

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NALOX-1 PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

OPIANT PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner

IPR2019-00685, IPR2019-00686, and IPR2019-00687
Patent No. 9,211,253 B2

PETITIONER'S NOTICE
(As Authorized by the Board's Order Dated June 11, 2019)

Petitioner Nalox-1 Pharmaceuticals, a pharmaceutical company, is currently developing, and plans to seek FDA approval to market far in advance of the 2035 patent expiration, a much needed generic version of Narcan® naloxone nasal spray. The '253 patent is one of several related Orange Book patents listed for Narcan® that Petitioner has challenged to remove the barriers to an approved generic naloxone nasal spray. The '253 patent claims are invalid, primarily in light of the teachings of Wyse, Davies, and Wang. Due to different statutory bases for invalidity, as well as substantive differences in these three primary references, Petitioner filed three separate, non-redundant, IPR Petitions. The Board should consider the Petitions in the following order, and for at least the following reasons, the Board should institute review for all three Petitions:

Rank	Petition	Primary Reference
1	IPR2019-00685	Wyse
2	IPR2019-00687	Davies
3	IPR2019-00686	Wang

A. Statutory Bases for Invalidity and Different Version of Wang Used in Petitions Render the Petitions Non-Redundant

Petition 1 challenges the priority claim of the '253 patent and relies on Wyse, which is prior art because the '253 patent is not entitled to a priority date of March 14, 2014. The other Petitions do not rely on challenging the priority claim.

Petition 1 relies on Wyse, which is prior art under § 102(a)(2). Petitions 2 and 3, on the other hand, rely on primary references Davies and Wang, each of which is

prior art under § 102(a)(1). Patent Owner may seek to remove Wyse as prior art under an exception under § 102(b)(2), but will be unable to do so for Davies and Wang under the same exception, as Davies and Wang are prior art under § 102(a)(1) and can only be removed as prior art if an exception under a separate statutory section, § 102(b)(1), applies. Instituting each Petition will ensure that Patent Owner cannot eliminate all instituted Petitions, should it present evidence sufficient to qualify as an exception for only one category of prior art.

In addition, Petitions 2 and 3 rely on a human translation of Wang, certified to be true and accurate, while, during prosecution, Patent Owner provided to the Office only a machine translation. Patent Owner may argue about the materiality of such differences, and may otherwise seek to disqualify or discredit Wang as prior art. For these reasons, the Petitions are not redundant.

B. Differences of Disclosure Between Primary References Renders the Petitions Non-Redundant

There are numerous differences in the disclosures of the three primary references, such that certain primary references anticipate certain claim limitations while others do not. For example, Petition 1 relies on Wyse, which Patent Owner argues teaches away from the use of benzalkonium chloride (BAC). Petition 1 relies on Wyse as a primary reference and the Declaration of Dr. Donovan to support the position that a POSA would not have considered Wyse to teach away from the use

of BAC. Petitions 2 and 3 do not rely Wyse for the teaching of BAC, but instead for its other teachings.

In addition, Wyse and Davies each anticipates the “single-use, pre-primed device” limitation of claim 1, while Wang does not. Wyse and Wang each anticipates the “pH of 3.5-5.5” limitation of claim 1, while Davies does not. And Wyse anticipates the plasma concentration limitations of claims 25–29, while Davies and Wang do not. Different legal standards apply depending on whether a claim limitation is anticipated by a single reference, or obvious in view of multiple references. For this additional reason, the Petitions are not redundant.

The following chart highlights the differences noted above, as well as additional information the Board may find useful in determining the disposition of the Petitions.

	Wyse	Davies	Wang
Statutory category of primary reference	§ 102(a)(2)	§ 102(a)(1)	§ 102(a)(1)
Was primary reference Cited By Patent Owner	Publication version	Y	Machine translation
Relies on Wyse for teaching of BAC	Y	N	N
Anticipates “single-use, pre-primed device” limitation of claim 1	Y	Y	N
Anticipates “pH 3.5-5.5” limitation of claim 1	Y	N	Y
Anticipates plasma concentration limitations of claims 25-29	Y	N	N

The Petitions do not rely on substantially overlapping grounds or theories, and the Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board institute each Petition.

Dated: June 17, 2019

/s/ Yelee Y. Kim

Dr. Yelee Y. Kim

Reg. No. 60,088

ARENT FOX LLP

1717 K Street NW

Washington D.C. 20006

Telephone: (202) 857-6000

Fax: (202) 857-6395

yelee.kim@arentfox.com

Attorney for Petitioner

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.