

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

ALKERMES PHARMA IRELAND LIMITED,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-00943  
Patent 7,919,499

---

**Patent Owner's Response  
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review  
of U.S. Patent No. 7,919,499**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Claim Construction.....	4
A. “the step of parenterally administering a long acting formulation comprising about 310 mg to about 480 mg of naltrexone” .....	5
B. “the serum AUC of naltrexone . . . achieved by 50 mg/day oral administration” .....	7
C. “initial oral dose of naltrexone” .....	10
III. Amneal Has Not Established Anticipation.....	12
A. Ground 1: The Claims Are Not Anticipated by Comer .....	13
1. Comer Does Not Disclose a Single Injection of Naltrexone Within the Claimed Range of Doses .....	13
2. Comer Does Not Disclose the Claimed AUC Differential .....	14
3. Comer Does Not Disclose “Treating” .....	20
B. Ground 2: The Claims Are Not Anticipated by Nuwayser .....	25
1. Nuwayser Does Not Disclose a Single Injection of Naltrexone Within the Claimed Range of Doses .....	25
2. Nuwayser Does Not Disclose the Claimed AUC Differential.....	25
3. Nuwayser Does Not Disclose the Claimed Range of Doses .....	26
C. At a Minimum, Dependent Claims 10 and 11 Are Not Anticipated...26	
1. Claim 10: Comer Does Not Disclose Administration to an Individual Afflicted by Alcohol Dependency .....	27
2. Claim 11: Neither Comer nor Nuwayser Disclose Administration Without an Initial Oral Dose .....	28
IV. Amneal Has Not Established Obviousness .....	29

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
A. Amneal’s Obviousness Grounds Rely on Improper Hindsight.....	30
B. Grounds 3 & 4: The Claims Are Not Obvious Over Comer, Nuwayser, Rubio, and Wright.....	35
1. The Asserted Combination Does Not Disclose a Single Injection of Naltrexone Within the Claimed Range of Doses .....	35
2. The Asserted Combination Does Not Disclose the Claimed AUC Differential .....	36
3. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated or Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining the Asserted References....	36
4. At a Minimum, Dependent Claims 2, 6–9, and 11 Are Not Obvious Over Comer, Nuwayser, Rubio, and Wright.....	38
C. Ground 5: The Claims Are Not Obvious Over Nuwayser, Kranzler, Rubio, and Wright .....	43
1. The Asserted Combination Does Not Disclose a Single Injection of Naltrexone Within the Claimed Range of Doses .....	43
2. The Asserted Combination Does Not Disclose the Claimed AUC Differential .....	44
3. The Asserted Combination Does Not Disclose the Claimed Range of Doses.....	44
4. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated Or Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining the Asserted References....	46
5. At a Minimum, Dependent Claims 2, 6–9, and 11 Are Not Obvious Over Nuwayser, Kranzler, Rubio and Wright .....	47
D. Ground 6: The Claims Are Not Obvious Over Alkermes 10-K, Vivitrex Specimen, Rubio, and Wright.....	47
1. Neither the Alkermes 10-K nor the Vivitrex Specimen Qualify as Prior Art.....	47

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
2. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated Or Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining the Asserted References....	49
3. The Asserted Combination Does Not Teach or Suggest All Claim Features .....	50
E. Objective Indicia Support a Finding of Nonobviousness .....	51
1. Commercial success .....	52
2. Others Failed and There Was a Long-Felt, But Unsolved, Need ..	53
3. The Claimed Invention Provided Unexpected Results .....	55
4. There Was Skepticism in the Industry .....	57
5. Vivitrol <sup>®</sup> Has Received Industry Praise and Recognition .....	59
V. Conclusion .....	60

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****CASES**

<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kan. City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	29, 51
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	29, 35, 36, 50
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments</i> , 134 S.Ct. 2120 (2014).....	8, 9
<i>Apple Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	51
<i>Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	53
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese &amp; Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	30
<i>Continental Can Co. USA Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	12
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	53
<i>DePuy Spine Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	37
<i>Hansgirk v. Kemmer</i> , 102 F.2d 212 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	12
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	12
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	30, 31
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	48, 49
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	48

# 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.