

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
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 4

 A. The Development of the '061 Patent 5

 B. The '061 Prosecution History 7

III. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 9

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 9

 A. “Suspension” and “Fluid Phase of Said Suspension” 9

 B. “Viscosity” 10

V. LEGAL STANDARDS 12

VI. PETITIONERS’ ALLEGED UNPATENTABILITY
 GROUNDS ARE FATALLY FLAWED 14

 A. None of Petitioners’ References Disclose or Teach
 Claimed Viscosity Limitation 14

 1. The Teachings in Johnson and Gustafsson that
 Petitioners Rely On Do Not Relate to the Fluid
 Phase of a Suspension 15

 2. Neither Johnson nor Gustafsson Specify the
 Viscosity or the Temperature at which Viscosity
 Should be Measured 16

 3. Petitioners’ Reliance on the Tracy Declaration is
 Flawed 19

 B. Gustafsson Does Not Disclose or Teach Claimed
 Microparticle Limitation 22

C.	Petitioners Have Not Shown that a POSA Would Have Combined the Cited Art with a Reasonable Expectation of Success	23
1.	Petitioners Have Failed to Show a POSA Would Have Combined Johnson and Kino With a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	24
a.	Petitioners Offer Only Conclusory and Vague Statements About Motivation to Combine and Likelihood of Success	25
b.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Johnson and Kino	28
c.	A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success at Arriving at the Claimed Invention by Combining Johnson and Kino	31
2.	Petitioners Have Failed to Show a POSA Would Have Combined Gustafsson, Ramstack and the Handbook with a Reasonable Expectation of Success	32
a.	Petitioners Offer Only Conclusory and Vague Statements About Motivation to Combine and Likelihood of Success	33
b.	A POSA Would Not Have Combined Gustafsson, Ramstack and the Handbook	35
c.	A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Gustafsson, Ramstack and the Handbook	38
VII.	PETITIONERS FAIL TO REBUT THE OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF NONOBVIOUSNESS	40
VIII.	CONCLUSION	42

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 22

Apple, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 41

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)..... 17

Crocs v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....31, 39

In re GPAC Inc.,
57 F.3d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 42

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

In re Soni,
554 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 13

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 12, 13, 23

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

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

Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. TWi Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 13

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 11

Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.,
566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 13, 23

*Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk
Drilling USA, Inc.*,
699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 41

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103 12, 14

35 U.S.C. § 311(b)..... 12, 20, 21

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)..... 12

35 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) 26

P.T.A.B.

Coalition for Affordable Drugs VII LLC v. Pozen Inc.,
IPR No. 2015-01680, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2016)..... 21

Conopco v. Procter & Gamble,
IPR No. 2013-00510, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2014)..... 24

E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Monsanto Tech. LLC,
IPR No. 2014-00333, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. July 11, 2014)..... 24

Fontaine Engineered Prods., Inc. v. Raildecks, Inc., IPR No.
2013-00361, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 13, 2013)..... 15, 24

Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.,
IPR No. 2015-01633, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 4, 2016) 26, 28

Merial Ltd. v. Virbac,
IPR No. 2014-01279, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 22, 2015) 41

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

Phigenix, Inc. v. Immunogen, Inc.,
IPR No. 2014-00676, Paper 39 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 27, 2015)..... 42

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.