

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**LUPIN LTD. and LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.**

**Petitioners,**

**v.**

**HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, LLC**

**Patent Owner.**

---

**IPR2017-00829**  
**U.S. Patent No. 9,095,559**

**PETITIONERS' REPLY**

**Mail Stop PATENT BOARD**  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Horizon Mischaracterizes Both the Claims and State of the Prior Art .....	1
(a) POSAs Used Ammonia Levels to Adjust Drug Dosage .....	2
(b) A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Adjust Drug Levels in Patients Near the ULN Because the Prior Art Taught POSAs to Maintain Stable Plasma Ammonia Levels .....	3
(c) The Prior Art Does Not Demonstrate Complacency When Plasma Ammonia Was At or Under the ULN .....	5
(d) Claim 5 is Not Patentable .....	10
(e) POSAs Used Fasting Plasma Ammonia Levels .....	11
2. There Was Motivation to Combine the Cited Prior Art References .....	12
(a) Any Purported Differences Between the Nitrogen Scavenging Drugs in Simell and the '859 Publication are Irrelevant to Simell's Role in the Unpatentability Analysis .....	12
(b) LPI is a UCD .....	14
(i) A POSA Would Have Combined the Cited References Even Though They Do Not All Address Dosing Based on Normal Fasting Plasma Ammonia Levels .....	16
3. Horizon's Arguments Regarding POSA Level and Dr. Vaux's Qualifications Should be Rejected .....	18
(a) Horizon's Proposed POSA Level is Artificially Stringent .....	18
(b) Dr. Vaux Treats UCD Patients and is an Expert in the Field of the Claimed Subject Matter .....	21
4. Lupin Has Shown a Reasonable Expectation of Achieving the Claimed Subject Matter, and Horizon's Legally Flawed Argument to the Contrary Should be Rejected .....	22
5. Conclusion .....	24

1. **Horizon Mischaracterizes Both the Claims and State of the Prior Art**

Patent Owner Horizon greatly overstates the scope of the claimed subject matter, mischaracterizing it as “an ingenious solution” to the “problem” of “how to treat a patient suffering from a nitrogen retention disorder,” while referencing “accumulation of potentially fatal levels of ammonia.” (POR at 1.) Methods of using glyceryl tri-[4-phenylbutyrate] to lower plasma ammonia levels were known long before the ’559 patent, and Horizon did not solve the problem of how to lower fatal ammonia levels. Indeed, the ’559 patent claims are not even related to treating acute hyperammonemia. They are instead narrowly directed to fine-tuning or optimizing drug dosage in patients who already have normal fasting plasma ammonia levels, based on comparing the patient’s fasting plasma ammonia levels to the ULN for plasma ammonia. The use of ammonia as a biomarker for evaluating drug dosages was well known; fine-tuning drug dosage was well within the ordinary skill of physicians; and the effect of carrying out the claimed methods would be to routinely maintain normal plasma ammonia levels—a goal that was fully reported in the prior art. Because the challenged claims are to nothing more than “the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions,” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 417 (2007), they should be cancelled as obvious.

(a) **POSAs Used Ammonia Levels to Adjust Drug Dosage**

In arguing that plasma ammonia levels “were not a basis upon which to increase the dosage of a drug” (POR at 46), Horizon directly contradicts the prior art. For example, the ’857 Publication—which shares an inventor with the ’559 patent—clearly teaches using ammonia levels to determine whether to adjust drug dosage. (*See* Petition at 22-23.)

Horizon lists several purported drawbacks of using ammonia as a biomarker, none of which change the fact that POSAs used ammonia levels when adjusting drug dosage. And the claimed methods fail to address these purported drawbacks in any event. For example, citing Ex. 2015, Horizon contends that inherent difficulties with the interpretation of blood ammonia levels “undermined its usefulness as a diagnostic tool.” (POR at 12, 49.) This argument misses the mark. Ex. 2015 discusses the difficulty in diagnosing a specific UCD based on the specific numerical level of ammonia (Ex. 2015 at 75), but the ’559 claims do not cover using a specific numerical value of ammonia to diagnose diseases. Thus Horizon did not solve this purported problem.

Nor have the ’559 patent claims solved any of the other purported problems with ammonia that Horizon raised, including diurnal fluctuation; artificially high levels if a patient is catabolic due to fasting, exercise, surgery, an infection, or pregnancy; and lack of correlation of ammonia levels with clinical status. (POR at

12, 48-50.) The prior art disclosed all of these issues with ammonia, yet POSAs still used ammonia levels to adjust drug dosage. (*See, e.g.*, Ex. 1007 at [0232] (“[D]ose adjustment would be based on repeated measurement of urinary PAGN as well as assessment of dietary protein and plasma ammonia.”).)

(b) **A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Adjust Drug Levels in Patients Near the ULN Because the Prior Art Taught POSAs to Maintain Stable Plasma Ammonia Levels**

In trying to undercut a motivation to combine, Horizon disputes that a goal of nitrogen scavenging therapy is to maintain a “stable” plasma ammonia level. (POR at 33-34.) Once again, Horizon ignores the express teachings of the prior art, which make clear that maintenance of plasma ammonia levels within normal limits, and below the ULN, is one of the objectives of drug therapy. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1007 at [0046] (noting desire to “maintain a stable level of plasma ammonia”); [0182] (noting that HPN-100-treated subjects will typically “achieve and maintain normal plasma ammonia levels”); [0209] (discussing consistent reduction of ammonia to below about 40  $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ); Ex. 1020 at 3327 (noting that plasma ammonia “should be maintained within normal limits”). Horizon further asserts that due to the known variability in plasma ammonia levels, a stable level cannot be achieved. (POR at 34.) But that is exactly Petitioners’ point: because ammonia levels were known to vary, a POSA would have been motivated to keep the baseline ammonia levels low, such that despite transient fluctuations, *e.g.* in

# 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.