

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

KVK-TECH, INC.
FLAT LINE CAPITAL, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

SILVERGATE PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 9,463,183
Issue Date: Oct. 11, 2016
Inventors: Gerald L. Mosher, David W. Miles

Title: LISINOPRIL FORMULATIONS

Case Number: Unassigned

**PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,463,183
UNDER TO 35 U.S.C. §§ 321 *ET SEQ.* AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.200 *ET SEQ.***

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Notice of Real-Party-In-Interest.....	3
III.	Notice of Related Matters	3
IV.	Notice Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and (b)(4)	3
V.	Payment of Filing Fee	3
VI.	Grounds for Standing	3
VII.	Statement of Precise Relief Requested	4
VIII.	Background	4
A.	Lisinopril	4
B.	Oral liquid formulations.....	5
C.	Excipients for oral liquid formulations.	6
D.	Acids, bases, pH and buffer capacity.....	10
E.	Preparing stable oral liquid formulations.....	12
F.	Measuring stability of oral liquid formulations.....	14
G.	The ‘183 Patent	16
G.	Prosecution History of the ‘183 Patent	19
H.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	27
X.	Analysis	28
A.	GROUND 1: Claims 1-13 are unpatentable because they are not enabled under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a).	28
B.	GROUND 2: Claims 1-13 are unpatentable because they lack adequate written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a).	41
C.	GROUND 3: Claims 1-13 are rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Beidel in view of Nerurkar, Pharma Compounding Sept. 2006, Beidel Two and in further view of the understanding of the person of ordinary skill in the art.....	42
XI.	Conclusion.....	81
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT	82
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	83

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Baxter Pharm. Prods.</i> , 471 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	65
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	29, 40
<i>Apple v. Samsung</i> , 816 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	79
<i>Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2010)(en banc)	41
<i>Automotive Tech. Int'l, Inc. v. BMW of North America, Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	33, 34
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	75, 77
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , 108 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	34
<i>Genetics Institute, LLC v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed.Cir.2011)	36
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (CCPA 1955)	56, 57
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012).	60
<i>In re Best</i> , 562 F.2d 1252 (CCPA 1977))......	23
<i>In re Boesch</i> , 617 F.2d 272 (CCPA 1980)	59

<i>In re Dillon</i> , 919 F.2d 688 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	75
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	56, 57
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	65
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.2d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	46
<i>In re Merck & Co.</i> , 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986).	23
<i>In re Papesch</i> , 315 F.2d 381 (CCPA 1963)	78
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).	56-59, 69
<i>Ineos USA LLC v. Berry Plastics Corp.</i> , 783 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	63
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co., Inc. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	78
<i>Janssen Pharmaceutica N.V., et al. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.</i> , 583 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	35, 36
<i>KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	64
<i>Nat'l Recovery Techs., Inc. v. Magnetic Separation Sys., Inc.</i> , 166 F.3d 1190 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	28
<i>Novartis AG v. Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd.</i> , No. 2016-1352, Slip. Op. (Fed. Cir. April 12, 2017)	78

<i>Plant Genetic Sys., N.V. v. DeKalb Genetics Corp.,</i> 315 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2003).	35
<i>Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.,</i> 190 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	32
<i>Sitrick v. Dreamworks, LLC,</i> 516 F.3d. 993 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	28
<i>Tex. Instruments v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,</i> 988 F.2d 1165 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	79
<i>Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner,</i> 778 F.2d 775 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	65
<i>Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar,</i> 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed.Cir.1991).....	41
<i>Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Solutions, Inc.,</i> 698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	43, 47

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.