

Filed: February 22, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

and

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,

Petitioners

v.

HORIZON PHARMA USA, INC. and NUVO PHARMACEUTICALS
(IRELAND) DESIGNATED ACTIVITY COMPANY,

Patent Owners.

Case No. IPR2017-01995¹
U.S. Patent No. 9,220,698

RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNERS' MOTION TO TERMINATE

¹ Petitioner Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc. ("DRL"), from IPR2018-00894, has been joined as a Petitioner to this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND	1
I. The District Court Litigation and Summary Judgment.....	2
II. The '698 and '208 <i>Inter Partes</i> Reviews	3
ARGUMENT	5
I. The Board Has Already Construed the Claims and Applied the Prior Art.....	5
A. The Board Has Already Construed the Claims.....	6
B. One Can Apply the Relied-Upon Art to the Challenged Claims	8
II. Efficiency Does Not Weigh in Favor of Terminating the IPRs.....	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE
<i>Apple Inc. v. Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC</i> , No. IPR2014-00086, Paper 8 (PTAB Apr. 25, 2014).....	8
<i>Blackberry Corp. v. MobileMedia Ideas, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00036, Paper 65 (PTAB Mar. 7, 2014).....	9
<i>Comtech Mobile Datacom Corp. v. Vehicle IP, LLC</i> , Case IPR2018-00531, Paper 9 (PTAB July 20, 2018).....	10
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	6
<i>Ex Parte Miyazaki</i> , 89 U.SP.Q.2d 1207 (B.P.A.I. Nov. 19, 2008).....	7
<i>Ex Parte Saceman</i> , 27 U.S.P.Q.2d 1472 (B.P.A.I. 1993).....	8
<i>In re Alpert</i> , 2013 WL 3805709 (PTAB July 15, 2013).....	8
<i>In re Keller</i> , 2013 WL 6212689 (PTAB Nov. 26, 2013).....	8
<i>In re Packard</i> , 751 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	7
<i>In re Siraky</i> , 2014 WL 869351 (PTAB Feb. 28, 2014).....	8
<i>In re Steele</i> , 305 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1962).....	7
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. IpLearn-Focus, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00097, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 26, 2015).....	9
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Lee</i> , 797 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	7

ii

United Carbon Co. v. Binney & Smith Co.,
317 U.S. 228 (1942).....7

Vibrant Media, Inc. v. Gen. Elec. Co.,
No. IPR-2013-00172, Paper 50 (PTAB July 28, 2014).....9

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a).....10

Patent Owners' motion to terminate ('698 IPR Paper 66) rests on the district court's indefiniteness finding—a finding they are appealing—and a supposed resultant inability of Mylan and Dr. Reddy's Laboratories ("Petitioners") to now prove unpatentability. Patent Owners have waived that position. Their argument should be rejected for that reason as well as their misapprehension of the law, their own patents, and the prior art. Although the patents fail to provide clear boundaries, unpatentability can still be found because the prior art does not fall near these undefined edges; it falls *dead-center* in the claims.

BACKGROUND

The '698 and '208 patents ("patents") claim methods of administering a drug formulation combining naproxen with esomeprazole. The patent claims recite steps for administering that formulation and the intended pharmacokinetic ("PK") and pharmacodynamic ("PD") results. The patents claim a particular PK/PD profile, reciting a range of PK/PD values " $\pm 20\%$." The claimed formulations, however, need not *produce* any particular results. Importantly, the claims require only that the ranges are "target[ed]." Thus, while a formulation actually producing the recited values may "target" the recited range, the claims also envision one merely "*target[ing]*" that range, even if one does not achieve the claimed results.

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.