

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 RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF EXHIBITS	iv
PATENT OWNER’S RESPONSE.....	1
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Summary of Patent Owner’s Argument	1
B. The Posture of This IPR.....	6
II. SHOJAEI– A THREE COMPONENT, THREE DELIVERY (IR-DPR-SR) AMPHETAMINE DOSAGE SYSTEM.....	8
A. The Invention and Its Technical Background	8
B. Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art	15
C. The Shojaei Specification.....	17
D. Claim Construction.....	18
III. PETITIONER’S PRIOR ART.....	19
A. Burnside – Two Beads ONLY, No SR Combination	19
B. ADDERALL XR – Two Beads ONLY; No SR at All.....	21
C. No References Motivated Three Beads And SR Amphetamine	22
1. Kratochvil – A Problem and a Teach-Away	22
2. Mehta – No Pulses, No Amphetamine	22
3. Midha – Triple-Pulse Methylphenidate; Avoid SR.....	23
4. Couch – No Leap to Three-Bead SR Combinations	24
5. Rudnic, Burnside ‘776, and Wilson – Different Drugs, Different Combinations	25
IV. BURNSIDE DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY CLAIMS (GROUND 1).....	25
A. Claim 1 Is Not Anticipated	25
B. Claims 2-4, 13-18 and 29 Are Not Anticipated.....	26
C. Claims 5-12 and 19 Are Not Anticipated (PK Claims).....	27
V. CLAIM 1 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER BURNSIDE AND XR.....	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
A. No Motivation to Combine Burnside Example 4 with Example 5 or ADDERALL XR	29
B. Other References Did Not Point from Burnside to Shojaei.	32
1. Mehta, Rudnic, And Burnside ‘776 – No Pulse, Different Drugs	34
2. Couch – No Reason to Add Late SR after a Pulse	35
3. Wilson and Midha – SR Was Unsuitable	37
C. Burnside’s SR Bead Was Not “Obvious to Try”	38
D. No Reasonable Expectation of Success	40
1. Burnside’s In Vitro Release Profile Did Not Predict Therapeutic Success	41
(a) Petitioner’s In Vitro to In Vivo Predictions Are Unsound	42
(b) Predictability Needs Data that Was Unavailable	50
2. The Prior Art Taught Away From The Invention	52
(a) Acute Tolerance Discredited SR Amphetamine	53
(b) Pharmacodynamics Discouraged SR Amphetamine	57
VI. CLAIMS 2-4, 13-18, AND 19-20, AND 31 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER BURNSIDE ALONE WITH ADDERALL XR (COATINGS, CORES, AND SALTS)	59
VII. CLAIMS 5-12 AND 19 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER BURNSIDE ALONE OR WITH ADDERALL XR (“PK CLAIMS”)	59
A. Claims 5-12 Are Not Inherently Obvious (PK Claims)	60
1. Different Bead Ratios and Coatings of Burnside Make Different Compositions and Results	60
2. Expectation from Shojaei Is Not Inherency from Burnside	63
B. Claim 19 Is Not Inherently Obvious (No Food Effect)	64

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
VIII. CLAIMS 20-28 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER BURNSIDE ALONE OR WITH ADDERALL XR (“DOSAGE CLAIMS”).....	65
IX. OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE THAT THE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS	67
X. CONCLUSION.....	69

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, 10 (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)
2030	Rowland, Clinical Pharmacokinetics 2d (1989)

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.