Entered: November 21, 2018

| UNITED STATES I | PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE |
|-----------------|--|
| BEFORE THE PA | TENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD |
| NEP | ΓUNE GENERICS, LLC, Petitioner, |
| | v. |
| CORCE | PT THERAPEUTICS, INC., Patent Owner. |
| | Case IPR2018-01494 S. Patent No. 8,921,348 |

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | I | Page(s) | |
|------|--|--|----------------|--|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | | | |
| II. | CKGROUND TO THE '348 CLAIMED INVENTION | 2 | | |
| | A. B. C. | The Belanoff '348 Claimed Invention is the Subject of this IPR Proceeding | 6 | |
| III. | SCO | PE AND CONTENT OF ALLEGED PRIOR ART | 12 | |
| | A. B. C. D. E. F. | Belanoff '953 Belanoff '848 Belanoff 2002 Chu & Belanoff Sitruk-Ware Murphy | 14 15 16 | |
| IV. | PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ("POSA")18 | | | |
| V. | CLA | IM CONSTRUCTION | 18 | |
| VI. | THE | BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF GROUNDS 1-6. | 18 | |
| VII. | UND OR S ARG | SIX OBVIOUSNESS GROUNDS SHOULD BE DENIED DER 35 U.S.C. §§ 325(D) AND 314(A) BECAUSE THE SAME SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME PRIOR ART AND GUMENTS WERE PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED AND ERCOME DURING PROSECUTION | 19 | |
| | A. | Grounds 1-6 Should Be Denied Because the Petitioner's Prior Art and Arguments Have Already Been Considered and Rejected by the Patent Office | 21 | |
| | | Petitioner Relies on the Same or Substantially the Same Prior Art Previously Presented to the Office | 21 | |
| | | (a) Belanoff '953 Was Considered and Overcome During Prosecution | 22 | |



| | | | (b) | Petitioner's Other Relied Upon References Are Cumulative of Belanoff '953 | 26 |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----|
| | | 2. | Argu | oner Relies on the Same or Substantially the Same ments Already Considered and Rejected During ecution | 28 |
| VIII. | RELI | ES ON | I UNS | HOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER SUPPORTED, CONCLUSORY ASSERTIONS SIBLE HINDSIGHT | 30 |
| | A. B. | Discle Petitic Effica Based | ose the oner's icious I on U | Dispute that None of the Relied Upon References e Efficacious 1300 ng/mL Mifepristone Serum Level Assertion that the Claimed Method Employing the 1300 ng/mL Level Would Have Been Obvious is insupported, Conclusory Assertions and ble Hindsight | 33 |
| IX. | FAIL HOW THE | S TO A THE CLAIN | ARTIC COMI MED I | HOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER CULATE WITH THE REQUISITE SPECIFICITY BINATIONS WOULD PREDICTABLY LEAD TO INVENTION OR HOW A POSA WOULD HAVE IABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS | 40 |
| | A. | Arrivo Treati | e at the ment F | rails to Explain How a POSA Would Predictably e Efficacious 1300 ng/mL Level, and Design a Protocol Based Thereon, With a Reasonable of Success, Particularly in View of the | |
| | B. | Unpre Conte Confi Expec | edictalempora rms Ti etation | poility in the Artaneous Literature from Petitioner's Own Expert hat a POSA Would Have Had No Reasonable of Success in Arriving at the 1300 ng/mL Level ag an Effective Treatment Protocol | |
| X. | FAIL | S TO | ARTIC | HOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER CULATE ANY MOTIVATION TO COMBINE ERENCES | 49 |
| XI. | | | | | |



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|---------------|
| CASES | |
| ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc., 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 49 |
| AnyLogic North America, LLC v. TheBrain Techs., LP, IPR2018-00546, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. May 24, 2018) | 30, 31 |
| Apple Inc. v. Voip-pal.com, LLC., IPR2016-01201, Paper 54 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 20, 2017) | 31 |
| Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG, IPR2017-01587, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)19 | 9, 22, 30, 31 |
| Biodelivery Scis. Int'l, Inc. v. Monosol, IPR2015-00167, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. May 20, 2018) | 40, 41, 48 |
| Cultec, Inc. v. StormTech LLC, IPR2017-00777, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 22, 2017) | passim |
| In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig., 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 43 |
| DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) | 41 |
| <i>Graham v John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966) | 38 |
| Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc., 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 31 |
| Hengdian Grp. DMEGC Magnetics Co., Ltd., v. Hitachi Metals, Ltd., IPR2017-01313, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 6, 2017) | 27 |
| Illumina, Inc. v. Cornell Research Found., Inc., IPR2016-00549, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 8, 2016) | 38 |



| Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-Mak), Inc. v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC, IPR2018-00119, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2018) |
|--|
| Initiative for Meds., Access & Knowledge (I-Mak), Inc. v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC, IPR2018-00103, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. June 13, 2018) |
| Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino, 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)41 |
| <i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC,</i> 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014) |
| <i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)49 |
| KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)28, 38, 41, 49 |
| Larson Mfg. Co. of S.D. v. Aluminart Prods. Ltd., 559 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009) |
| Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea, 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) |
| Neil Ziegman, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens, IPR2015-01860, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 24, 2016)20, 21, 22 |
| Neil Ziegman, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens, IPR2015-01860, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017)20 |
| R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings 1 B.V., IPR2017-01642, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 16, 2018)27 |
| Shenzhen Liown Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Disney Enters., Inc., IPR2016-01785, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 3, 2017) |
| Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics Inc. v. Radiometer Med. APS, IPR2018-00311, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. June 25, 2018)27 |
| Symantec Corp. v. Finjan, Inc., IPR2015-01897, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 26, 2016)12 |



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

