

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

POZEN INC. and HORIZON PHARMA USA, INC.,
Patent Owners.

Case IPR2017-01995
Patent 9,220,698

**PATENT OWNERS POZEN INC. AND HORIZON PHARMA USA, INC.'S
RESPONSE**

37 C.F.R. § 42.10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	BACKGROUND	2
A.	The '698 Patent and Vimovo®	2
1.	Technical Background	2
2.	The '698 Patent	8
a.	Dr. Plachetka and His Team Conceived Of and Reduced To Practice The Invention Claimed In The '698 Patent By June 25, 2007	9
b.	Illustrative Claim	13
B.	District Court Litigations Regarding The Vimovo® Patents.....	15
II.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	17
III.	MYLAN'S PETITION IS TIME BARRED	19
IV.	THE OPINIONS OF MYLAN'S EXPERT DECLARANTS SHOULD BE AFFORDED LITTLE WEIGHT	20
V.	MYLAN HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH THAT THE '285 PATENT OR THE EC-NAPROSYN LABEL ARE PRIOR ART	22
A.	The '285 Patent Is Not § 102(e) Prior Art.....	22
B.	The EC-NAPROSYN® Label Does Not Qualify As Prior Art.....	26
1.	Petitioner Failed To Establish That Exhibit 1009 Is A Publicly Available Printed Publication.....	26
2.	Petitioner Failed To Establish That Exhibit 1009 Predates The Invention Date.....	30
VI.	MYLAN HAS FAILED TO PROVE CLAIMS 1-7 ARE INHERENTLY ANTICIPATED BY THE '285 PATENT	30
VII.	MYLAN HAS FAILED TO PROVE CLAIMS 1-7 ARE OBVIOUS IN LIGHT OF THE '285 PATENT	34
A.	The '285 Patent Cannot Not Be Used To Render the '698 Patent Obvious	35
B.	The '285 Patent Does Not Render The '698 Patent Inherently Obvious	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
VIII. MYLAN HAS FAILED TO PROVE CLAIMS 1-7 ARE OBVIOUS IN LIGHT OF THE '285 PATENT, EC-NAPROSYN LABEL, AND HOWDEN 2005.....	40
1. '285 patent (Exhibit 1005).....	40
2. EC-Naprosyn® Label (Exhibit 1009).....	40
3. Howden 2005 (Exhibit 1006).....	41
4. Mylan's Ground III Fails	45
IX. OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS DEMONSTRATE THE PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMED INVENTIONS	47
A. Long-Felt Need.....	47
B. Teaching Away and Surprising and Unexpected Results	49
C. Skepticism	51
X. CONCLUSION.....	52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Illumina, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01093, Paper 69 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 7, 2016)	22
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	28
<i>Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 40 F.3d 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	9
<i>Celltrion, Inc. v. Biogen, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01614, Paper 65 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 21, 2018).....	29, 30
<i>Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.</i> , 543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	37
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	9
<i>In re Costello</i> , 717 F.2d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	23
<i>In re DeBaun</i> , 687 F.2d 459 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	23
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Astro-Valcour, Inc.</i> , 267 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	10
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	22
<i>Fox Grp., Inc. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 1300 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	9, 10
<i>Frontier Therapeutics, LLC v. Medac Gesellschaft Fur Klinische Spezialpreparate MBH</i> , IPR2016-00649, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 1, 2016).....	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	26
<i>In re Haruna</i> , 249 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	49
<i>Honeywell International Inc. v. Mexichem Amanco Holding S.A. DE</i> <i>C.V.</i> , 865 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	38, 39
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	47
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. ITC</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	27
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	27
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Corel Software, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01300, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 4, 2017)	28
<i>Monsanto Tech. LLC v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.</i> , 878 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	37
<i>Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Intl. GMBH</i> , IPR2016-01566, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 3, 2017).....	28
<i>Netgear, Inc. v. Ruckus Wireless, Inc.</i> , 5 F. Supp. 3d 592 (D. Del. 2013).....	36
<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litig.</i> 483 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	31
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	47
<i>In re Papesch</i> , 315 F.2d 381 (C.C.P.A. 1963)	38

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.