

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIQUIDIA TECHNOLOGIES, Inc.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

IPR2021-00406
U.S. Patent No. 10,716,793

**PATENT OWNER UNITED THERAPEUTIC CORPORATION'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 A. Background 4

 B. The Challenged '793 Patent 6

II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION 9

 A. The Board Should Exercise Discretionary Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)..... 9

 1. The District Court Litigation 10

 2. Analysis of *Fintiv* Factors 12

 a. Whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted 13

 b. Proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for final written decision 14

 c. Investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties 17

 d. Overlap between issues raised in the petition and the parallel proceeding 20

 e. Whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party 23

 f. Other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits 24

 B. UTC Respectfully Requests That the Board Exercise Discretionary Denial Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)..... 25

 C. Grounds 1-6 Should Be Denied Because Each Ground Relies On Publications That Liquidia Has Failed to Establish Are Prior Art..... 26

1.	Liquidia Has Failed to Establish That the Undated Optineb Manual Was Publicly Available at the Priority Date (Grounds 1-2)	28
2.	Liquidia Has Failed to Establish that Ghofrani and Voswinckel 2006 Are Prior Art “by others” under 102(a) (Grounds 3-6).....	32
a.	Ghofrani	34
b.	Voswinckel 2006	39
D.	Grounds 1-2, 4, and 6 Should Be Denied Because Liquidia Has Failed to Show That They Would Succeed on the Merits	42
1.	The ’212 Patent Teaches Away From Per Breath Dosing And Exemplifies Inhalers That Are Incapable Of Providing The Claimed Dosing	44
2.	Voswinckel JESC Teaches Continuous Nebulization Like The ’212 Patent And Teaches Away From The Claimed Dosing	50
3.	Voswinckel JAHA Cites A “Pulsed” Optineb Device, Which Is Not Described In Any Printed Publication.....	53
III.	CONCLUSION.....	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	33, 38, 41
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	9
<i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (CCPA 1982)	33, 34, 37
<i>In re Land</i> , 368 F.2d 866 (CCPA 1996)	33, 38
<i>Lacks Industries, Inc. v. McKechnie Vehicle Components USA, Inc.</i> , 322 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	32
<i>Minerva Surgical, Inc. v. Hologic, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 20-440, 2021 WL 77248 (U.S. Jan. 8, 2021)	23
<i>SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)	9, 42
<i>Sewall v. Walters</i> , 21 F.3d 411 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	34
Statutes	
21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(5)(B)(iii)	15
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)	32
35 U.S.C. § 314	4, 9, 42
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	25, 42
Other Authorities	
<i>Adaptics Ltd. v. Perfect Company</i> , IPR2018-01596, Paper 20 (PTAB Mar. 6, 2019).....	31
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020)	25
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB May 13, 2020).....	passim

Becton Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG,
IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017).....26

Cellco Partnership v. Bridge and Post, Inc.,
IPR2018-00054, Paper 40 (PTAB Apr. 15, 2019)..... 33, 38

CSL Behring LLC v. Bioverative Therapeutics Inc.,
IPR2018-01313, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2019).....34

Google LLC v. IPA Technologies,
IPR2019-00734, Paper 14 (PTAB Oct. 17, 2019)..... 26, 33

Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC,
IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 (PTAB Dec. 20, 2019)..... 26, 28

Liquidia Tech., Inc. v. United Therapeutics Corp.,
IPR2020-00769, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 13, 2020).....14

Liquidia Tech., Inc. v. United Therapeutics Corp.,
IPR2020-00770, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 13, 2020).....14

Microsoft Corp. v. Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC,
IPR2015-00483, Paper 10 (PTAB Jul. 15, 2015).....25

NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.,
IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sep. 12, 2018)9

Philip Morris Prods., S.A. v. Rai Strategic Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2020-01097, Paper 9 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2021)19

Snap, Inc. v. SRK Technology, LLC,
IPR2020-00820, Paper 15 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2020).....14

Trans Ova Genetics, LC v. XY, LLC,
IPR2018-00250, Paper 35 (PTAB Jun. 26, 2019)..... 33, 38

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.1071

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.