

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AQUESTIVE THERAPEUTICS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NEURELIS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00451
Patent 9,763,876

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE
37 C.F.R. §42.120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
Cases	iv
Statutes.....	v
Regulations	v
Other Authorities	v
I. Precise Requested Relief	1
II. Statement of Reasons to Deny The Petition	2
A. Background	2
1. Epilepsy and epilepsy treatment.....	2
2. Benzodiazepine for intranasal administration.....	5
3. The challenged patents and claims	8
4. The '876 patent's chain of priority	10
B. Claim Construction	12
1. “consisting of”	12
2. “in a combined amount”	13
C. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	15
D. Aquestive’s Unpatentability Analysis and the Institution Decision Hinge on Incorrect Theories of Patent Priority.....	17

1.	Aquestive Never Met its Burden to Establish a Facially Reasonable Likelihood of Unpatentability	18
2.	Misplaced Reliance on Rule 57 Cannot Save the Petition	21
E.	The Combination Does Not Teach the Claimed Subject Matter	23
1.	The Alleged Prior Art	24
2.	Aquestive Fails to Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine the Disclosure of Gwozdz with that of Meezan’962 (Ground 1 Fails)	27
3.	Aquestive Fails to Demonstrate a Motivation to Combine the Formulation of Cartt’784 to the Gwozdz and/or Meezan’962 Formulations (Ground 2 Fails)	38
III.	Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness	40
IV.	Conclusion	44
	EXHIBIT LIST	45
	TYPE VOLUME CERTIFICATE.....	48
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Alco Standard Corp. v. Tenn. Valley Auth.</i> , 808 F.2d 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	46
<i>Aristocrat Techs. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 543 F.3d 657 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	24
<i>Carbino v. West</i> , 168 F.3d 32 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	23
<i>In re Dow Chemical Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	32
<i>In re Edwards</i> , 568 F.2d 1349 (CCPA 1978).....	22
<i>Exela Pharma Sciences, LLC v. Lee</i> , 781 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	24
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 265 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	24
<i>Gemstar-TV Guide Int’l, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 383 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>Harari v. Hollmer</i> , 602 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	24
<i>In re Heinle</i> , 342 F.2d 1001 (CCPA 1965).....	13
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063, 1075-77 (Fed. Cir. 2012).	43
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina, Inc.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	23
<i>Magnivision, Inc. v. Bonneau Co.</i> , 115 F.3d 956 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	24
<i>Ex parte Maziere</i> , 27 USPQ2d 1705 (BPAI 1993).....	24
<i>McDonnell v. United States</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2355 (2016).....	24
<i>Medgraph, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 843 F.3d 942 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	14

<i>Millennium Pharm., Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	43
<i>Multilayer Stretch Cling Film Holdings, Inc. v. Berry Plastics Corp.</i> , 831 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	13
<i>In re Piasecki</i> , 745 F.2d 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	46
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	23
<i>Telebrands Corp. v. Tinnus Enterprises, LLC</i> , PGR2017-00015, Paper 53 (2019).....	23
<i>Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar</i> , 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	13

STATUTES

5 U.S.C. §557(c).....	24
35 U.S.C. §120.....	13
35 U.S.C. §314(a).....	19
35 U.S.C. §316.....	22, 25

REGULATIONS

37 CFR §1.57.....	23, 24
-------------------	--------

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §608.01(p)(1)(B) (9th ed. rev. R-08.2017, Jan. 2018).....	12, 24
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §2163.07(b) (9th ed., rev. R-08.2017, Jan. 2018).....	12
U.S. Constitution, Amendment V.....	24
<i>Webster's Third New Int'l Dictionary</i> (1993).....	16

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.