

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, LLC,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01768

Patent 9,095,559

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. RELATED PROCEEDINGS5

III. BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART.....6

IV. THE '559 PATENT CLAIMS.....9

V. CLAIM INTERPRETATION11

VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART13

VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE
LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS
UNPATENTABLE.....15

 A. The Board’s Finding of Unpatentability of the ’215 Patent is
 Inapplicable to the ’559 Patent Claims15

 B. Ground 1 Should be Denied17

 1. The Prior Art Did Not Recognize that UCD Patients
 Having a Plasma Ammonia Level Within the Normal
 Range Required an Increased Dosage of Nitrogen
 Scavenging Medication.....17

 (a) The Prior Art in the Petition Provides no
 Motivation to Increase the Dosage of Nitrogen
 Scavenging Medication for a Patient with a
 Normal Plasma Ammonia Level 19

 (b) The Prior Art as a Whole Refutes Petitioner’s
 Assertion that a POSA Would Have Been
 Motivated to Perform the Claimed Methods 27

 2. The Variability in Plasma Ammonia Levels Discouraged
 Reliance on Normal Plasma Ammonia Levels in Making
 Dosage Adjustments32

 3. The Prior Art Does Not Suggest Reliance on Fasting
 Plasma Ammonia Measurements for Dosage Adjustment37

4.	The Petition Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Expectation of Success	41
5.	Dr. Sondheimer’s Unsupported and Hindsight-Driven Testimony Should be Given no Weight.....	43
6.	Dependent Claims 4, 7-10, 12 and 13 are Not Obvious Over the Prior Art	46
C.	Ground 2 Should be Denied	47
1.	The Prior Art Does Not Suggest Targeting a Fasting Plasma Ammonia Level at or Below Half the ULN.....	47
2.	Dr. Sondheimer’s Unsupported and Hindsight-Driven Testimony Should be Given no Weight.....	48
D.	Ground 3 Should be Denied	53
1.	The Prior Art Does Not Suggestion Administration of an Initial Dosage of Nitrogen Scavenging Medication to a Patient Having a Fasting Plasma Ammonia Level Below the ULN.....	53
E.	Ground 4 Should be Denied	57
VIII.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D).....	58
IX.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312(A)(3)	59
X.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.,
776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 32, 43, 52

Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC,
805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)21

Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.,
732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)41

Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech, LLC,
IPR2017-00777, Paper 7 (Aug. 22, 2017).....59

Disney Entm't, Inc. v. Kappos,
923 F. Supp. 2d 788 (E.D. Va. 2013).....29

Envtl. Designs, Inc. v. Union Oil Co.,
713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)15

Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.,
IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 (July 27, 2017).....59

Hospitality Core Servs. LLC v. Nomadix, Inc.,
IPR2016-0052, Paper 8, 2016 WL 2909164 (Apr. 27, 2016)12

In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.,
367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)43

In re Cyclobenzaprine Extended-Release Patent Litigation,
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)41

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)43

In re Paulsen,
30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)12

In re Rijckaert,
9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)21

In re Smith Int'l, Inc.,
No. 2016-2303, slip op. at 12-13 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 26, 2017).....12

In re Zurko,
258 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2001)49

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2016).... 32

Leo Pharm. Prods. Ltd. v. Rea,
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)19

Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v Greene's Energy Group, LLC,
No. 16-712 (cert. granted June 12, 2017).....60

Tissue Transplant Tech. Ltd. et al. v. Mimedx Group, Inc.,
IPR2015-00320, Paper 13 (June 29, 2015)43

Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman,
IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (Dec. 14, 2016)59

W.L. Gore & Assocs. Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.,
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)..... 50, 52

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 17, 47, 53, 57

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....59

35 U.S.C. § 3131

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)15

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) 5, 58, 59

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 4260

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2).....5

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)..... 32, 43, 46, 52

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.