



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO., EXAMINER, ART UNIT, PAPER NUMBER, NOTIFICATION DATE, DELIVERY MODE. Includes application details for Roberto VILLA and examiner TRAN, SUSAN T.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112(a) or the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA). See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed applications fail to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by 35 U.S.C. 112(a) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), first paragraph for one or more claims of this application. None of the prior-filed applications appear to provide support for the limitation “hydrogel-forming hydrophilic excipient other than a gum” recites in the present claims. As such, the present application does not have priority date of the earlier filed applications.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 01/15/13 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of USPN 8,293,273; 8,029,823; 7,410,651; 7,431,943; and copending applications 13/249,389 and 13/462,409 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hallgren et al. US 6,239,120.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Friend et al. US 5,811,388.

These rejections have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's Amendment filed 01/15/13.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Villa et al. US 2006/0134208 A1.

Villa teaches a controlled release and taste masking oral tablet comprising budesonide, and an inert matrix comprising of one or more hydrophilic water-swallowable excipients, an amphiphilic compound, and a lipophilic excipient. Amphiphilic compound includes lecithin. Lipophilic includes compound having melting point between 40°C to 90°C. Hydrophilic includes compound capable of molecular relaxation. See abstract; and paragraphs 0028-0031. The tablet is coated with a gastro-resistant film. (ID).

Example 2 shows a tablet having: 1) a core comprising of 9.0 mg of budesonide, stearic acid, lecithin, and cellulosic excipients; and 2) a gastro-resistant coating.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friend et al. US 5,811,388 in view of Hallgren et al. US 6,239,120.

This rejection has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's Amendment filed 01/15/13.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

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.