

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

NOVEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 9,724,310

Title: TRANSDERMAL ESTROGEN DEVICE AND DELIVERY

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2018-00173

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Overview of the '310 Patent and Prosecution History	2
III.	Level of Skill in the Art.....	6
IV.	Technological Background.....	6
	A. Transdermal Drug Delivery and Drug Flux	6
	B. Developing Transdermal Drug Delivery Systems	8
	C. Coat Weight Was Not Known To Impact Flux.....	13
	1. Kim (EX1010) Does Not Evidence A General Understanding	15
	2. Ghosh (EX1014) Does Not Evidence A General Understanding	18
	3. Bronaugh (EX1026) Is Not Related to TDSs	18
	4. Chien (EX1009) Does Not Support Petitioner's Case.....	19
	5. Mueller (EX1005) Did Not Recognize Coat Weight To Impact Flux	21
	D. Estradiol Transdermal Drug Delivery Systems	22
V.	Claim Construction.....	24
	A. Legal Standard.....	24
	B. "About"	24
	C. "Coat Weight"	25
	D. "Flux"	26
	E. "Therapeutically Effective Amount"	29
VI.	Standard for Institution.....	29
VII.	The Cited References.....	30
	A. Mueller (EX1005)	30

B.	Vivelle-Dot® Label (EX1006).....	33
C.	Kanios (EX1007).....	34
D.	Chien (EX1009)	36
VIII.	Petitioner Failed To Satisfy 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.61(c) and 42.65(b) For The Figures Relied Upon	36
IX.	Grounds 1-4 Improperly Rely On Petitioner’s Own Interpretations Of Figures	38
X.	The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood Of Unpatentability Based On Ground 1	39
A.	Petitioner has not carried its burden of establishing a reasonable likelihood of anticipation of claims 1, 2, 8, and 10-15 by Mueller Example 3.....	40
1.	Mueller Does Not Disclose Or Show That Example 3 Achieved The Claimed Estradiol Flux	40
2.	Mueller Example 3 Did Not Use A Control	42
3.	Mueller Presents Fig. 3 Qualitatively and Imprecisely	43
XI.	Petitioner has not carried its burden of establishing a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-2 and 8-15 are obvious in view of Mueller and the Vivelle-Dot® Label for Ground 2	47
XII.	Petitioner has not carried its burden of establishing a reasonable likelihood that claims 3-7 are obvious in view of Mueller, the Vivelle- Dot® Label and Kanios for Ground 3	49
A.	Petitioner has not shown the requisite motivation or reasonable expectation of success	49

B.	A POSA would have been discouraged from attempting Petitioner’s asserted modifications of Mueller	51
C.	Petitioner relies on an invalid comparison of Mueller and Kanios.....	52
XIII.	Petitioner has not carried its burden of establishing a reasonable likelihood of obviousness of claims 1-15 in view of Mueller, the Vivelle-Dot® Label, Kanios, and Chien for Ground 4	55
XIV.	The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because the Primary References Were Considered During Prosecution	57
XV.	Conclusion	60
XVI.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b)(1).....	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools International</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	47
<i>3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Tredegar Corp.</i> , 725 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	25, 29
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	49, 55
<i>Continental Can Co. U.S.A. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	39, 40, 43
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	47
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int’l</i> , 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	38, 57
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs.</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	24
<i>In re Gartside</i> , 203 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	47
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981)	39
<i>In re Wright</i> , 569 F.2d 1124 (CCPA 1976)	39, 41
<i>Nystrom v. Trex Co.</i> , 424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	38, 40, 57
<i>RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc.</i> , 730 F.2d 1440, 1446 (1984).....	46
<i>United States v. Adams</i> , 383 U.S. 39 (1966).....	47

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.