

Reply Declaration of Jeffrey D. Winkler, Ph.D.
IPR2020-00770

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIQUIDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner

IPR2020-00770
U.S. Patent No. 9,604,901

REPLY DECLARATION OF JEFFREY D. WINKLER, PH.D.

Liquidia Exhibit 1017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. QUALIFICATIONS	2
III. MATERIALS CONSIDERED	4
IV. PERSONS OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	6
V. UNDERSTANDING OF LEGAL CONCEPTS	13
A. Obviousness.....	13
B. Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	14
C. Product-By-Process Claims.....	15
VI. DR. PINAL MISQUOTES AND MISCHARACTERIZES MY DEPOSITION TESTIMONY.....	15
VII. DR. PINAL INCORRECTLY FOCUSES ON INDUSTRIAL SCALE PROCESSES	36
VIII. THE '901 PATENT FILE HISTORY HAS ALREADY BEEN ACCURATELY CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD	41
IX. THE '393 IPR IS RELEVANT TO THIS PROCEEDING	47
A. Motivation To Combine Moriarty and Phares	47
B. Comparability of the '393 Claims and '901 Claims	49
X. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	54
XI. GROUND 1: PHARES RENDERS OBVIOUS THE CLAIMS OF THE '901 PATENT.....	54
A. Phares Teaches (+)-Treprostinil Synthesis.....	54
B. Dr. Pinal's Focus on Impurities and Polymorphs is Misplaced.....	67
C. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Make the Diethanolamine Salt of Treprostinil.....	69
1. Making a Salt of Treprostinil Would Improve Bioavailability	70
2. No Safety Problems Relative to FDA-Approved Remodulin	71

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
D. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Forming Treprostinil Diethanolamine Based on the Disclosures in Phares	71
E. Elimination of the Crude Treprostinil Isolation Step in Phares Would Have Been Obvious.....	72
1. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Eliminate the Crude Treprostinil Isolation Step of Phares to Improve Synthetic Efficiency and Reduce Cost.....	72
2. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Eliminating the Crude Treprostinil Isolation Step of Phares.....	74
F. Synthesis of Gram-Scale Product Quantities was Well Known and Scaling Up the Product Quantity in Phares Would Have Been Obvious	78
G. Dependent Claims 2-5 and 8-9.....	79
XII. GROUND 2: MORIARTY IN COMBINATION WITH PHARES RENDERS OBVIOUS THE CLAIMS OF THE '901 PATENT	82
A. Dr. Pinal Does Not (and Cannot) Dispute that Moriarty Discloses the Claimed Alkylation and Hydrolysis Steps.....	82
B. Dr. Pinal's Lengthy Discussion of "Impurity Profiles" and "Batch-to-Batch Variations" is Misplaced.....	85
C. A POSA Would Be Motivated to Combine Moriarty with Phares	88
D. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Forming Treprostinil Diethanolamine Based on the Disclosures in Phares	92
E. Elimination of the Crude Treprostinil Isolation and Crystallization Steps of Moriarty Would Have Been Obvious.....	97
F. Dependent Claims 2-5 and 8-9.....	99
XIII. STORAGE CLAIMS 6 AND 7 ARE OBVIOUS	99

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
XIV. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	105
XV. CONCLUSION.....	107

I, Jeffrey D. Winkler, hereby declare and state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am over the age of eighteen and otherwise competent to make this declaration.

2. I have been retained by counsel for the Petitioner to offer technical opinions with respect to U.S. Patent No. 9,604,901 (“the ’901 patent”) and prior art references cited in *inter partes* review proceedings for the ’901 patent.

3. I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate, which is \$850 per hour. My compensation is not dependent on the outcome of, or the content of my testimony in, the present IPR.

4. I have reviewed the ’901 patent and, in assessing it, I have considered the teachings of the scientific literature before December 17, 2007, in light of general knowledge in the art before that date.

5. I understand that the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“the Board”) has instituted *inter partes* review of the ’901 patent based on the petition submitted by Liquidia Technologies, Inc. (“Liquidia”). Since IPR institution, I understand that United Therapeutics Corporation (“UTC”) has filed a Patent Owner Response as well as a declaration from Rodolfo Pinal, Ph.D. in support thereof.

6. This declaration presents my additional expert opinions, considering the Institution Decision rendered by the Board, as well as UTC’s Patent Owner

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.