

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Aurobindo Pharma USA Inc.
Petitioners,

v.

Andrx Labs, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00530
U.S. Patent No. 6,790,459

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Background 7

 A. State of the Art in November 2000 7

 B. Clinical Development and Approval of Fortamet® 8

 C. The '459 Patent 9

 D. Litigation Involving the '459 Patent 13

 E. Alleged Prior Art Relied on by Petitioner 17

III. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... 23

IV. Claim Construction 23

 A. “C_{max}” 24

 B. “T_{max}” 24

 C. “AUC₀₋₂₄” or “AUC_{0-24hr}” 25

 D. Other Claim Terms Not Requiring Construction 25

V. Institution Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 325(d) Because the Petitioner’s Request Provides Nothing New Over Its Previous Request for *Inter Partes* Review 26

 A. Institution Should Be Denied Under § 325(d) Because Petitioner Presents Substantially The Same Prior Art And Arguments Previously Presented To (and Rejected by) The Office 26

 B. The *General Plastic* Factors Strongly Favor Denial of Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)..... 27

VI. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any of Claims 1-21 is Obvious Over Cheng in View of Timmins, Wagner, Lewis, Gibaldi, and DeFronzo (Ground I) 33

 A. Petitioner’s Conclusory Assertions Cannot Support a Finding of Motivation to Combine with a Reasonable Expectation of Success... 33

 B. Petitioner And Its Declaration Fail to Properly Assert a Reasonable Expectation of Success 44

VII. Objective Indicia Support the Non-Obviousness of the Challenged Claims 45

VIII. Patent Owner Reserves the Right to Challenge the Validity of This *Inter Partes* Review Proceeding 48

IX. Conclusion 48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	35, 40
<i>Aurobindo Pharma</i> , IPR2017-01673, Papers 1, 10 and 11 (PTAB).....	2, 12, 27, 38
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> 496 US 661 (1990).....	15, 16
<i>General Plastic Indus. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357/-01358/-01359/-01360/-01361 (PTAB)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Intendis GMBH v. Glenmark Pharm. Inc., USA</i> , 822 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	32, 42, 43
<i>InTouch Techs. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	32, 42
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Sols., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2014).....	7
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	2
<i>In re NuVasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	32, 40, 41
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	32, 40, 41
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Elec. Co.</i> , IPR2016-00134, Paper 9 (PTAB May 4, 2016).....	25, 29
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Group, LLC</i> 584 U. S. ____ (2018) (slip op.,)	46
<i>Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	32, 42
<i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	32, 35

<i>Sciele Pharma, Inc. et al v. Lupin Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 1-09-cv-00105 (D. Md.).....	14
<i>Sciele Pharma, Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , 684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	36
<i>Sciele Pharma, Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , No. 09-0037 (D. Del.).....	14
<i>Shionogi Inc. and Andrx Labs. L.L.C. v. Aurobindo Pharma Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 1:17-cv-00072-MSG (D. Del. Jan. 25, 2017)	13
<i>Shionogi Inc. et al. v. Qingdao Baheal Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.</i> , No. 17-cv-1347-MSG (D. Del. Sept. 22, 2017).....	14
<i>Sinorgchem Co. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 511 F.3d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	22, 23
<i>Takeda Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., et. al. v. Mylan, Inc., et. al.</i> , No. 2-12-cv-00026 (W.D. Pa.).....	15
<i>Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited et al v. Mylan, Inc. et al.</i> , No. 1-12-cv-00024 (S.D.N.Y.)	14
<i>Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited et al v. Mylan, Inc. et al.</i> , No. 1-12-cv-02038 (S.D.N.Y.)	14
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman</i> , No. IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (PTAB December 14, 2016).....	25
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	32, 40, 41
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102.....	10, 16, 19
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	10, 16, 19
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....	30
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	2, 14, 24, 25, 31
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d)	48

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)21
37 C.F.R. § 42.1083, 25

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.