

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

L'OREAL USA, INC.
Petitioner

v.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
Patent Owner

IPR2018-00778
Patent No. 6,423,327

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '327 PATENT	3
A.	The Relevant Distinction Between the Epidermal vs. Dermal Layers of the Skin as Taught in the '327 Patent	3
B.	The '327 Patent's Inventions Enhance the Condition of Unbroken, Non-Diseased Skin, Without Increasing Dermal Cell Proliferation.....	5
C.	The '327 Patent's Claims Require Applying Adenosine to the Dermal Cells Without Increasing Dermal Cell Proliferation.....	9
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
A.	“adenosine concentration applied to the dermal cells is 10^{-4} M to 10^{-7} M”	11
B.	Petitioner's Proposed Construction Is Contrary To The Plain Meaning Of The Claim.	12
C.	Petitioner's Proposed Construction Is Contrary To The Specification	14
D.	Petitioner's Proposed Construction Is Inconsistent With The Prosecution History	16
E.	The Board Should Disregard the Petition's § 112 Written Description Arguments and Deny the Petition	19
IV.	OVERVIEW OF PETITION GROUNDS	22
V.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CLAIM IS ANTICIPATED BY DE '107	22
A.	Overview of DE '107	22
B.	DE '107 is Based on <i>Increasing</i> Cell Proliferation.....	23
C.	DE '107 Teaches Thousands of Formulations, But Does Not Teach Delivery of Adenosine to the Dermal Layer at All, Let Alone in the Claimed Range.	24
D.	DE '107 Was Cited During Prosecution of the '327 Patent.	26
E.	DE '107 Does Not Anticipate.	29

VI.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CLAIM IS OBVIOUS OVER DE '107	34
VII.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CLAIM IS OBVIOUS OVER THE COMBINATION OF JP '153 AND DE '107	40
	A. Overview of JP '153.....	40
	B. JP '153 Does Not Teach Delivery of Adenosine to the Dermal Layer of Cells at the Claimed Range of the '327 Patent.....	42
	C. The Petition Does Not Provide A Motivation To Combine Or Modify JP '153 and/or DE '107.....	44
	D. The Combination Would Necessarily Fall Outside Claim 1 of the '327 Patent.....	47
VIII.	PATENT OWNER ASSERTS ITS RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY JURY	50
IX.	INSTITUTION SHOULD BE BARRED BY SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY	50
X.	CONCLUSION.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>A123 Sys., Inc. v. Hydro-Quebec</i> , 626 F.3d 1213 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	52
<i>In re Antoine</i> , 559 F.2d 618 (CCPA 1977)	48
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	38
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. IRECO, Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	32
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chemical Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	32, 33, 34
<i>In re Woodruff</i> 919 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	35
<i>Continental Can Co. USA, Inc., v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	33
<i>Elekta Instrument v. OUR Scientific Intern.</i> , 214 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	18
<i>Fed. Mar. Comm’n v. S.C. State Ports Auth.</i> , 535 U.S. 743 (2002).....	51
<i>General Electric Co. v. Joiner</i> , 522 U.S. 136 (1997).....	38
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize Prods., Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	48
<i>In re Bond</i> , 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	29

<i>Ineos USA, LLC v. Berry Plastics, Corp.</i> , 783 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	30, 31
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	45
<i>Library of Congress v. Shaw</i> , 478 U.S. 310 (1986).....	51
<i>Millenium Pharms., Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	33, 40
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 F. App’x 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	46
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	10
<i>Quantum Corp. v. Rodime, PLC</i> , 65 F.3d 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	20
<i>Regents of Univ. Of N.M. v. Knight</i> , 321 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	52
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	29
<i>Securus Techs., Inc. v. Global Tel Link Corp.</i> , 701 Fed. Appx. 971	45
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC</i> , 584 U.S. __ (2018).....	50
<i>Tegic Commc’ns Corp. v. Bd. Of Regents of Univ. of Tex. Sys.</i> , 458 F.3d 1355.....	52
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.</i> , 617 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	45

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.