conde
dconde@fchs.com
(212) 218-2100

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Praxair Distribution, Inc.

Petitioner,

v.

INO Therapeutics LLC

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00524
U.S. Patent No. 8,293,284

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY
PATENT OWNERS PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

<p>Mallinckrodt Hosp. Prods. IP Ltd. Exhibit 2019 Praxair Distrib., Inc. et al., v. Mallinckrodt Hosp. Prods. IP Ltd. Case IPR2016-00779</p>
--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	6
A.	The Development of the '284 Patent	6
1.	The Initial INOT22 Protocol Was Carefully Constructed and Reviewed, and Did Not Contain the Claimed Exclusion Criteria.....	6
2.	Unanticipated Serious Adverse Events Initially Occurred During the INOT22 Study	9
3.	Based on the Unexpected Serious Adverse Events Early in the Trial, the INOT22 Protocol Was Amended and the Rate of SAEs Was Significantly Reduced.....	10
B.	The '284 Prosecution History	11
1.	The PTO Considered Many References	11
2.	Praxair Relies on the Same Statements Ikaria Overcame During Prosecution.....	13
C.	The '284 Patent Claims	19
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	20
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20
V.	LEGAL STANDARD	22
VI.	A SKILLED ARTISAN WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO EXCLUDE NEONATES HAVING LVD AND NOT DEPENDENT ON RIGHT-TO-LEFT SHUNTING OR REASONABLY EXPECT THOSE NEONATES WOULD HAVE EXPERIENCED SAEs	26
A.	There was no motivation to implement the claimed exclusion based on studies with adults because left	

	ventricular dysfunction in neonates is much different than in adults	28
B.	A skilled artisan would not have reasonably expected that the claimed excluded neonates would have SAEs as initially occurred in the INOT22 Study	31
VII.	GROUND 1: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>BERNASCONI</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>INOMAX</i> [®] <i>LABEL</i> , <i>LOH</i> AND <i>GOYAL</i>	34
A.	Praxair fails to show that <i>Bernasconi</i> , the <i>INOmax</i> [®] <i>label</i> , <i>Loh</i> or <i>Goyal</i> include the claimed exclusion criteria	35
B.	Praxair's Assertions that warnings in the art are applicable to the claimed exclusion criteria are unsupported	43
C.	Praxair fails to raise any new arguments or supplement the record to address issues overcome during prosecution	46
D.	Praxair fails to show that elements in dependent claims 5, 11, 20 and 28 are present in the prior art.....	49
VIII.	GROUND 2: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>BERNASCONI</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>INOMAX</i> [®] <i>LABEL</i> , <i>LOH</i> , <i>GOYAL</i> AND <i>MACRAE</i>	50
IX.	GROUND 3: THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW BASED ON ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS OVER <i>ICHINOSE</i> IN COMBINATION WITH <i>NEONATAL GROUP</i> , <i>MACRAE</i> , <i>LOH</i> , <i>GOYAL</i> AND <i>GERMANN</i>	52
X.	PRAXAIR FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS TO COUNTER THE OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF UNEXPECTED RESULTS	54
XI.	Conclusion	56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	54
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	44
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	23, 55
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Tech. LLC</i> , No. 14-1301, slip. op. (Fed. Cir. 2015)	20, 21
<i>In re Dembiczak</i> , 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	24
<i>Insite Vision Inc., et al. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 2014-1065 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	45
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	23, 55
<i>Leo Pharmaceutical Products, Ltd v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	23, 33
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	21
<i>Rohm and Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	44

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103	22, 23, 34, 50, 52
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	2, 22
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	46

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)	48
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	20
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	24, 40
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	2, 22
37 C.F.R. § 42.6	58
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	44

P.T.A.B.

<i>Int'l Securities Exchange, LLC v. Chicago Board Options Exchanges, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00099, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014)	24, 40
<i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc., v. Advanced Messaging Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01027, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 22, 2014)	25, 56
<i>Merial v. Virbac</i> , IPR No. 2014-01279, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 22, 2015)	4, 25, 46, 48, 56
<i>Mylan v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.</i> , IPR No. 2014-00888, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 9, 2014)	4, 25
<i>Mylan Pharma. Inc. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.</i> , IPR No. 2014-00885, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 9, 2014)	44
<i>Zetec, Inc. v. Westinghouse Elec. Co., LLC</i> , IPR No. 2014-00384, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 23, 2014)	3, 24, 40

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.