

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re *Inter Partes* Review of:)
U.S. Patent No. 9,555,027)
Issued: January 31, 2017)
Application No.: 14/512,189)
Filing Date: Oct. 10, 2014)

For: **Pharmaceutical Composition**

FILED VIA E2E

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,555,027

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Overview.....	1
II.	Identification of Claims Being Challenged (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B))	7
III.	Overview of the '027 Patent.....	8
	A. Specification.....	8
	B. The '027 Patent Claims Oral Preparations Comprising 20%- 45% Lurasidone and 10%-50% Pregelatinized Starch	8
IV.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	9
V.	Claim Construction.....	10
	A. Applicable Law	10
	B. Construction of Claim Terms	10
	1. “equivalent dissolution profile”	11
	2. “pregelatinized starch”	12
VI.	Background and State of the Art	13
	A. Formulation of Oral Preparations with Good Disintegration and Rapid Dissolution Was Well-Known in the Art	13
	B. Formulations of Lurasidone Were Known.....	15
	C. Pregelatinized Starch Was a Commonly-Used Disintegrant in Oral Dosage Forms.....	16
VII.	Scope and Content of the Prior Art	18
	A. Fujihara Disclosed Oral Preparations of Lurasidone Including Disintegrants.....	18
	B. Aulton Disclosed a Small Group of Common Disintegrants, Including Pregelatinized Starch	19
	C. Denton Disclosed Oral Preparations of a Poorly Soluble Drug Containing Pregelatinized Starch that Had High Drug Loads, Rapid Dissolution, and Equivalent Dissolution Between Dosages.....	21

D.	Chowdary Taught the Amount of Pregelatinized Starch to Include in a Formulation to Obtain Rapid Dissolution and Disintegration	22
VIII.	Claims 1-34 Would Have Been Obvious Over the Prior Art.....	24
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-34 Would Have Been Obvious Over Fujihara in View of Aulton	24
1.	One of Ordinary Skill Would Have Been Motivated to Use the Lurasidone Oral Preparations of Fujihara	25
2.	Fujihara Discloses Ranges of Lurasidone Content and Excipients that Overlap with the Challenged Claims	26
3.	One of Skill Was Motivated to Select a Known Disintegrant in Fujihara	28
4.	It Would Have Been Obvious to Combine Fujihara With Aulton to Select Pregelatinized Starch as the Disintegrant Because It Was in a Small Group of Commonly-Used Disintegrants	29
5.	There Is No Evidence of Unexpected Results from the Claimed Ranges of Lurasidone or Pregelatinized Starch	33
6.	Fujihara and Aulton Render Obvious Every Limitation of the Claims	36
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-34 Would Have Been Obvious Over Fujihara in View of Denton and Chowdary	47
1.	One of Ordinary Skill Would Have Been Motivated to Use the Lurasidone Oral Preparations of Fujihara	48
2.	Denton Disclosed the Use of Pregelatinized Starch in Oral Preparations to Produce Higher Dosages, Maintain Acceptable Tablet Size, and Obtain Equivalent Dissolution Profiles Across Dosages	48
3.	Chowdary Disclosed the Preferred Range of 10%-20% Pregelatinized Starch	50
4.	Fujihara, Denton, and Chowdary Render Obvious Every Limitation of the Claims	51
C.	There Was a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Formulating Pregelatinized Starch with Lurasidone.....	57
1.	Sumitomo Incorrectly Asserted that Highly Relevant Art Should Be Disregarded	58

2.	Sumitomo Incorrectly Asserted that Pregelatinized Starch Has an Unpredictable Effect on Dissolution.....	60
D.	The Prior Art Did Not Teach Away From the Claimed Range of Pregelatinized Starch.....	63
IX.	The Office Has Not Previously Considered Substantially the Same Art, Evidence, or Arguments	66
X.	Secondary Considerations Do Not Overcome the Strong Evidence of Obviousness	68
A.	Commercial Success.....	69
B.	Long-Felt But Unmet Need or Failure of Others	70
C.	Industry Praise	70
D.	Unexpected Results	70
XI.	Conclusion	71
XII.	Requirements for Petition for <i>Inter partes</i> Review	71
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	71
B.	Notice of Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	71
C.	Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	71
D.	Notice of Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information	72
E.	Fee for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	72
F.	Proof of Service.....	72

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>10x Genomics v. Univ. of Chicago</i> , IPR2015-01157, Paper 14 (Nov. 16, 2015)	68
<i>Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.</i> , 520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	68
<i>Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 743 F. Supp. 2d 305 (D. Del. 2010), <i>aff'd</i> , 675 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	44, 59, 60, 70
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs II LLC v. NPS Pharms., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00990, Paper 28 (Oct. 23, 2015)	68
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	44
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	44
<i>Kayak Software Corp. v. Int’l Bus. Machs. Corp.</i> , CBM2016-00075, Paper 16 (Dec. 15, 2016)	68
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	2
<i>Merck & Cie v. Gnosis S.p.A.</i> , 808 F.3d 829 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	66, 70
<i>Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Labs., Inc.</i> , 874 F.2d 804 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	33, 41, 59
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	69, 70
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Multi-Tech Sys., Inc.</i> , 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	12

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.