

Case IPR2016-01095
Patent No. 6,667,061
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
Attorney Docket No. 9LUYE 7.1R-001

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LUYE PHARMA GROUP LTD., LUYE PHARMA(USA) LTD., SHANDONG
LUYE PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD., and NANJING LUYE
PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.

Petitioners

v.

ALKERMES PHARMA IRELAND LTD
Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,667,061 to Ramstack *et al.*
Issue Date: December 23, 2003
Title: PREPARATION OF INJECTABLE
SUSPENSIONS HAVING IMPROVED INJECTABILITY

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-01095

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
CLAIMS 1-13 AND 17-23 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,667,061**

Mail Stop: Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent And Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	III
EXHIBIT LIST	iv
I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)).....	1
A. Notice Of Each Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	1
B. Notice Of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))	1
C. Designation Of Lead And Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....	2
D. Notice Of Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	2
E. Grounds For Standing (37 C.F.R. §42.104(a)).....	3
II. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(A))	3
III. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 104(B))	3
IV. BACKGROUND	5
A. Introduction.....	5
B. Improving Injectability	7
C. Risperidone	8
D. The Role Of Viscosity In Injectable Formulations.....	8
E. The Prior Art Taught Microparticle Suspensions With The Claimed Concentration And Viscosity.....	9
V. THE '061 PATENT.....	12
A. The Claims.....	12
B. The Family History Of The '061 Patent.....	13

C.	The Specification Of The '061 Patent	14
D.	The Pertinent Prosecution History Of The '061 Patent.....	15
VI.	PERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”).....	17
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	18
A.	“Suitable For Injection”	18
B.	“Microparticles”.....	18
C.	“Injection Vehicle”	19
D.	“Suspension”.....	19
E.	“Fluid Phase Of Said Suspension”	20
F.	“Viscosity Greater Than About 20cp And Less Than About 600 cp” ..	20
VIII.	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '061 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE	21
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, 17-19, And 22-23 Are Anticipated By Goldenheim (Ex.1004).....	21
1.	Goldenheim Teaches Every Element Of Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, 17-19, And 22-23	22
a.	Claim 1	22
b.	Claims 2-3.....	24
c.	Claim 6.....	25
d.	Claim 7.....	25
e.	Claims 8-9 And 12-13	26
f.	Claims 17-19.....	26
g.	Claims 22-23.....	27

2.	Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, 17-19, And 22-23 Are Anticipated.....	28
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, And 17-23 Are Obvious Over Goldenheim (Ex.1004) In View Of Ramstack (Ex.1005), And The Two Pharmacopoeia (Exs.1006 And 1007)	33
1.	Goldenheim In View Of Ramstack And The Two Pharmacopoeia Teaches Every Element Of Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, And 17-23	36
a.	Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, 17-19, And 22-23	36
b.	Claims 20 And 21	37
2.	Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, And 17-23 Are Obvious	38
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-13 And 17-23 Are Obvious Over Goldenheim (Ex.1004) In View Of Kino (Ex.1010) And The Two Pharmacopoeia (Exs.1006 And 1007).....	43
1.	Goldenheim, In View Of Kino And The Two Pharmacopoeia, Teaches Every Element Of Claims 1-13 And 17-23	44
a.	Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-13, 17-19, And 22-23	44
b.	Claims 4, 5, 10, And 11	45
c.	Claims 20-21.....	47
2.	Claims 1-13 And 17-23 Are Obvious	48
IX.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	52
X.	CONCLUSION.....	54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	34
<i>Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	53
<i>In re DBC</i> , 545 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	53
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)	33
<i>J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co.</i> , 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	53
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	33, 34
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	17
<i>Par Pharm. Inc. v. TWi Pharms., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	34, 54
<i>Warner Chilcott Co. v. Lupin Ltd</i> , Civ. Action Nos. 11-5048, 12-2928, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6228 (D.N.J. Jan. 17, 2014).....	17
STATUTES, RULES & OTHER AUTHORITIES	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	33

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.