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 IPR2018-00293

US Patent No. 9,173,857

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

PUBLIC



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I IOT	r oe e	VIIID	TTC	:		
			ITS			
IAD I.		LE OF AUTHORITIES				
II.	The Exa	troduction				
III.	The Shojaei '857 Patent – A Three Component, Three Delivery Mode (IR-DPR-SR) Amphetamine Dosage System					
	A.	The 1	Invention and Its Technical Background	9		
	B.	Perso	on 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				
	E.	Clair	n Construction	19		
		1.	"About"	20		
		2.	"No Food Effect"	20		
IV.	Petit	Petitioner's Prior Art2				
	A.	Burnside (EX1002) Does Not Disclose a Three-Bead/Three- Mode Combination				
	B.	ADDERALL XR (EX1003, EX1031) Does Not Disclose a Three-Bead/Three-Mode Combination				
	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	26		
		3.	Midha (EX1018) – Triple Pulse Methylphenidate			
		4.	Couch (EX1023) – No Extrapolation			
		5.	Rudnic (EX1016) and Burnside '776 (EX1017) - Different Drugs and Different Formulations	30		



TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

V.	The Board Should Deny Institution of Ground 1 Because Burnside Does Not Disclose the Combination of Features in any Claim				
	A.	Burnside Lacks the Claimed Three-Bead IR-DPR-SR Combination			
	B.		endent Claims 2-4 Are Not Anticipated (Different ings)	37	
	C.	Clair	ms 13-16 and 29 Are Not Anticipated (Cores, Layers)	37	
	D.	Clair	ms 17-18 Are Not Anticipated (Amphetamine salts)	38	
	E.	Clair	ms 5-12 Are Not Anticipated (PK Claims)	38	
	F.		m 19 Is Not Anticipated (No Food Effect)		
VI.		ms 1-29 Are Not Obvious over Burnside or ADDERALL XR n Burnside (Grounds 2 and 3)43			
VII.	The Board Should Deny Institution of Ground 2 Because Burnside Does Not Make Any Claim Obvious				
		1.	Burnside Does Not Suggest the Pharmaceutical Composition of Claim 1	47	
		2.	Burnside Does Not Suggest the Features of the Dependent Claims	51	
	В.	ADI	Board Should Deny Institution of Ground 3 Because DERALL XR and Burnside Do Not Make any Claims ious	52	
		1.	The Prior Art Did Not Suggest the Claimed Combination and Its Success	53	
		2.	No Other References Motivated Combining ADDERALL XR And Burnside	56	
	C.	Claims 2-4 are not Obvious (Coatings)			
	D.	Claims 5-12 are not Obvious (Pharmacokinetics)5			
	E.	Claims 13-18 and 29 are not Obvious (Cores, Layers, Salts)6			
	F.		m 19 is not Obvious (No Food Effect)		



34842576v1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

			Page
	G.	Claims 20-28 are not Obvious (Dosage Amounts)	64
VIII.	Objec	etive Evidence that the Claims Are Not Obvious	65
IX.	CON	CLUSION	68



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	Malinowsi, 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)



DOCKET

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.

