

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

LUPIN LTD. AND LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,

Petitioner

v.

HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, LLC,

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR 2017-01159

Patent 9,254,278

---

**PATENT OWNER HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 4

    A. Related Patents and IPR Proceedings ..... 4

    B. Technical Background on Treatment of UCDS ..... 7

    C. Overview of the '278 Patent ..... 9

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ..... 12

IV. CLAIM INTERPRETATION..... 15

    A. “upper limit of normal” ..... 15

    B. “the subject” ..... 16

V. THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE  
LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS ..... 17

    A. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Increase the Dosage of  
Glycerol Phenylbutyrate Based on Normal Plasma Ammonia Levels ..... 17

        1. The '859 Publication and the Prior Art as a Whole Taught That  
Normal Plasma Ammonia Levels Were Acceptable ..... 17

        2. The Potential Variability of Normal Plasma Ammonia Levels  
Would Not Have Motivated a POSA to Increase the Dosage of  
Glycerol Phenylbutyrate ..... 24

        3. Lupin’s Obviousness Analysis Hinges on Dr. Vaux’s Conclusory  
and Unsupported Testimony ..... 27

    B. Lupin Has Failed to Demonstrate that a POSA Would Have Combined the  
Prior Art ..... 31

        1. Simell Concerns the Dosing of Different Drugs for a Different  
Condition Than the '859 Publication ..... 31

        2. Simell and Blau Do Not Address the Use of Normal Fasting Plasma  
Ammonia Levels to Treat UCDS ..... 35

        3. Simell, Blau and Brusilow '979 Fail to Cure the Deficiencies of the  
'859 Publication ..... 37

    C. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Expectation of Success ..... 38

D. Lupin Has Not Demonstrated that Claims 1-3, 5, 9 or 13 are Obvious Over  
the Prior Art ..... 40

VI. CONCLUSION..... 43

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*,  
726 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 30

*Alza Corp. v. Mylan Labs, Inc.*,  
464 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ..... 30

*Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*,  
776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ..... 27, 31

*Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.*,  
732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 38

*C.R. Bard, Inc. v. Med. Components, Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01660 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 9, 2016) ..... 29

*Catalina Mktg. Int’l v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.*,  
289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002) ..... 16

*Disney Enter., Inc. v. Kappos*,  
923 F. Supp. 2d 788 (E.D. Va. 2013) ..... 22

*Envtl. Designs, Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*,  
713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ..... 14

*Hospitality Core Services LLC v. Nomadix, Inc.*,  
IPR2016-00052, 2016 WL 2909164 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 27, 2016) ..... 15

*In re Cyclobenzaprine Extended-Release Patent Litigation*,  
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ..... 38

*In re Kahn*,  
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ..... 30

*In re Paulsen*,  
30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994) ..... 16

*In re Van Geuns*,  
988 F.2d 1181 (Fed. Cir. 1993) ..... 15

*In re Wilson*,  
311 F.2d 266 (C.C.P.A. 1962) ..... 22

*Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*,  
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... 3

*Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00529 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014)..... 34

*Leo Pharm. Prods. Ltd. v. Rea*,  
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 19

*Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v Greene’s Energy Group, LLC*,  
No. 16-712 (cert. granted June 12, 2017) ..... 43

*Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*,  
182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999) ..... 16

*Verlander v. Garner*,  
348 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... 29

*Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc. v. Four Mile Bay, LLC*,  
IPR2016-00011 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 1, 2016)..... 29

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103..... 17

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)..... 3

35 U.S.C. § 313..... 1

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) ..... 17

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42..... 6, 43

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 3

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 ..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)..... 6, 28, 32

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)..... 3

37 C.F.R. § 42.5(b) ..... 6

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)..... 27, 31, 36

# 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.