

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND GMBH,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2018-01676
U.S. Patent No. 8,603,044

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(A) AND 324(A) TO DENY INSTITUTION.....	4
A. Procedural Background.....	5
B. The Board Has Discretion to Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 324(a).....	8
C. <i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752.....	9
1. The parties are engaged in district court litigation on the same patent.....	10
2. Petitioner relies on the same prior art in the Petition as in the District Court case.....	11
3. Trial in the District Court case will conclude before the IPR.....	12
4. Instituting the IPR permits the Petitioner a tactical advantage.....	12
D. <i>General Plastic Industrial Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357.....	13
1. <i>General Plastic</i> Factors 1, 2, 4, and 5: Whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent; whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition or should have known of it; the length of time that elapsed between the time the petitioner learned of the prior art asserted in the second petition and the filing of the second petition; whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time	

	elapsed between the filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent.....	14
2.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factor 3: whether at the time of filing of the second petition the petitioner already received the patent owner’s preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board’s decision on whether to institute review in the first petition	16
3.	<i>General Plastic</i> Factors 6 and 7: the finite resources of the Board; and the requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) to issue a final determination not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices institution of review	17
III.	THE 044 PATENT	18
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
	A. “main housing”	23
	B. “tubular clutch” and “clicker”	26
V.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON GROUNDS 1 AND 2.....	27
	A. Ground 1 Should Be Denied Because Steinfeldt-Jensen Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims	27
	1. Overview of U.S. Patent No. 6,235,004 (“Steenfeldt-Jensen”) (Ex. 1014).....	27
	2. Steinfeldt-Jensen Does Not Teach or Render Obvious a “drive sleeve comprising an internal threading ... adapted to engage an external thread of said piston rod”	32
	a) Steinfeldt-Jensen’s Disclosure on Switching the Piston Rod Guide and Nut Element Is Made for a Different Embodiment That Is Not the Basis for the Ground	34

b)	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Make Petitioner’s Proposed Modification to the Fifth Embodiment Because the Fifth Embodiment Does Not Suffer the Same Drawbacks as the First Embodiment.....	36
c)	The Petitioner’s Modification to Switch the Piston Rod Guide and Nut Element to the Fifth Embodiment Results in an Inferior Pen Injector	42
B.	Ground 2 Should Be Denied Because Møller, Alone or in Combination with Steinfeldt-Jensen, Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims	45
1.	Overview of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052578 (“Møller”)	46
2.	The Combination of Møller and Steinfeldt-Jensen Does Not Teach or Render Obvious “a drive sleeve extending along a portion of said piston rod”	48
a)	A POSA Would Not Have Considered Connection Bars 12 and Nut 13 Functionally and Structurally Equivalent to Connection Element 112 and Nut 113	51
b)	A POSA Would Not Have Expected Connection Bars 12 with Nut 13 Could Be Formed as a Tubular Structure That Encompasses Piston Rod 4 Without Affecting the Device’s Operation.....	55
3.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine the Teachings of Møller and Steinfeldt-Jensen as Petitioner Contends	56
a)	Møller Teaches Away From Steinfeldt-Jensen’s Externally-Grooved Dose Scale Drum	57
b)	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Make the Relied-Upon Combination Due to a Purported Benefit Alleged by Petitioner	58

4.	The Combination of Møller and Steinfeldt-Jensen Does Not Teach or Render Obvious “said dose dial sleeve comprising a helical groove configured to engage a threading provided by said main housing, said helical groove provided along an outer surface of said dose dial sleeve”	63
VI.	THE PETITION FAILS TO PUT PATENT OWNER ON NOTICE OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE TO BE CONSTRUED IN THE GROUNDS AS REQUIRED BY 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)	67
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	70

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.