Paper No. <u>33</u>

Date Filed: March 8, 2017

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 IPR2016-01096 U.S. Patent No. 6,667,061

PATENT OWNERS' RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTI	TRODUCTION				
II.	BACKGROUND					
	A.	Overview of the '061 Patent				
	B.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art ("POSA")				
	C.	The Claims of the '061 Patent				
	D.	The Prosecution History				
III.	CLA	IM C	ONST	RUCTION	13	
IV.	THE BOARD SHOULD FIND THAT ALL OF THE CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE AND NONOBVIOUS					
	A.			Should Find All Challenged Claims Remain Under Ground 1	14	
		1.	Ove	rview of Ground 1 References	15	
			a.	Johnson	15	
			b.	Kino	15	
		2.	Veh	tioners Fail to Establish that the Johnson icle Inherently Has a Viscosity Within the med Range	16	
			a.	Testing Shows the Johnson Vehicle Falls Outside the Claimed Range	18	
			b.	Petitioners Fail to Establish that CMC Alone is the Viscosity-Controlling Component of the Johnson Vehicle	18	
			c.	Petitioners Fail to Account for the Wide Variety of Commercially Available Types and Grades of CMC	20	



Paper No. <u>33</u> Date Filed: March 8, 2017

		d.	Petitioners Fail to Account for Many Other Factors that Impact Viscosity	24	
	3.	Petitioners' Ground 1 Challenge to Dependent Claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 Fails for Additional Reasons			
		a.	Petitioners Have Failed to Show a POSA Would Have Inserted the "Filler" of Kino into the Vehicle of Johnson to Arrive at Claims 4 and 5	30	
		b.	Petitioners Have Failed to Show a POSA Would Have Inserted the "Polysorbate 80" Disclosure of Kino into the Vehicle of Johnson to Arrive at Claims 10 and 11	32	
B.	The Board Should Find All Challenged Claims Remain Patentable Under Ground 2				
	1.	Ove	rview of Ground 2 References	35	
		a.	Gustafsson	35	
		b.	Ramstack	36	
		c.	The Handbook	37	
	2.	Testing Shows the Gustafsson Vehicle Falls Outside the Claimed Range			
	3.	Petitioners Fail to Establish that the Gustafsson Vehicle Inherently Discloses a Viscosity Within the Claimed Range			
	4.	Iden	and 2 also Fails Because Petitioners Fail to tify "Microparticles Comprising a Polymeric ler" and Gustafsson Teaches Away from Them	39	
		a.	Gustafsson Teaches Away from the Microparticles of the '061 Patent	40	



Paper No. <u>33</u> Date Filed: March 8, 2017

		b.	Gustafsson Also Teaches Away From the	
			PLGA- Microparticles of Claims 18, 19 and 21	42
	5.		tioners' Challenge to Claims 20-21 Fails for litional Reasons	
		a.	Whether Gustafsson <i>Could</i> be Combined with Ramstack is Not Legally Relevant	46
		b.	Petitioners Have No Evidence of Obviousness for Claims 20 and 21	47
		c.	A POSA Would Not Have Selected Gustafsson in Developing Microparticles for Delivering Risperidone	49
		d.	A POSA Would Not Have Had Any Reason to Combine Gustafsson and Ramstack	52
	6.		tioners' Challenge to Dependent Claims 8, 9, and 13 Fails for Additional Reasons	57
V.	OBJECTIV	/E IN	DICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	59
VI.	CONCLUSION			



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Apple, Inc. v. ITC, 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	59
Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys., Inc., 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	29
Continental Can Co. U.S.A. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	17, 38
Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co., 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	49
Eisai Co. Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd, 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	53
In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig., 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	60
<i>In re Dembiczak</i> , 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	48
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	47
In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	46
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	47
In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd., 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	47
In re Sang Su Lee, 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	49
InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Communications, Inc., 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	46
Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	47
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	47, 48
Leo Pharm. Prods. v. Rea, 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	52, 54
Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L., 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	18



DOCKET

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.

