

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**WATSON LABORATORIES, INC.**

Petitioner

v.

**UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORP.**

Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,358,240

Issue Date: June 7, 2016

Title: TREPROSTINIL ADMINISTRATION BY INHALATION

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. 2017-01621

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
III.	BACKGROUND .....	2
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	5
A.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (“POSA”).....	6
B.	Claim Terms .....	8
1.	“pulsed” and “pulse” .....	8
2.	“opto-acoustical trigger which allows said human to synchronize each breath to each pulse” .....	11
3.	“single event dose” .....	14
V.	PETITIONER HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN TO ESTABLISH THAT VOSWINCKEL AND GHOFRANI ARE PRIOR ART .....	15
A.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Voswinckel was publicly accessible.....	16
B.	Ghofrani is not prior art “by another.” .....	21
C.	The Inventors Reduced To Practice At Least As Much Of The Claimed Invention As Is Taught By Ghofrani Before The Date of Public Accessibility .....	27
VI.	PETITIONER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED OBVIOUSNESS OVER VOSWINCKEL, PATTON, AND GHOFRANI BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE.....	29

1. Voswinckel does not provide a POSA with a reasonable expectation of success for a method of treating pulmonary hypertension.....31
2. Voswinckel does not teach a pulsed ultrasonic nebulizer “that aerosolizes a fixed amount of treprostinil or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof per pulse” ([B1]) or that comprises “an opto-acoustical trigger which allows said human to synchronize each breath to each pulse” ([C]). .....33
3. Patton does not teach a pulsed ultrasonic nebulizer “that aerosolizes a fixed amount of treprostinil or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof per pulse” ([B1]) and that comprises “an opto-acoustical trigger which allows said human to synchronize each breath to each pulse” ([C]). .....36
4. A POSA would not be motivated to combine Voswinckel, Patton, and Ghofrani to produce a pulsed ultrasonic nebulizer “that aerosolizes a fixed amount of treprostinil or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof per pulse” ([B1]) or that comprises “an opto-acoustical trigger which allows said human to synchronize each breath to each pulse” ([C]). .....38
5. Ghofrani does not teach a “therapeutically effective single event dose” ([D]). .....41
6. A POSA would not be motivated to combine Ghofrani and Voswinckel to deliver a “therapeutically effective single event dose” ([D]). .....42
7. Claims 2, 5, and 6 are non-obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 1. ....43
8. Claims 3 and 9 are non-obvious and separately patentable over the combination of Voswinckel, Patton, and Ghofrani. ....43

9. Claim 4 is non-obvious and separately patentable over the combination of Voswinckel, Patton, and Ghofrani.....44

10. Claims 7-9 are non-obvious and separately patentable over the combination of Voswinckel, Patton, and Ghofrani. ....45

B. Dr. Donovan’s testimony lacks credibility and relies on references outside the scope of the “prior art.” .....46

1. Dr. Donovan’s conclusion that a pulsed nebulizer requires breath synchronization is unsupported and contradicts her deposition testimony. ....48

2. Dr. Donovan’s conclusion that including an opto-acoustical trigger with the pulsed nebulizer disclosed in Voswinckel would have been obvious based on a POSA’s appreciation and “necessity” is unsupported. ....50

3. Dr. Donovan relies on the Optineb Manual (Ex. 1006), which is not cited under Ground 1 nor evidence of the “state of the art” since it is not publicly accessible. ....51

4. Dr. Donovan incorrectly identified how many patients were treated four times a day in Voswinckel.....54

C. The objective indicia of non-obviousness weigh in favor of patentability. ....55

1. Unexpected Results.....55

2. Commercial Success .....56

D. Conclusion.....62

VII. THE PETITION SHOULD HAVE BEEN DENIED BECAUSE IT WAS NOT TIMELY FILED.....62

VIII. THE INSTITUTION DECISION IS TAINTED BY THE BOARD’S CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONER’S REPLY TO THE PRELIMINARY RESPONSE.....63

IX. THE SUPREME COURT’S SAS DECISION DOES NOT APPLY .....63

X. CONCLUSION.....64

# 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.