JNITED 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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE **UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Intro	oduction	1
II.	Back	kground	5
	A.	State of the Art in November 2000	
	B.	Clinical Development and Approval of Fortamet®	
	C. D.	The '866 Patent Litigation Involving the '866 Patent	
	D. Е.		
III.		Alleged Prior Art Relied on by Petitionerel of Ordinary Skill in the Art	
IV.	Clair	m Construction	16
	A.	"Membrane"	16
	B.	"Dinnertime" or "At Dinner"	
	C.	"T _{max} "	18
	D.	Other Claim Terms Not Requiring Construction	19
V.		Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any of Claims	
	1-25	is Anticipated by Chen (Ground I)	19
VI.		Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any of Claims is Anticipated by Timmins (Ground II)	
	A.	Ground II Should Be Denied Because the Petition Does Not Apply to Correct Legal Standard for the Anticipation of a Claimed Range By an Overlapping Prior Art Range	21 of
		2. Petitioner Contends that Timmins Discloses a Range of Mean T _{max} Values, Rather Than Specific Mean T _{max} Values Within	
		3. Petitioner Fails to Sufficiently Show How the Range of Mean T _{max} Values Allegedly Disclosed By Timmins Anticipates the Claimed Range	
	B.	Ground II Should Also Be Denied Because it Presents the Same Price	
		Art that Previously Was Considered and Rejected By the Patent	
		Office	25



VII.	The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any of Claims		
	1-25 is Obvious Over Cheng in View of Timmins (Ground III)	26	
VIII.	Objective Indicia Support the Non-Obviousness of the Challenged		
	Claims	30	
IX.	Conclusion	33	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s) Cases Atofina v. Great Lakes Chemical Corp., ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc., INEOS USA LLC v. Berry Plastics Corp., *In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Patent Litigation*, 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)27 In re Katz, 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982)......20 Kinetic Technologies, Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc., IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014)......5 Sinorgchem Co. v. International Trade Commission, Tessera, Inc. v. Internatonal Trade Commission, 646 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2011)21 Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner, **Docketed Cases** Sciele Pharma Inc. et al. v. Lupin Ltd., et al., Sciele Pharma, Inc. et al v. Lupin Ltd. et al., No. 1-09-cv-00105 (D. Md.).....11 Sciele Pharma, Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.,



Shionogi Inc. and Andrx Labs. L.L.C. v. Aurobindo Pharma Ltd. et al., Civ. Act. No. 1:17-cv-00072-MSG (D. Del.)	10
Shionogi Inc. et al. v. Nostrum Laboratories, Inc., et al., 1:12-cv-04402 (D.N.J.)	12
Shionogi Inc. et al. v. Qingdao Baheal Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., Civ. Act. No. 17-cv-1347-MSG (D. Del.)	11
Shionogi Pharma v. Mylan, Inc., Civ. Act. No. 10-135 (D. Del.)	11
Takeda Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., et. al. v. Mylan, Inc., et. al., No. 2-12-cv-00026 (W.D. Pa.)	12
Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited et al v. Mylan, Inc. et al., No. 1-12-cv-00024 (S.D.N.Y.)	12
Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited et al v. Mylan, Inc. et al., No. 1-12-cv-02038 (S.D.N.Y.)	12
Statutes, Codes & Regulations	
35 U.S.C. § 102(g)	20
35 U.S.C. § 314	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108	1
American Inventors Protection Act of 1999	20
Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002	20
Other Authorities	
December 11, 2002 Examination Guidelines for 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)	20
MPEP § 706.02(F)(1)(I)(C)(3)	19, 20
MPEP § 2132(III)	20
MPEP 8 2136.04	20



DOCKET

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.

