

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Taro Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc.,

v.

Apotex Technologies, Inc.

Patent No. 7,049,328 B2

Title: USE FOR DEFERIPRONE

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,049,328 B2**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
III.	MANDATORY NOTICES	2
	A. Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	2
	B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(B)(2))	2
	C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....	2
	D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	3
IV.	CERTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING	3
V.	FEES	3
VI.	SUMMARY OF THE '328 PATENT AND PROSECUTION HISTORY	3
	A. The Claims of the '328 Patent.....	4
	B. Specification of the '328 Patent	5
	C. Prosecution History of the '328 Patent	7
VII.	OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	9
VIII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
IX.	BACKGROUND ON DEFERIPRONE AND IRON OVERLOAD	12
	A. “Iron-Overload Conditions of the Heart” in Transfusion-Dependent Patients	12
	B. Iron Chelators Treat Iron-Overload Conditions.....	15
	1. Desferrioxamine.....	15

2.	Deferiprone	17
X.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	19
1.	Preamble – Identification of “the Patient”	20
2.	Administration of a “Therapeutically Effective Amount”	23
3.	Recitation of Intended Results	24
XI.	GROUNDS 1–5: ANTICIPATION OF CLAIMS 1–11, 13–17, AND 19 BY EACH OF MIMS 1998, HOFFBRAND 1998, OLIVIERI ABSTRACT 1995, AGARWAL 2000, AND OLIVIERI 1995.....	28
A.	The Intended Results Stated in Claims 1, 2, 4–10 and 19 Are Not Limiting, But Nonetheless Are Inherently Anticipated by the Primary References	29
B.	Ground 1: Anticipation by MIMS 1998 (Ex. 1009).....	32
C.	Ground 2: Anticipation by Hoffbrand 1998 (Ex. 1007).....	34
D.	Ground 3: Anticipation by Olivieri Abstract 1995 (Ex. 1010)	36
E.	Ground 4: Anticipation by Agarwal 2000 (Ex. 1011)	39
F.	Ground 5: Anticipation by Olivieri 1995 (Ex. 1012).....	42
XII.	GROUNDS 6–10: OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 1–17 AND 19 OVER EACH OF MIMS 1998, HOFFBRAND 1998, OLIVIERI ABSTRACT 1995, AGARWAL 2000, AND OLIVIERI 1995.....	43
A.	The Claims of the ’328 Patent Are <i>Prima Facie</i> Obvious over Each of the Primary References in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	44
B.	No Secondary Considerations Overcome the <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness of the Claims	51
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	49
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	26, 27, 30
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	20
<i>In re Copaxone</i> , Civil Action No. 14–1171-GMS, 2016 WL 873062 (D. Del. Mar. 7, 2016)	25
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	19
<i>In re Droge</i> , 695 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	48
<i>Endo Pharm. Inc. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-192, 2014 WL 2859349 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 23, 2014).....	25
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F. 3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	50
<i>King Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	11, 31, 32
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	48
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	48
<i>Redline Detection, LLC v. Star Envirotech, Inc.</i> , 811 F.3d 435 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	43

<i>Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharmaceutical, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	49
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	50
<i>Syntex (U.S.A.) LLC v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 407 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	25
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	20
<i>Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 814 F. 2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	30
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	50
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)	40
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	33, 34, 37, 42
35 U.S.C. § 112	8
35 U.S.C. § 112(d)	24
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	11
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(B)(2)	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	19
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	3
M.P.E.P § 608.01(i)	24

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.