

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

KVK-TECH, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SHIRE LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2018-00290  
US Patent No. 8,846,100

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

PUBLIC

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| LIST OF EXHIBITS .....   | iv   |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....   | vi   |
| I. Introduction.....   | 1    |
| II. The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) because the Examiner Thoroughly Considered the Same Arguments about Burnside and ADDERALL XR..... | 4    |
| III. The Shojaei ‘100 Patent – A Three Component, Three Delivery Mode (IR-DPR-SR) Amphetamine Dosage System.....   | 8    |
| A. The Invention and Its Technical Background .....  | 9    |
| B. Person of Ordinary (Not Extraordinary) Skill in the Art .....   | 13   |
| C. The Shojaei Specification.....  | 14   |
| D. The Prosecution History – Repeated Rejections over Burnside Were Correctly Overcome .....   | 15   |
| E. Claim Construction.....   | 19   |
| 1. “About” .....   | 19   |
| 2. “No Food Effect” .....  | 20   |
| IV. Petitioner’s Prior Art.....  | 20   |
| A. Burnside (EX1002) Does Not Disclose a Three-Bead/Three-Mode Combination.....  | 21   |
| B. ADDERALL XR (EX1003, EX1031) Does Not Disclose a Three-Bead/Three-Mode Combination.....   | 23   |
| C. The “Motivational” References Fail .....  | 25   |
| 1. Kratochvil (EX1010) States a Problem but not the Claimed Solution.....  | 25   |
| 2. Mehta (EX1015) – No Pulses and a Different Drug.....  | 25   |
| 3. Midha (EX1018) – Triple Pulse Methylphenidate .....   | 27   |
| 4. Couch (EX1023) – No Extrapolation .....   | 29   |
| 5. Rudnic (EX1016) and Burnside ‘776 (EX1017) - Different Drugs and Different Formulations .....   | 30   |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| V. The Board Should Deny Institution of Ground 1 Because Burnside Does Not Disclose the Combination of Features In Any Claim ..... | 30          |
| A. Burnside Lacks the Claimed Three-Bead IR-DPR-SR Combination .....   | 34          |
| B. Dependent Claims 2-4 Are Not Anticipated (Different Coatings) .....   | 36          |
| C. Claims 13-18 and 31 Are Not Anticipated (Cores, Layers).....  | 37          |
| D. Claims 19-20 Are Not Anticipated (Amphetamine salts).....   | 37          |
| E. Claims 5-12 Are Not Anticipated (PK Claims) .....   | 38          |
| F. Claim 21 Is Not Anticipated (No Food Effect).....   | 41          |
| VI. Claims 1-31 Are Not Obvious over Burnside or ADDERALL XR With Burnside (Grounds 2 and 3) .....                                 | 42          |
| A. The Board Should Deny Institution of Ground 2 Because Burnside Does Not Make Any Claim Obvious.....                             | 46          |
| 1. Burnside Does Not Suggest the Pharmaceutical Composition of Claim 1 .....   | 47          |
| 2. Burnside Does Not Suggest the Features of the Dependent Claims .....  | 51          |
| B. The Board Should Deny Institution of Ground 3 Because ADDERALL XR and Burnside Do Not Make any Claims Obvious.....              | 52          |
| 1. The Prior Art Did Not Suggest the Claimed Combination and Its Success .....   | 52          |
| 2. No Other References Motivated Combining ADDERALL XR And Burnside .....  | 56          |
| C. Claims 2-4 are not Obvious (Coatings).....  | 58          |
| D. Claims 5-12 are not Obvious (Pharmacokinetics) .....  | 59          |
| E. Claims 13-20 and 31 are not Obvious (Cores, Layers, Salts).....   | 62          |
| F. Claim 21 is not Obvious (No Food Effect) .....  | 63          |
| G. Claims 22-30 are not Obvious (Dosage Amounts) .....   | 63          |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| VII. Objective Evidence that the Claims Are Not Obvious ..... | 64          |
| VIII. CONCLUSION.....   | 67          |

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2001 | DECLARATION OF BERNHARDT L. TROUT, Ph.D. (with CV)                 |
| 2002 | DECLARATION OF SARA ROSENBAUM, Ph.D. (with CV)                     |
| 2003 | FDA Orange Book Listing for MYDAYIS® (NDA N022063)                 |
| 2004 | MYDAYIS® FDA Label (06-2017)                                       |
| 2005 | MYDAYIS® Website Pages   |
| 2006 | Amidon, U.S. Patent No. 5,229,131                                  |
| 2007 | Mehta, U.S. Patent No. 5,837,284                                   |
| 2008 | IPR2017-00011 Decision Denying Institution (RE41, 148 (300 Patent) |
| 2009 | Excerpts from Merck, 11th Ed                                       |
| 2010 | Ansel, Popovich & Allen 6th, Ch. 3-5 (1995)                        |
| 2011 | Sonsalia, Remington Ch. 74, - CNS Stimulants (1995)                |
| 2012 | Robinson, Remington, Ch. 94 - Sustained Release (1995)             |
| 2013 | Porter, Remington, Ch. 93 – Coating (1995)                         |
| 2014 | Franz, Remington Vol. II, Ch. 57 - Sympathomimetic Drugs (1995)    |
| 2015 | Malinowski, Remington, Ch. 53 – Bioequivalence (2000)              |
| 2016 | Stempel, 7th Ed. - Dispensing of Medication (1971)                 |
| 2017 | USP 23 NF 18 - Uniformity Sec. 905 (1955)                          |
| 2018 | USP 23 NF 18 1995 - Excerpts (1955)                                |
| 2019 | Patrick, Human Psychopharmacology, 12:527-546 (1997)               |
| 2020 | Spencer, Arch Gen Psych, 58:775-78 (2001 Aug)                      |
| 2021 | Lehninger, Principles of Biochemistry, Excerpt (1993)              |
| 2022 | Benet, Toxicologic Pathology, 23:115-123 (1995)                    |
| 2023 | Shargel, Applied Bio & Pharmacokinetics, Ch. 2 (1999)              |
| 2024 | Gibaldi, Biopharmaceutics & Clinical Pharmacokinetics, Ch.1 (1991) |
| 2025 | Gibaldi, Biopharmaceutics & Clinical Pharmacokinetics, Ch.5 (1991) |
| 2026 | Chiao, Remington, Ch. 94 – Sustained Release (1995)                |
| 2027 | Hinsvark, J. Pharmacokin. Biopharm., 1:319-328 (1973)              |
| 2028 | Benet, Transplantation Proc., 31 (Suppl 3A), 7S-9S (1999)          |
| 2029 | Winters, Basic Clinical Pharmacokinetics (1994)                    |

# 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.