

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 IPR2019-00690
Patent 9,468,747

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER
OPIANT PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND3

II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PETITION IS REDUNDANT.....6

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION IN LIGHT OF THE PARALLEL DISTRICT COURT ACTIONS.....8

 A. The Teva Case Involves a Generic Manufacturer with Final Approval for an Intranasal Naloxone Product.9

 B. The Teva Case is Nearing Its Final Stages.....12

 C. The Factual Record Developed in the Teva Case Will Be Onerous, if even Possible, to Re-create in this Proceeding15

IV. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS WITH RESPECT TO ANY CLAIMS CHALLENGED IN THE PETITION.18

 A. The POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Use a Single Intranasal Naloxone Dose of 4 mg.19

 1. Petitioner Ignores Clinical Evidence and Provides No Testimony from a Clinician.22

 2. The Prior Art Taught That an Initial Intranasal Dose of 2 mg or Less Was Therapeutically Effective.23

 3. The Prior Art Disclosed That Too Much Liquid Was a Problem for Nasal Delivery, Not Lack of Efficacy.....24

 4. The Art Taught, and the POSA Would Have Understood, That Higher Doses of Naloxone Risked Withdrawal Symptoms and Other Significant Negative Effects.27

 5. Davies Does Not Teach 4 mg Doses of Naloxone.34

 6. Contrary to Petitioner’s Misreading, Wyse Does Not Teach 4 mg Doses of Naloxone.....38

7.	The Pharmacokinetic Data in Wyse Would Not Lead the POSA to a Single 4 mg Dose of Intranasal Naloxone.	40
B.	The POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Use the Required Stabilizing Agent, Much Less the Combination of BZK with EDTA.	45
1.	Davies Does Not Teach the Use of BZK and a Stabilizing Agent at the Claimed Concentrations.	46
2.	The POSA Would Have Been Taught Away from the Use of BZK and EDTA In Light of the Studies in Wyse.....	48
3.	HPE Also Teaches Away From BZK and EDTA and Would Not Override Wyse’s Teach Away Anyway.	54
4.	Bahal and Kushwaha Would Not Lead the POSA to Use BZK and EDTA.	57
V.	CONCLUSION.....	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)58

E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. v. Synvina C.V.,
904 F.3d 996 (Fed. Cir. 2018)37

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.,
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)6

*In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule
Patent Litig.*, 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)15

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)51

Neptune Generics, LLC v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
921 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2019)10, 15

St. Regis Mohawk Tribe v. Mylan Pharms., Inc.,
896 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2018)6, 17

Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc.,
192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)55

W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.,
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)56

Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.,
Case IPR2019-00225, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. June 3, 2019)6

Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.,
Case IPR2019-00232, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. May 20, 2019)6

E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.,
Case IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2019)8, 13, 14

Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC,
Case IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 5, 2013)17

Gen. Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha,
Case IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....9

Mylan Pharms., Inc. v. Bayer Intellectual Property GMBH,
Case IPR2018-01143, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 3, 2018)12

Neptune Generics, LLC v. Aventis Generics S.A.,
Case IPR2019-00136, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 6, 2019)10

NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs. Inc.,
Case IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2018).....12, 14

Valve Corp. v. Elec. Scripting Prods., Inc.,
Case IPR2019-00062, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 2, 2019).....14, 15

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 314.....14, 18

35 U.S.C. § 316.....18

35 U.S.C. § 325.....13

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.108.....23

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.