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.

Case IPR2018-00717 U.S. Patent No. 9,492,393

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page			
TAE	BLE O	F AUTHORITIES	iii			
		F ABBREVIATIONS				
		EXHIBITS				
I.		TRODUCTION				
II.		BACKGROUND				
	A.					
	В.	The '393 Patent and Prosecution History				
	C.	Pending Litigations	6			
	D.	The Impax Merger	7			
III.	PER	SON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ("POSA")				
IV.		CLAIM CONSTRUCTION				
	A.	"Compression Shaped" And "Compression"	9			
	B.	"Curing"				
	C.	"Optionally"	11			
	D.	"Total Combined Weight Of Said High And Low Molecular Weight PEO"				
	Е.	"Selected From The Group Consisting Of 4,000,0000; 7,000,000; And A Combination Thereof"				
	F.					
V.	HAS	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS NOT IDENTIFIED AMNEAL AS A REAL PARTY-IN-INTEREST				
	A.					
		1. Factors relevant to determining who is a real-party-in-interest	17			
		2. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) Time Bar				
	В.	Amneal Is A Real-Party-In-Interest	19			



TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

Page

		1.		19	
		2.			
		3.	Amneal and Kashiv were represented by the same counsel in prior IPRs, and are currently represented by the same counsel in a litigation involving the '393 patent	25	
		4.	Kashiv equates itself with Amneal in its Petition	27	
	C.	The l	Petition Should Be Time-Barred Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	28	
VI.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER'S ASSERTED PRIOR ART AND ARGUMENTS HAVE ALREADY BEEN REJECTED BY THE EXAMINER				
	A.		Examiner Determined That Purdue's Density Testing llts Were Unexpected	31	
		1.	A POSA would have expected curing to increase the density	32	
		2.	Purdue's data establishes an unexpected density decrease	34	
		3.	Decreased density provides superior results	40	
		4.	Decreased density is not a latent property	42	
	B.	The Petition Presents Substantially The Same Prior Art Or Arguments Previously Considered By The Office			
		1.	Ground 1 Presents Substantially The Same Prior Art Or Arguments Previously Considered By The Office	44	
		2.	Ground 2 Presents Substantially The Same Prior Art Or Arguments Previously Considered By The Office	47	
VII	CON	CLUS	ION	50	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

P:	age
Cases	
Apotex Inc. et al. v. Osi Pharms, Inc., IPR2016-01284, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2017)	30
Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennet Regulatory Guards, Inc., IPR2013-00453, Paper 88 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 6, 2015)pass	sim
Becton, Dickinson and Company v. B. Braun Melsungen AG, IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	.30
Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Tech., LLC, IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014)	39
Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc., 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	29
In re Baxter Travenol, Labs., 952 F.2d 389392 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	43
In re Garnero, 412 F.2d 276 (CCPA 1979)	14
Johnson Health v. ICON Health and Fitness, IPR2014-01242, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2015)	27
Multilayer Stretch Cling Film Holdings, Inc. v. Berry Plastics Corp., 831 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	13
Petroleum Geo-Services, Inc. v. WesternGeco, L.L.C., IPR2014-00689, Paper 22 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2014)	18
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	9



Purdue Pharma L.P. et al. v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC, 17-cv-00210-RGA (D. Del. Mar. 1, 2017)	6, 26
Purdue Pharma L.P. et al. v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC, C.A. No. 15-1152-RGA (D. Del. Dec. 15, 2015)	19, 22
Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Kashiv, 17-cv-210, D.I. 86 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2018)	26
Unified Patents Inc. v. John L. Berman, IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 14, 2016)	50
Zoll Lifecor Corp. v. Electronics N. Am. Corp. et al., IPR2013-00609, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2014)	passim
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. 315(d)	2
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2)	16
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	1, 18, 28
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	29, 43
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. 42.100(b)	8
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3)	39
77 Fed. Reg. 48,759 (Aug. 14, 2012)	16-18, 21
77 Fed Reg 48 760 (Aug 14 2012)	25



DOCKET

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.

