

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

NOVEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.  
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 9,833,419

Title: TRANSDERMAL ESTROGEN DEVICE AND DELIVERY

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2018-01119

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Institution Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) or 325(d).....2

III. Overview Of The Patent And Prosecution History .....7

IV. Level Of Skill In The Art ..... 10

V. Technological Background..... 11

    A. Transdermal Drug Delivery and Drug Flux ..... 11

    B. Developing Transdermal Drug Delivery Systems ..... 12

    C. Coat Weight Was Not Known To Impact Flux..... 17

        1. Kim (EX1010) Does Not Evidence A General Understanding..... 19

        2. Ghosh (EX1014) Does Not Evidence A General Understanding..21

        3. Wong (EX1028) Does Not Evidence a General Understanding ...22

        4. Bronaugh (EX1026) Is Not Related to TDSs .....23

        5. Benson (EX1039) Does Not Link Coat Weight To Occlusion ....23

        6. Chien (EX1009) Does Not Support Petitioner’s Case.....24

        7. Mueller (EX1005) Did Not Recognize Coat Weight To Impact  
            Flux ..... 25

    D. Estradiol Transdermal Drug Delivery Systems .....26

VI. Claim Construction..... 28

    A. Legal Standard.....28

    B. “About” .....28

C.	“Coat Weight” .....	29
D.	“Flux” .....	30
E.	“Therapeutically Effective Amount” .....	33
VII.	Standard For Institution .....	33
VIII.	The Cited References.....	34
A.	Mueller (EX1005) .....	34
B.	Vivelle-Dot® Label (EX1006).....	36
C.	Kanios (EX1007).....	37
D.	Chien (EX1009) .....	39
IX.	Petitioner Failed To Satisfy 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.61(c) and 42.65(b) .....	40
X.	Grounds 1-4 Improperly Rely On Petitioner’s Own Interpretations Of Figures .....	41
XI.	The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood Of Unpatentability On Ground 1 .....	43
A.	Petitioner has not carried its burden on anticipation of claims 1, 2, 8, and 10-15 by Mueller Example 3.....	44
1.	Mueller does not disclose or show that Example 3 achieved the claimed estradiol flux.....	45
2.	Mueller Example 3 did not use a control .....	47
3.	Mueller presents Fig. 3 qualitatively and imprecisely .....	49

XII. Petitioner Has Not Carried Its Burden On Obviousness Of Claims 1-2 And 8-15 In View Of Mueller And The Vivelle-Dot® Label For Ground 2 .....	53
XIII. Petitioner Has Not Carried Its Burden On Obviousness Of Claims 3-7 In View Of Mueller, The Vivelle-Dot® Label And Kanios For Ground 3 .....	55
A. Petitioner has not shown the requisite motivation or reasonable expectation of success .....	56
B. A POSA would have been discouraged from attempting Petitioner’s asserted modifications of Mueller .....	58
C. Petitioner relies on an invalid comparison of Mueller and Kanios.....	59
XIV. Petitioner Has Not Carried Its Burden On Obviousness Of Claims 1-15 In View Of Mueller, Vivelle-Dot® Label, Kanios, And Chien For Ground 4 .....	62
XV. Conclusion .....	64
XVI. CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b)(1).....	65

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Tredegar Corp.*,  
725 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 29, 33

*Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.*,  
576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009) ..... 55, 62

*Continental Can Co. U.S.A. v. Monsanto Co.*,  
948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ..... 43, 44, 48

*Graham v. John Deere Co.*,  
383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....53

*Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc.*,  
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....3

*Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int’l*,  
222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2007) ..... 42, 63

*In re Gartside*,  
203 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....53

*In re Magnum Oil Tools International*,  
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....53

*In re Mraz*,  
455 F.2d 1069 (CCPA1972).....43

*In re Oelrich*,  
666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981).....44

*In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*,  
504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....28

*In re Wright*,  
569 F.2d 1124 (CCPA 1976)..... 42, 45

*Nystrom v. Trex Co.*,  
424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ..... 41, 42, 44, 63

# 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.