

Paper No. ____
Filed: December 4, 2017

Filed on behalf of: Mylan Technologies, Inc.
By: Steven W. Parmelee (sparmelee@wsgr.com)
Michael T. Rosato (mrosato@wsgr.com)
Jad A. Mills (jmills@wsgr.com)
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2018-00173
Patent No. 9,724,310

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,724,310**

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Introduction	1
A. Brief Overview of the '310 Patent.....	4
B. Brief Overview of the Prosecution History	5
C. Brief Overview of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art	8
D. Brief Overview of the Level of Skill in the Art	15
E. Background Knowledge in the Art Prior to July 10, 2008	16
II. Grounds for Standing.....	19
III. Mandatory Notices under 37 C.F.R. §42.8.....	20
IV. Statement of the Precise Relief Requested	21
V. Claim Construction	22
A. “About”	24
B. “Coat weight”	25
C. “Flux”	26
D. “Therapeutically Effective Amount”.....	27
VI. Detailed Explanation Of Grounds For Unpatentability.....	28
A. [Ground 1] Claims 1-2, 8, and 10-15 are Anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 by Mueller.	28
B. [Ground 2] Claims 1-2 and 8-15 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Mueller and Vivelle-Dot [®] Label.....	41
C. [Ground 3] Claims 3-7 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Mueller, Vivelle-Dot [®] Label, and Kanios.	47
D. [Ground 4] Claims 1-15 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Mueller, Vivelle-Dot [®] Label, Kanios, and Chien.	54
VII. Secondary Indicia of Non-obviousness	58
VIII. Conclusion.....	61
IX. Certificate of Compliance	62
X. Payment of Fees under 37 C.F.R. §§42.15(a) and 42.103.....	63
XI. Appendix – List of Exhibits	64

I. INTRODUCTION

Mylan Technologies, Inc. (“Mylan”) requests review of U.S. Patent No. 9,724,310 to Mantelle (“the ’310 patent,” EX1001), which issued on August 8, 2017. PTO records indicate that the ’310 patent is assigned to Noven Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (Patent Owner, “PO”). This Petition demonstrates that there is a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-15 of the ’310 patent are unpatentable for failure to distinguish over the prior art asserted herein. An additional petition is being filed simultaneously to address similar claims of related U.S. Patent No. 9,730,900, also assigned to PO.

These patents are directed to a monolithic (single drug-containing layer) transdermal drug delivery system (*i.e.*, a transdermal patch) for the administration of estradiol, and to conventional methods of making and administering them. The patch comprises a backing layer, and a single drug-containing adhesive polymer matrix, and optionally a release liner. The claims specify parameters for coat weight, drug loading (dose per-unit-area), and estradiol flux (permeation over time) that were each known in the prior art.

The art of transdermal delivery of estradiol using monolithic patches was well developed by the time of the ’310 patent’s earliest claimed priority in July, 2008. In fact, PO had obtained FDA approval for one patch system, termed Vivelle[®], as early as 1994. EX1008 (Vivelle[®] Label); EX1034 (Orange Book

Listing), 0175. In 1999, PO received FDA approval for a second-generation patch system with higher estradiol flux, termed Vivelle-Dot[®], which permitted the delivery of the same amount of estradiol as Vivelle[®], but in smaller patches. EX1006 (Vivelle-Dot[®] Label); EX1034, 0175. The art made clear that smaller adhesive patches were desirable for a number of reasons, both aesthetic and practical (*e.g.*, reduced skin irritation, better adhesive properties, improved patient satisfaction, improved compliance, and reduced packaging costs).

Thus, before July, 2008, it was well recognized in the art that one could deliver a drug more efficiently, and reduce the patch size for a given dose, by increasing the flux of a patch. The prior art described several methods for increasing the flux of monolithic transdermal patches, including for estradiol. For example, the prior art taught that higher flux can be achieved by increasing the amount of hydrophiles within the adhesive polymer matrix, or by using increased amounts of penetration enhancers. EX1005, ¶¶3, 5, 17-18, 27, 31; EX1007 (Kanios), ¶¶118-22, 126-28.

The prior art Mueller reference (EX1005) describes a monolithic transdermal estradiol delivery system in Example 3 that satisfies each of the elements of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 8, and 10-15. The Mueller system comprises a single drug-containing adhesive polymer matrix layer, a backing layer, and a release liner. Mueller teaches that the polymer matrix

comprises greater than 0.156 mg/cm² estradiol, acrylic and silicone adhesives, soluble polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP), dipropylene glycol as a penetration enhancer, and a coat weight above 10 mg/cm². Moreover, Mueller teaches that it provides a constant release of estradiol over a period of 72 hours, and achieves an estradiol flux of 0.015 mg/cm²/day, within the claimed range of “from about 0.0125 to about 0.05 mg/cm²/day.” Mueller Example 3 achieves a higher estradiol flux than was reported for the prior art Vivelle-Dot[®] patch. Mueller expressly teaches that higher flux permits the use of smaller patches to deliver a given amount of estradiol.

The prior art also teaches that increasing the coat weight of the drug-matrix layer of a patch results in an increased flux per-unit-area. For example, Chien, which was not of record during prosecution, explicitly teaches that increasing estradiol drug loading, or the coat weight of the adhesive polymer matrix of an estradiol patch, directly increased flux. EX1009, FIGS. 4-5. Yet, during prosecution, PO obtained allowance for the '310 patent by repeatedly asserting that it was “surprising and unexpected” that increasing the amount of estradiol per-unit-area (increasing the coat weight) of the drug-containing matrix would increase the flux of the patch. *See, e.g.*, EX1004, 0387; *see also id.*, 0013, 0120, 0382-0400, 0416-36.

Additional references besides Chien, including Kim and Ghosh, which were not of record during prosecution are discussed in this Petition, also teach that

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.