

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

NALOX-1 PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

ADAPT PHARMA OPERATIONS LIMITED, and  
OPIANT PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owners.

---

Case IPR2019-00694  
U.S. Patent No. 9,629,965

---

**PATENT OWNERS' SURREPLY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Nalox-1 Has Not Met Its Burden As To BZK.....2  
A. The POSA Would Recognize That BZK Could Cause Naloxone Degradation. ....3  
B. Wyse Discourages Using BZK With Naloxone.....5  
C. Nalox-1 Offers No Plausible Reason *To* Use BZK, And Other Art Also Discourages It.....6  
D. The POSA Had No Reason To Conduct Further Testing To Investigate The “Root Cause” Of Wyse’s Degradation.....8  
II. The “Preservative” Limitations Are Non-Obvious. ....11  
III. It Would Not Be Obvious To Select And Combine The Claim Elements. ....11  
IV. The Claimed 4 Milligram Dose Is Non-Obvious. ....12  
A. Dr. Hochhaus Is Unqualified To Address Clinical Motivations.....13  
B. Wyse Does Not Teach A 4 Milligram Dose. ....14  
C. Wyse Teaches Away From “High and Fast” Doses. ....15  
D. Nalox-1’s Pharmacokinetics Arguments Are Flawed.....17  
E. Nalox-1’s New Motivations Do Not Support Obviousness.....19  
V. Objective Indicia Confirm Non-Obviousness. ....22  
A. Failure of Others, Skepticism, Copying .....22  
B. Unexpected Properties.....24  
C. Praise, Commercial Success, Long-Felt Need .....27  
VI. Conclusion .....28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

*Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.*,  
796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....15

*Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.*,  
575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....10

*Bone Care Int’l, LLC v. Roxane Labs, Inc.*,  
2012 WL 2126896 (D. Del. June 11, 2012) .....10

*Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*,  
509 U.S. 579 (1993).....14

*DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.*,  
567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....16

*Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC*,  
938 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....19

*In re Armodafinil Patent Litig.*,  
939 F. Supp. 2d 456 (D. Del. 2013).....9

*In re Fulton*,  
391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....5

*In re Gurley*,  
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....6

*Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*,  
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....3, 19

*Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Chrimar Sys., Inc.*,  
2017 WL 6549892 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 20, 2017).....23

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....10, 12

*Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH*,  
139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....23

*Skky, Inc. v. MindGeek, s.a.r.l.*,  
859 F.3d 1014 (Fed. Cir. 2017) ..... 14

*WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.*,  
829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... 28

Nalox-1's Reply introduces brand-new theories that it claims, without a hint of irony, support obviousness, even though it took Nalox-1 over a year to arrive at them. Nalox-1's new theories fare no better than its old ones. The Board should reject them all.

Particularly astonishing is how frequently Nalox-1 sets about trying to discredit its own references. An obviousness case should have the POSA follow the teachings of its references. Here, at every turn, Nalox-1 would have the POSA read Wyse and HPE and do precisely what they instruct *not* to do—try to achieve high and fast naloxone levels, use BZK, and combine it with EDTA.

In reply, Nalox-1 attempts to discredit Wyse's BZK teachings based on a new and incorrect theory that BZK "could not cause the naloxone degradation reported in Wyse." Reply 2. Wyse did not conclude that, and Nalox-1's evidence does not support it. Nalox-1's expert contends only that BZK cannot "directly" react with naloxone to form a particular naloxone degradant—a far cry from Nalox-1's blanket assertion of impossibility. And the POSA would know that BZK could *indirectly* cause degradation.

Nalox-1 also claims for the first time that the POSA would ignore Wyse and undertake extensive testing to find some alternate "root cause" of the degradation—one Nalox-1 is glaringly unable to identify. Nalox-1's suggestion that the POSA would try to pull BZK from the reject pile is hindsight at its worst.

# 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.