

Paper No. ____
Filed: June 22, 2016

Filed on behalf of Alembic Pharmaceuticals, Ltd.

By: Jeffer Ali

Gary J. Speier

CARLSON, CASPERS, VANDENBURGH, LINDQUIST & SCHUMAN, P.A.

225 South Sixth St., Suite 4200

Minneapolis, MN 55402

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALEMBIC PHARMACEUTICALS, LTD., Petitioner

v.

RESEARCH CORPORATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Patent Owner

Case No. **Unassigned**

Patent No. RE38,551

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. RE38,551**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....1

 A. Real Parties-In-Interest under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)1

 B. Related Matters under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)1

 C. Lead and Backup Counsel under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....2

 D. Service Information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....2

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....3

 A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)3

 B. Identification of Challenge, 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)3

III. SUMMARY OF THE '551 PATENT6

IV. PREVIOUS PETITION FILED BY OTHER UNRELATED PARTIES8

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)(3).....9

 A. “Therapeutic Composition” in Claim 10.....9

 B. “A Compound in the R Configuration” in Claim 111

VI. LEVEL OF SKILL AND KNOWLEDGE IN THE ART13

 A. Cortes (Ex. 1015)14

 B. LeGall (1987) (Ex. 1008).....15

 C. Kohn 1991 (Ex. 1012).....16

 D. '729 Patent (1991) (Ex. 1009).....18

 E. Kohn 1993 (Ex. 1017).....19

 F. Choi (1995) (Ex. 1010)20

G.	'301 Patent (1995) (Ex. 1019).....	21
VII.	CLAIM-BY-CLAIM EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY	23
A.	Ground 1A: Claims 1 and 3-8 Are Anticipated by LeGall	23
1.	New evidence establishes that LeGall is prior art	23
2.	LeGall discloses “racemic lacosamide” and R-lacosamide and therefore anticipates claims 1 and 3-8.....	25
B.	Ground 1B: Claims 2 and 9-13 Are Obvious Over LeGall and The '729 Patent	26
1.	Claims 2 and 9 to “substantial” or “90%” pure R-enantiomer are obvious over LeGall and '729 patent.....	26
2.	Claim 10 to a “therapeutic composition” is obvious over LeGall and the '729 patent.....	30
3.	Claims 11-13 to methods of treatment are obvious over LeGall and '729 patent.....	33
C.	Ground 2A: Claims 1-9 Are Obvious Over Choi and Kohn 1991.....	36
1.	Choi and Kohn 1991 are prior art	36
2.	POSA had a reason to select Compound 2d of Choi as a lead compound	37
3.	POSA had a reason to modify the hydroxymethyl compound to a “ <i>functionalized oxygen</i> ” group	42
4.	POSA would have a reasonable expectation of success in making racemic lacosamide and R lacosamide	44
D.	Ground 2B: Claims 10-13 Are Obvious Over Choi, Kohn 1991, And '729 Patent.....	45
E.	Ground 3A: Claims 1-9 Are Obvious Over Kohn 1991 and Silverman.....	45

1.	Kohn 1991 and Silverman are prior art	45
2.	Activity data and bioisosterism suggest the change from methoxyamino to methoxymethyl (lacosamide)	46
F.	Ground 3B: Claims 10-13 Are Obvious Over Kohn 1991, Silverman, and '729 Patent	49
G.	Ground 4A: Claims 1-9 Are Obvious Over Cortes and Kohn 1991	50
1.	Cortes and Kohn 1991 are prior art	50
2.	POSA had a reason to select the methyl compound of Cortes or Kohn 1991 as a lead compound	50
3.	POSA had a reason to modify the methyl substituent to a methoxymethyl.....	51
H.	Ground 4B: Claims 10-13 Are Obvious Over Cortes, Kohn 1991, And '729 Patent.....	53
VIII.	THERE ARE NO SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS	54
IX.	THE CLAIMS ARE NOT ENTITLED TO THE PROVISIONAL FILING DATE.....	56
X.	FOUNDATIONS 1-4 ARE NON-CUMULATIVE OF EACH OTHER	58
XI.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT DECLINE TO INSTITUTE BASED ON ITS DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	58
XII.	CLAIMS CHART FOR DEPENDENT CLAIM 2 AND 9-13	59
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	60
XIV.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	61
XV.	PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(A) AND 42.103.....	62

EXHIBIT LIST63
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE66

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.