UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/083,167	03/17/2005	Elliot Ehrich	4000.3010 US1	8002

38421 7590 07/20/2010

ELMORE PATENT LAW GROUP, PC
515 Groton Road
Unit 1R
Westford, MA 01886

EXAMINER
CARTER, KENDRA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1627	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/20/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	11/083,167	EHRICH, ELLIOT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KENDRA D. CARTER	1627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 May 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23 and 26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *3-5* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6-23 and 26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/26/10*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The Examiner acknowledges the applicant's remarks and arguments of May 5, 2010 made to the office action filed January 6, 2010. Claims 1-23 and 26 are pending. Claims 24 and 25 are cancelled and claims 3-5 are withdrawn. Claim 1 is amended.

The declaration filed October 5, 2009 has been considered and found persuasive. Particularly, the Applicant's application exhibits a serum AUC of naltrexone at least about three times or at least about two times greater than that achieved by 50 mg/day oral administration, whereas the formulation of Tice is similar to a 50 mg/day oral administration. In light of the declaration and/or the Applicant's arguments, the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) rejections are withdrawn.

For the reasons in the previous office action and below, the Applicant's arguments of the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection were found not persuasive, thus the rejection is upheld.

The Examiner still upholds that there is allowable subject matter, wherein claim 1 is amended to include the polymer of claim 22, but the Applicant's still do not agree because the limitation would deny Applicant's the full scope of their invention.

In light of the amended claim, the modified 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection is below. The Applicant's arguments are also below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating an individual with a long acting formulation comprising naltrexone and polylactide-co-glycolide polymer wherein the serum AUC is at least about three times greater than that achieved by 50/mg/day oral administration, does not reasonably provide enablement for a formulation comprising any biocompatible polymer. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant claims are drawn to a method for treating an individual in need of naltrexone comprising the step of parenterally administering a long acting formulation wherein the serum AUC of naltrexone is at least about three times greater than that

achieved by 50 mg/day oral administration. The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to fully practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

(1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

(1) The nature of the invention:

The claim 1 is drawn to "a method for treating an individual in need of naltrexone comprising the step of parenterally administering a long acting formulation comprising naltrexone and a biocompatible polymer to the individual wherein the serum AUC of naltrexone is at least about three times greater than that achieved by 50 mg/day oral administration."

(2) The breadth of the claims:

Claims 1, 2, 6-23 and 26 embrace and read on a long acting naltrexone formulation with any biocompatible polymer. The specification does not enable any long acting naltrexone formulation comprising any biocompatible polymer that gives a serum

DOCKET ALARM

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.