

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TARO PHARMACEUTICALS U.S.A., INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

APOTEX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2017-01446

U.S. Patent No. 7,049,328 B2

Title: USE FOR DEFERIPRONE

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
A.	The Treatment and Care of Thalassemia Major Patients	2
B.	Prior Art Testing of Deferiprone in TM Patients	5
C.	The Invention of the '328 Patent	6
D.	The '328 Patent & FERRIPROX [®]	7
1.	The Teachings of the '328 Patent	7
2.	The Challenged Claims of the '328 Patent	9
E.	Procedural History	10
1.	The Grounds for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	10
2.	Related District Court Litigation	10
III.	THE LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART	11
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	11
A.	An “Iron Overload Condition of the Heart” Requires a Condition on the Spectrum of Cardiac Disease	11
B.	The “Claimed Results” Would be Understood by a POSA to Define Whether the Methods of Treatment of Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 are Successfully Achieved	13
1.	Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 19 require different results	14
2.	The intrinsic record shows that the claimed results were relevant to patentability	15
C.	<i>Bristol-Myers</i> and its Progeny Are Distinguishable from this Case ...	17
D.	The Board’s Reliance on <i>Catalina</i> is Misplaced	20

E. Even if the Board Finds that the Results Following “therapeutically effective amount” Are Not Limiting, Taro’s Petition Acknowledges that the Preambles of Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 Are Limiting21

V. CLAIMS 1, 2, 4-11, 13-17, AND 19 ARE NOT EXPRESSLY OR INHERENTLY ANTICIPATED BY THE PRIOR ART23

A. The Patient Populations Required by Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 Are Not Explicitly or Inherently Disclosed by Hoffbrand 1998, Olivieri 1995 or Olivieri Abstract 1995.....26

1. Hoffbrand 1998 does not expressly or inherently disclose treating a blood transfusion-dependent patient having iron-induced cardiac disease.....26

2. Olivieri 1995 does not expressly or inherently disclose treating a blood transfusion-dependent patient having iron-induced cardiac disease.....29

3. Olivieri Abstract 1995 does not expressly or inherently disclose treating a blood transfusion-dependent patient having iron-induced cardiac disease31

B. The Claimed Methods of Treatment Required by Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 Are Not Explicitly or Inherently Disclosed by Hoffbrand 1998, Olivieri 1995 or Olivieri Abstract 199536

1. Hoffbrand 1998 does not expressly or inherently disclose that the claimed methods were successfully practiced37

2. Olivieri 1995 does not expressly or inherently disclose that the claimed methods were successfully practiced39

3. Olivieri Abstract 1995 does not expressly or inherently disclose that the claimed methods were successfully practiced42

C. Anticipation Requires that the Claimed Methods of Treatment Were Successfully Practiced in the Prior Art45

VI. CLAIMS 1, 2, 4-17, AND 19 ARE NOT OBVIOUS47

A.	Taro Fails to Set Forth a Proper Obviousness Analysis under <i>Graham</i>	49
B.	Claims 1, 2, 4-17, or 19 of the '328 Patent Are Not Obvious Over Hoffbrand 1998, Olivieri 1995, or Olivieri Abstract 1995, Alone or in Combination with the Background Knowledge of a POSA	51
1.	Hoffbrand 1998 Provides a POSA No Reasonable Expectation that the Claimed Methods Could be Practiced Successfully and Teaches Away from Treating Patients with an Iron Overload Condition of the Heart Using Deferiprone	51
2.	A POSA Would Have Been Aware of Later Publications Questioning the Disclosure of Olivieri 1995 and Olivieri Abstract 1995, Which Fail to Teach or Suggest the Claimed Methods.....	53
C.	Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness	56
1.	Unexpected Results.....	56
2.	Long-Felt, but Unmet Need	57
3.	Industry Praise	57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE(S)
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	46, 47
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	48
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	17-19
<i>Catalina Mktg., Intl. v. Coolsavings.com</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	20, 21
<i>Comark Commc'ns v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	14
<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	23, 41
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct 2131 (2016)	14
<i>D'Agostino v. MasterCard Int'l, Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	16
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375, 1378-79 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	34
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. L.A. Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr.</i> , 849 F.3d 1073 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	23
<i>Endo Pharm. Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00653, Paper 12 (PTAB Sep. 29, 2014)	23
<i>Front Row Techs., LLC v MLB Advanced Media, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01932, Paper 7 (PTAB Mar. 25, 2016)	49, 50

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.