

IPR2019-00207
Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

Filed on behalf of Almirall, LLC

By:
JAMES S. TRAINOR, Reg. No. 52,297
JENNIFER R. BUSH, Reg. No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
902 Broadway, Suite 14
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: 212.430.2600
Facsimile: 650.938.5200

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC and AMNEAL
PHARMACEUTICALS OF NEW YORK, LLC
Petitioners,

v.

ALMIRALL, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00207
Patent 9,517,219

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PATENT OWNER’S EXHIBIT LIST	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BASES FOR DENYING INSTITUTION.....	3
A. The <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Demonstrate that the Board Should Exercise Its Discretion Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	3
1. Factor 1: whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent	6
2. Factor 2: 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	10
3. 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	11
4. Factor 4: elapsed time	14
5. Factor 5: 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.....	15
6. Factor 6: the finite resources of the Board and the one-year final decision requirement.....	17
7. Factor 7: Additional Considerations	18
8. Weighing the Factors	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	Page
B. The Board Should Deny Institution Under § 325(d).....	18
1. Factor (a): The similarities and material differences between the asserted art and the prior art involved during examination	20
2. Factor (b): The cumulative nature of the asserted art and the prior art evaluated during examination	23
3. Factor (c): The extent to which the asserted art was evaluated during examination, including whether the prior art was the basis for rejection.....	25
4. Factor (d): The extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which Petitioner relies on the prior art or Patent Owner distinguishes the prior art.....	31
5. Factor (e): Whether Petitioner has pointed out sufficiently how the Examiner erred in its evaluation of the asserted prior art.....	33
6. Factor (f): The extent to which additional evidence and facts presented in the Petition warrant reconsideration of prior art or arguments.....	35
C. Weighing the Factors.....	39
III. CONCLUSION.....	41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Abiomed, Inc. v. Maquet Cardiovascular, LLC</i> , IPR2017-02134, Paper 7 (PTAB April 16, 2018)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Abiomed, Inc. v. Maquet Cardiovascular, LLC</i> , IPR2017-02150, Paper 11 (PTAB March 12, 2018)	5
<i>Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.</i> , IPR2017-01371, Paper 7 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2017).....	5, 8
<i>Arris Grp, Inc. v. Cirrex Sys. LLC</i> , IPR2015-00530, Paper 12 (PTAB Jul. 27, 2015)	17
<i>Becton, Dickenson and Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01301, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 13, 2017).....	17
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016–01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	19
<i>Hologic, Inc. v. bioMérieux, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00566, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 24, 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Harris</i> , 409 F.3d 1339, 74 USPQ2d 1951 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	33
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325, 65 USPQ2d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	32
<i>In re Wertheim</i> , 541 F.2d 257,191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976).....	32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	Page(s)
<i>In re Woodruff</i> , 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	32
<i>NetApp Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 12, 2017).....	8
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01305, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 17, 2017).....	13
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , IPR2015-00555, Paper 20 (PTAB June 19, 2015)	18
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01423, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 28, 2015).....	9
<i>Unilever v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper 25 (Dec. 10, 2014).....	9

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 103	21
35 U.S.C. §314(a)	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....	4
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	<i>passim</i>

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 1.132	35, 38
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....	1

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.