

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NALOX-1 PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

OPIANT PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00685
Patent 9,211,253 B2

Before ZHENYU YANG, JACQUELINE T. HARLOW, and
MICHAEL A. VALEK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

YANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)

INTRODUCTION

Nalox-1 Pharmaceuticals, LLC (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 1 (“Pet.”)), seeking an *inter partes* review of claims 1–29 of U.S. Patent 9,211,253 B2 (“the ’253 patent,” Ex. 1001). Opiant Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

Under the statute, an *inter partes* review may not be instituted unless the information presented in the petition and the preliminary response shows “there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). On April 24, 2018, the Supreme Court held that a decision under § 314 may not institute review on fewer than all claims challenged in the petition. *SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348, 1355–56 (2018).

For the reasons provided below, we determine Petitioner has satisfied the threshold requirement set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Thus, based on the information presented, and under *SAS*, we institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–29 of the ’253 patent.

Related Proceedings

Petitioner concurrently filed IPR2019-00686 and IPR2019-00687, challenging the same claims of the ’253 patent with additional prior art.

The ’253 patent is one of five patents listed in the Orange Book for intranasal naloxone sold under the brand name NARCAN. Pet. 1; Paper 8, 1. Petitioner also filed petitions for *inter partes* review, challenging the other four patents listed. Pet. 6; Paper 5, 1–2.

According to the parties, Patent Owner asserted all five Orange-Book-listed patents in *Adapt Pharma Operations Ltd. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.*, Case 2:16-cv-07721 (D.N.J.) (consolidated, “the Teva Case”),

and *Adapt Pharma Operations Ltd. v. Perrigo UK FINCO Limited Partnership*, Case 2:18-cv-15287 (D.N.J.). Pet. 5; Paper 5, 2. Petitioner is not involved in those actions. Pet. 5–6.

Background of Technology and the '253 Patent

Opioid overdose is a crisis in the United States. Ex. 1001, 6:34. Naloxone is an opioid receptor antagonist that was initially approved for use by injection for the reversal of opioid overdose. *Id.* at 2:9–10. Naloxone hydrochloride injection prevents or reverses the effects of opioids, “including respiratory depression, sedation and hypotension.” Ex. 1044,¹ 1300.

According to the '253 patent, administering naloxone via injection requires trained medical personnel and imposes the risk of exposure to blood borne pathogens through needlestick injury. Ex. 1001, 6:10–22. The '253 patent discloses that “it ha[d] been suggested that in view of the growing opioid overdose crisis in the US, naloxone should be made available over-the-counter (OTC), which would require a device, such as a nasal spray device, that untrained consumers are able to use safely.” *Id.* at 6:33–37.

The '253 patent acknowledges that nasal administration of naloxone was known and used by numerous medical services and health departments. Ex. 1001, 2:25–6:3, *see also id.* at 4:32–35 (“Overdose education and nasal naloxone distribution (OEND) programs are community-based interventions that educate people at risk for overdose and potential bystanders on how to

¹ Physicians' Desk Reference 2003, entry for NARCAN (Naloxone Hydrochloride Injection, USP).

prevent, recognize and respond to an overdose.”). It points out, however, although some studies “reported that the nasal administration of naloxone is as effective as the intravenous route in opiate addicts,” others “reported that naloxone administered intranasally displays a relative bioavailability of 4% only and concluded that the IN [intranasal] absorption is rapid but does not maintain measurable concentrations for more than an hour.” *Id.* at 2:45–51.

The ’253 patent states

Thus, there remains a need for durable, easy-to-use, needleless devices with storage-stable formulations, that can enable untrained individuals to quickly deliver a therapeutically effective dose of a rapid-acting opioid antagonist to an opioid overdose patient. The therapeutically effective dose should be sufficient to obviate the need for the untrained individual to administer either a second dose of opioid antagonist or an alternative medical intervention to the patient, and to stabilize the patient until professional medical care becomes available.

Id. at 6:43–52.

According to the ’253 patent, its invention relates to devices adapted for nasal delivery of “a therapeutically effective amount of an opioid antagonist selected from naloxone and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof, wherein the device is pre-primed, and wherein the therapeutically effective amount, is equivalent to about 2 mg to about 12 mg of naloxone hydrochloride.” *Id.* at 6:54–60.

Illustrative Claim

Among the challenged claims, claim 1 is independent, and is reproduced below:

1. A single-use, pre-primed device adapted for nasal delivery of a pharmaceutical composition to a patient by one actuation of said device into one nostril of said patient, having a single

reservoir comprising a pharmaceutical composition which is an aqueous solution of about 100 µL comprising:
about 4 mg naloxone hydrochloride or a hydrate thereof;
between about 0.2 mg and about 1.2 mg of an isotonicity agent;
between about 0.005 mg and about 0.015 mg of a preservative;
about 0.2 mg of a stabilizing agent;
an amount of an acid sufficient to achieve a pH o[f] 3.5-5.5.

Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

Petitioner asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

Claims	Basis	References
1-3, 16-24, 28, 29	§ 103(a)	Wyse ² and HPE ³
4-7, 10-15, 25-27	§ 103(a)	Wyse, Djupesland, ⁴ and HPE
8, 9	§ 103(a)	Wyse, Djupesland, HPE, and the '291 patent ⁵

In support of its patentability challenge, Petitioner relies on the Declarations of Maureen D. Donovan, Ph.D. (Ex. 1002) and Günther Hochhaus, Ph.D. (Ex. 1003).

ANALYSIS

Discretion under § 314(a)

Under § 314(a), the Director has discretion to deny institution of an *inter partes* review. *Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, 136 S. Ct. 2131, 2140 (2016) (“[T]he agency’s decision to deny a petition is a matter

² Wyse et al., U.S. Patent 9,192,570 B2, issued November 24, 2015 (Ex. 1007).

³ Handbook of Pharmaceutical Excipients, 56-60, 64-66, 78-81, 220-22, 242-44, 270-72, 441-45, 517-22, 596-98 (Rowe et al. eds., 6th ed. 2009) (Ex. 1012).

⁴ Djupesland, *Nasal Drug Delivery Device: Characteristics and Performance in a Clinical Perspective - A Review*, 3 DRUG DELIV. & TRANSL. RES. 42-62 (2013) (Ex. 1010).

⁵ Wermeling, U.S. Patent 8,198,291 B2, issued June 12, 2012 (Ex. 1015).

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.