

Filed On Behalf Of:

Alkermes Pharma Ireland Limited and
Alkermes Controlled Therapeutics, Inc.

By:

Scott K. Reed
sreed@fchs.com
212-218-2100

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, and ALKERMES CONTROLLED
THERAPEUTICS, INC.,
Patent Owners.

Case IPR2016-01095
Patent 6,667,061

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION 5

 A. The Development of the '061 Patent 6

 B. The '061 Prosecution History 7

III. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 9

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 10

 A. “Suspension” and “Fluid Phase of Said Suspension” 10

 B. “Viscosity” 11

V. LEGAL STANDARDS 13

VI. PETITIONERS’ ALLEGED UNPATENTABILITY
 GROUNDS ARE FATALLY FLAWED 15

 A. IPR Should Not Be Instituted Based on Ground 1 15

 1. Goldenheim Does Not Disclose the Claimed
 Viscosity Limitation 16

 a. Goldenheim’s Alleged Viscosity Disclosure
 Does Not Specify Temperature 16

 b. Petitioners Also Failed to Relate
 Goldenheim’s Alleged Viscosity Disclosure
 to the Fluid Phase of a Suspension 20

 2. Petitioners Improperly Picked and Chose from
 Unrelated Disclosures in Goldenheim 22

 B. IPR Should Not Be Instituted Based on Ground 2 24

 1. Goldenheim in View of the Pharmacopeias Does
 Not Teach the Claimed Viscosity Limitation 24

2.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Goldenheim, the Pharmacopeias and Ramstack With a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	25
a.	Petitioners Offer Only Conclusory and Vague Statements About Motivation to Combine and Likelihood of Success	27
b.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Goldenheim, the Pharmacopeias and Ramstack	29
c.	A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Goldenheim, the Pharmacopeias and Ramstack.....	33
C.	IPR Should Not Be Instituted Based on Ground 3.....	35
1.	Goldenheim in View of the Pharmacopeias Does Not Teach the Claimed Viscosity Limitation	35
2.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Goldenheim, the Pharmacopeias and Kino With a Reasonable Expectation of Success	36
a.	Petitioners Offer Only Conclusory and Vague Statements About Motivation to Combine and Likelihood of Success	36
b.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Goldenheim, the Pharmacopeias and Kino.....	39
c.	A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Goldenheim, the Pharmacopeias and Kino	41
VII.	PETITIONERS FAIL TO REBUT THE OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF NONOBVIOUSNESS	42
VIII.	CONCLUSION	44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Apple, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 43

Aristocrat Techs. Australia Pty Ltd. v. Int'l Game Tech.,
709 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 11

Continental Can Co. U.S.A. v. Monsanto Co.,
948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)..... 13, 17, 18

Cook Biotech Inc. v. Acell, Inc.,
460 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 28

Crocs v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....34, 42

In re GPAC Inc.,
57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 44

In re Montgomery,
677 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....13, 18

In re Soni,
554 F. 3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 14

King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs., Inc.,
616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 13

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 13, 14, 26

Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea,
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)37, 39

Mformation Techs., Inc. v. Research in Motion Ltd.,
764 F.3d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 11

Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....4, 22

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 12

Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.,
566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....14, 26

*Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk
Drilling USA, Inc.*,
699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 43

Zenon Envtl., Inc. v. U.S. Filter Corp.,
506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 28

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 10213, 15

35 U.S.C. § 10313, 15

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 13

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) 37

P.T.A.B.

Conopco v. Procter & Gamble,
IPR No. 2013-00510, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2014)..... 26

E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Monsanto Tech. LLC,
IPR No. 2014-00333, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. July 11, 2014)..... 26

Fontaine Engineered Prods., Inc. v. Raildecks, Inc.,
IPR No. 2013-00361, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 13, 2013)..... 19, 21, 27

Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.,
IPR No. 2015-01633, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 4, 2016)37, 39

Merial Ltd. v. Virbac,
IPR No. 2014-01279, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 22, 2015) 42

Oxford Nanopore Techs. Ltd. v. Univ. of Wash.,
IPR No. 2014-00512, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 15, 2014)passim

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.