

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC
Petitioner

v.

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

Case IPR2016-01027
U.S. Patent No. 9,060,976

**PATENT OWNERS' RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES*
REVIEW UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exhibit List.....	v
Table of Abbreviations.....	xvi
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	5
A. There Was a Long Felt Need For a Solution to the Problem of Opioid Abuse at the Time of the Invention.....	5
B. Abuse-Deterrent OxyContin®	6
C. The '976 Patent	10
1. Disclosure of the '976 Patent.....	12
2. Pertinent Prosecution History of the '976 Patent	13
D. The Prior Art Does Not Teach or Suggest a Core Combining Oxycodone with Magnesium Stearate and PEO	16
1. McGinity	16
2. Joshi.....	22
3. Palermo	23
4. HPE-3 rd and Other Magnesium Stearate Prior Art	24
III. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	26
IV. Claim Construction.....	27
A. “PEG applied onto the core matrix”.....	27
B. “extended release”	27
C. “abuse deterrent”	28
D. “core matrix is heated to melt at least a portion of the PEO included in the core matrix during preparation of the dosage form”.....	31
V. Amneal’s Obviousness Ground Fails	32
A. A POSA Would Not Have Consulted McGinity To Tackle the Problem of Abuse Deterrence	34
B. The Prior Art Taught Away from Using McGinity’s HME Process To Combine Oxycodone with Magnesium Stearate and PEO.....	38

1.	The Handbook of Pharmaceutical Excipients and Related References Teach Away From Using Magnesium Stearate	38
2.	Bastin Teaches Not To Add Abuse-Deterring Gelling Properties to Extended-Release Formulations	41
3.	The CPDD Paper Demonstrates That the Art Teaches Away ..	42
C.	Joshi and Palermo Do Not Teach Modifying McGinity in a Way That Practices the Claimed Invention	43
D.	Anneal Presented No Evidence of Motivation To Combine Particular Portions of the Prior Art in a Way That Practices the Claimed Invention	44
E.	A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Successfully Practicing the Invention	49
F.	Objective Indicia Confirm Nonobviousness	54
1.	Commercial Success	54
2.	Regulatory Success	56
3.	Initial Skepticism, Unexpected Results, and Subsequent Acclaim	58
VI.	Conclusion	59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Application of Mercier</i> , 515 F.2d 1161 (C.C.P.A. 1975)	33
<i>Astrazeneca Pharms. LP v. Handa Pharms., LLC</i> , No. 08-3773, 2010 WL 4941431 (D.N.J. Nov. 30, 2010).....	28
<i>Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.</i> , 796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	33, 42
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	30
<i>Catalina Mktg Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	29
<i>Deere & Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC</i> , 703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	28, 29
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdoff Licensing, Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	57
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	32
<i>Electro Sci. Indus., Inc. v. Dynamic Details, Inc.</i> , 307 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	29
<i>Glaxo Wellcome, Inc. v. Impax Labs., Inc.</i> , 356 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	28
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Products Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	45

<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	45
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	32, 45, 46, 57
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	32, 59
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	31
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	58
<i>Mitsubishi Chem. Corp. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 718 F. Supp. 2d 382 (S.D.N.Y. 2010)	55
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	33
<i>Poly-Am., L.P. v. GSE Lining Tech., Inc.</i> , 383 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	31
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	35
<i>Proveris Sci. Corp. v. Innovasystems, Inc.</i> , 739 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	30
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich., Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	42
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	32, 37

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.