

IPR2018-00625
Patent No. 9,492,392
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
Attorney Docket No. KASHIV 7.1R-004

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

KASHIV PHARMA, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

PURDUE PHARMA L.P.,
THE P.F. LABORATORIES, INC., and
PURDUE PHARMACEUTICALS L.P.,

Patent Owners.

Patent No. 9,492,392 to McKenna *et al.*
Issue Date: November 15, 2016
Title: TAMPER RESISTANT DOSAGE FORMS

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2018-00625

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES*
REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,492,392**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
EXHIBIT LIST	vii
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
I. OVERVIEW	1
II. REQUIREMENTS FOR PETITION FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	3
A. Notice Of Each Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	3
B. Notice Of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))	3
C. Designation Of Lead And Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....	4
D. Notice Of Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	5
E. Grounds For Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	5
III. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED (37 C.F.R. § 104(B))	6
IV. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	6
V. SUMMARY OF THE '392 PATENT	9
VI. PERTINENT PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '392 PATENT	10
VII. PURDUE DID NOT DEMONSTRATE AN UNEXPECTED DENSITY DECREASE OR A SUPERIOR RESULT	12
A. Purdue's Data Would Not Establish A Density Decrease To A POSA.....	12
B. Density Is Not A Superior Result	16

C. Purdue’s Evidence Is Not Commensurate With The Scope Of The Claims.....	17
VIII. PERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART	18
IX. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	19
A. “Compression Shaped” And “Compression”	19
B. “Air Cured” And “Curing”	20
C. “Optionally”	20
D. “Total Combined Weight Of Said High And Low Molecular Weight PEO”	21
E. “Selected From The Group Consisting Of 4,000,000; 7,000,000; And A Combination Thereof”	22
F. Product-By-Process Limitations	22
X. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART	23
XI. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER THE PRIOR ART	25
A. Legal Background.....	26
B. Ground 1: The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Over Bartholomaeus (Ex. 1024) In View Of McGinity (Ex. 1025), Oshlack 2 (Ex. 1026), And Oshlack 1 (Ex. 1016).....	28
1. Independent Claim 1 Is Obvious.....	29
1. The Dependent Claims Are Also Obvious	35
C. Ground 2: The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Over Wright (Ex. 1017) In View Of Royce (Ex. 1027), Moroni (Ex. 1028), And Shao (Ex. 1029)	41
1. Independent Claim 1 Is Obvious.....	41
2. The Dependent Claims Are Also Obvious	48

D. Ground 3: Oshlack 1 (Ex. 1016) In View Of Bartholomaus (Ex. 1024), McGinity (Ex. 1025), And Oshlack 2 (Ex. 1026)	52
XII. CLAIM CHART	54
XIII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	60
XIV. CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
<i>Alcon Research, LTD. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	27
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955).....	26, 28
<i>Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	62
<i>In re Baxter Travenol, Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 389392 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	13
<i>Cadence Pharms., Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	20
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., L.L.C. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	19, 20
<i>In re DBC</i> , 545 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	62
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	16, 61
<i>Hoffmann La. Roche, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	60
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	27
<i>In re Harris</i> , 409 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	17
<i>In re Thorpe</i> , 777 F.2d 695 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	23
<i>In re Tiffin</i> , 448 F.2d 791 (1971)	17

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.