

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LUPIN LTD. AND LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

v.

HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00459
Patent 9,561,197

**HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	5
	A. RAVICTI® Litigation.....	5
	B. Technical Background	6
	1. UCDs and Treatment	6
	2. Response to Lupin’s Technical Background	10
	C. ’197 Patent Prosecution History.....	12
	D. Overview of the ’197 Patent	15
	1. “A method of treating a [UCD] in a subject”	17
	2. “a subject having a plasma PAA to PAGN ratio outside of the target range of 1 to 2 [or 2.5]”	18
	3. “administering to [the] subject ... a dosage of glyceryl tri-[4-phenylbutyrate] (HPN-100) effective to achieve a plasma PAA to PAGN ratio within the target range of 1 to 2 [or 2.5]”	19
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	20
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
	A. “PAA” and “PAGN”	24
	B. “A method of treating a [UCD] in a subject”	24
	C. “a subject having a plasma PAA to PAGN ratio outside the target range of 1 to 2 [or 2.5]”	26
	D. “administering ... a dosage of glyceryl tri-[4-phenylbutyrate] (HPN-100) effective to achieve a plasma PAA to PAGN ratio within the target range of 1 to 2 [or 2.5]”	27

V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY LUPIN’S PETITION.....	29
A.	Lupin’s Petition Fails to Articulate a <i>Prima Facie</i> Case of Obviousness Because It Fails to Identify Prior Art Describing or Suggesting Each Element of the Claims.....	29
B.	The Claimed Methods Are Not Obvious Over the Prior Art.....	35
1.	Scope and Content of the Prior Art	36
a.	Enns 2010	36
b.	MacArthur	37
c.	Piscitelli.....	40
2.	Differences Between the Claimed Invention and the Prior Art	43
a.	No Teaching or Suggestion of Plasma PAA:PAGN Ratio	43
b.	No Teaching or Suggestion of Target Range.....	48
c.	No Teaching or Suggestion of Utility of PAA:PAGN Ratio in a Method of Treating UCD Patients	51
d.	Teaching Away.....	52
3.	Secondary Considerations.....	54
a.	Surprising and Unexpected Results.....	54
b.	Long-Felt But Unmet Need.....	55
VI.	LUPIN’S PETITION PRESENTS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ART AND ARGUMENTS CONSIDERED DURING PROSECUTION.....	56
VII.	CONCLUSION	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>BSP Software LLC v. Motio, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00307, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2013)	34
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Biogen MA Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01136, Paper 23 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 2, 2015).....	35
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VII LLC v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01718, Paper 40 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 21, 2017)	55
<i>Envtl. Designs, Inc. v. Union Oil Co.</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	23
<i>Google Inc. v. EveryMD.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....	34
<i>Hosp. Core Servs. LLC v. Nomadix, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00052, 2016 WL 2909164 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 27, 2016)	23
<i>In re Smith Int’l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	24
<i>Kinetic Techs. Inc. v. Skywords Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00530, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 29, 2014).....	32
<i>Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs. Inc.</i> , 132 S.Ct. 1289 (2012)	15
<i>Merck Sharp & Dohme B.V. v. Warner Chilcott Co., LLC</i> , 711 F. App’x 633 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	50, 51
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred Int’l, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00023, Paper 32 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 11, 2013).....	5, 32, 34
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Polaris Innovations Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00382, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. June 23, 2017).....	32
<i>Varian Med. Sys., Inc. v. William Beaumont Hosp.</i> , IPR2016-00162, Paper 69 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2017).....	56

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 1031, 15
35 U.S.C. § 313 1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)29
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)56

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 1

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.