

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Aurobindo Pharma USA Inc.
Petitioners,

v.

Andrx Labs, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01648
U.S. Patent No. 6,866,866

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FACTUAL STATEMENT 5

 A. State of the Art in November 2000 5

 B. Fortamet® 6

 C. The '866 Patent 6

 D. Alleged Prior Art 7

 E. Examination of the '866 Patent 9

III. THE INSTITUTION DECISION 12

IV. OPINIONS FROM PETITIONER'S DECLARANT SHOULD BE GIVEN
MINIMAL OR NO WEIGHT 13

V. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS
OVER CHENG IN VIEW OF TIMMINS 17

 A. A POSA Would Not Target a Mean T_{max} Based on Timmins Absent
 the Benefit of Hindsight 17

 B. A POSA Would Not Combine the Disclosures of Timmins and Cheng 20

 C. A POSA Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success
 In Combining Timmins and Cheng To Achieve The Claimed
 Compositions 23

 D. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That A Combination of Timmins
 and Cheng Would Have Produced A Mean T_{max} In The Claimed Ranges
 of 5.5-7.5 Hours, 6.0 to 7.0 Hours, or 5.5 to 7.0 Hours 27

 E. The Arguments Advanced By Petitioner and Dr. Akhlaghi
 Impermissibly Rely On the Use of Hindsight 40

 F. Petitioner Has Failed to Demonstrate That Dependent Claims 2-25 are
 Obvious Over Cheng and Timmins 43

 G. Objective Indicia Demonstrate the Non-Obviousness of the Challenged
 Claims 50

VI. REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY 55

VII. CONCLUSION 56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc 'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	25
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	32
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	23
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	38
<i>In re Brandt</i> , 886 F.3d 1171 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	31
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	19
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. California Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	42
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	32
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	21
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	41
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	20
<i>MEHL/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum</i> , 192 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	44

<i>Mylan Institutional LLC v. Aurobindo Pharma Ltd.</i> , 857 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	53
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	44
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	50
<i>PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	44, 46-47
<i>In re Patel</i> , 566 F. App'x 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	31
<i>Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	20
<i>PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	23
<i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	21, 22
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	47
<i>Rolls–Royce PLC v. United Techs. Corp.</i> , 603 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	33
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)	12
<i>Sciele Pharma, Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , 684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (“the Federal Circuit opinion)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Securus Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00267, 2016 WL 7047972 (Sept. 12, 2016).....	42
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	50
<i>Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner</i> , 778 F.2d 775 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	31

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....9

35 U.S.C. § 103.....9, 12

Other Authorities

FDA Approval Letter (Ex. 2001).....6

U.S. Patent No. 3,845,770.....10

U.S. Patent No. 6,866,866.....*passim*

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.