

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 IPR2016-01413  
U.S. Patent No. 9,034,376

---

**PATENT OWNERS' RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES*  
REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities .....	iii
Exhibit List.....	vi
Table of Abbreviations.....	xiv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	2
A. There Was a Long-Felt Need For a Solution to the Problem of Opioid Abuse at the Time of the Inventions .....	2
B. Abuse-Deterrent OxyContin® .....	4
C. The '376 Patent .....	6
1. The '376 Patent Specification.....	7
2. The '534 Provisional Application.....	8
3. Pertinent Prosecution History of the '376 Patent .....	8
D. The References Cited by Amneal Do Not Teach or Suggest the Claimed Inventions.....	11
1. Royce.....	11
2. McGinity .....	14
3. Hoffmeister .....	16
4. Joshi.....	18
5. PDR-1999.....	26
III. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	27
IV. Claim Construction.....	27
A. “gelling agent in an effective amount to impart a viscosity” .....	27
B. “subjected to tampering [by dissolution]”.....	29
V. Amneal’s Unpatentability Grounds Fail.....	31
A. Legal Standard.....	31
B. Amneal’s Obviousness Ground Fails.....	33
1. A POSA Would Not Have Started With Royce To Arrive at	

	the Claimed Inventions .....	35
2.	Joshi Is Not Prior Art .....	37
3.	Even if Joshi Is Viewed as Prior Art, McGinity, Hoffmeister, Joshi, and PDR-1999 Do Not Suggest Modifying Royce To Practice the Claimed Inventions .....	39
4.	A POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Successfully Practicing the Claimed Inventions .....	51
5.	Amneal’s References Fail to Disclose the Viscosity Elements .....	54
VI.	Conclusion .....	58

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Application of Mercier</i> , 515 F.2d 1161 (C.C.P.A. 1975) .....	32
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc) .....	19
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics Inc. v. Illumina, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01093, Paper No. 69 (Jan. 7, 2016) .....	20
<i>Bausch &amp; Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.</i> , 796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	32, 39
<i>CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fielder GMBH &amp; Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	28
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	31, 42
<i>Dynamic Drinkware LLC v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	20, 32
<i>Epcon Gas Sys., Inc. v. Bauer Compressors, Inc.</i> , 90 F. App'x 540 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	28
<i>Ex Parte Yamaguchi</i> , 88 USPQ2d 1606 (BPAI 2008) .....	20
<i>In re Eaton</i> , 545 F. App'x 994 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	27
<i>In re Giacomini</i> , 612 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	20

<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	32
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	49
<i>In re OxyContin Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 04-md-1603, 2014 WL 2198590 (S.D.N.Y. May 27, 2014) .....	30
<i>In re Wesslau</i> , 353 F.2d 238 (C.C.P.A. 1965) .....	32
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Comm's.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	1
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	31, 33, 50
<i>Leo Pharm. Products, Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	31, 42
<i>Moore N. Am., Inc. v. Poser Business Forms, Inc.</i> , No. 99-cv-570, 2000 WL 1481001 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 2000) .....	28
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	50
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	32
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques v. Olympus America, Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	22, 23, 24
<i>Personal Web Technologies, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	33, 34
<i>Playtex Prod., Inc. v. Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , 400 F.3d 901 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	28

# 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.