

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

AQUESTIVE THERAPEUTICS, INC.

Petitioner

v.

NEURELIS, INC.

Patent Owner

---

IPR2019-00451

U.S. Patent No. 9,763,876

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY**

**TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO THE PETITION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....1

II. PO CANNOT CLAIM PRIORITY TO ITS ‘558 PROVISIONAL APPLICATION (EXHIBIT 1008) AND DIDN’T POSSESS INVENTION .....1

A. Petitioner Satisfied Its Initial Burden Of Going Forward With Evidence Of Unpatentability and Lack of Written Support in ‘558 Provisional - The Burden Then Shifted To PO To Demonstrate That The ‘876 Patent Demonstrated Criticality and Is Entitled To Claim Priority To The ‘558 Provisional .....3

B. The ‘558 Provisional Fails To Satisfy The Written Description Requirement Of Section 112 for the Essential Alkyl Glycosides .....4

C. Rule 57 Governs .....9

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....9

A. “consisting of” – includes water.....9

B. “pharmaceutical solution” includes solutions where the benzodiazepine is partially dissolved. ....11

IV. POSA – INCLUDES TRANSMEMBRANE EXPERIENCE .....12

V. MOTIVATION TO COMBINE.....12

A. A POSA would have been motivated to combine Gwozdz and Meezan’96213

1. A POSA would have combined disclosures to increase solubility with disclosures to increase penetration.....13

2. No concern about precipitating out. ....14

B. A POSA would have been motivated to combine Gwozdz, Meezan’962 and Cartt’784. ....15

VI. THE PRIOR ART – GWOZDZ, MEEZAN’962 & CARTT’784 .....16

A. Gwozdz (Exhibit 1014) .....16

1. Alkyl glycosides. ....16

2. Benzyl alcohol .....17

B. Meezan’962 (Exhibit 1011).....19

C. Cartt’784 (Exhibit 1015) .....21

VII. THE ‘876 PATENT CLAIMS ARE INVALID.....22

A. Claims 1-7, 13 & 14 with combined amounts of benzyl alcohol and ethanol are obvious. ....23

B. Claims 8, 9, 10, 15, 28, 30-33 are obvious, notwithstanding the separate ranges for benzyl alcohol and ethanol (or dehydrated ethanol).....23

C. Claims 11 & 12 are obvious. ....25

D. Claim 16 is obvious. ....25

E. Claims 24-26 are obvious.....25

F. Claims 27 & 29 are obvious.....26

G. Claims 34-36 are obvious.....26

H. Claims 17-23 are obvious.....27

VIII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS DON'T  
SUPPORT THE VALIDITY OF THE CLAIMS OF THE '876 PATENT .....27

A. The History of Intranasal Development is Replete with Successful Solutions  
As Well As The Intranasal Use of Benzodiazepine IV Solutions for Treating  
Seizures. ....28

B. Many Non-Formulation Issues Contributed to Lack of Commercialization. 29

C. No nexus between the '876 patent claims and Valtoco. ....30

IX. CONCLUSION .....31

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE .....32**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....33**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	8
<i>Dynamic Drinkware v. LLC v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	4
<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co. v. Synvina C.V.</i> , 904 F.3d 996 (Fed. Cir. 2018) ...	23
<i>Ex parte Maziere</i> , 27 USPQ2d 1705 (BPAI 1993).....	9
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	7
<i>Litton Sys., Inc. v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 728 F.2d 1423 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	5
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	8
<i>New Railhead Mfg., L.L.C. v. Vermteer Mfg. Co.</i> , 298 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .	4
<i>Power Oasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	5
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.</i> , 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	7
<i>Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	4

# 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.