



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/283,450	10/27/2011	Louie Daniel Garcia	PCIRA.037A	8217
20995	7590	09/16/2019	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/16/2019	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

efiling@knobbe.com
jayna.cartee@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte LOUIE DANIEL GARCIA, LIANGJIN ZHU,
WILLIAM JOSEPH LAMBERT, and GARY PATOU

Appeal 2018-007990
Application 13/283,450¹
Technology Center 1600

Before DONALD E. ADAMS, JOHN G. NEW, and
RACHEL H. TOWNSEND, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TOWNSEND, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an Appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 involving claims to a formulation of one or more non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, which have been rejected as obvious. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

¹ We use the word “Appellant” to refer to “Applicant” as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.42. Appellant identifies the real party in interest as Pacira Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (Appeal Br. 3.)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are administered both orally and intravenously. (Spec. ¶ 3.) “Oral NSAID treatment, however, has been linked to a variety of serious gastrointestinal complications, including peptic ulcer, digestive perforation, hemorrhage, colonic ulcer, and colitis.” (*Id.*) “GI toxicity is attributable to the magnitude and duration of drug exposure both in the GI tract following oral dosing and with high systemic levels of drug required to achieve efficacious drug levels at the synovial site of action^[2].” (*Id.* ¶ 4.)

Appellant’s invention is directed at a formulation of the NSAIDs meloxicam and/or piroxicam encapsulated in a multivesicular liposome³ which minimize the side effects of NSAIDs while maintaining or improving efficacy. (*See id.* ¶¶ 8, 28, claim 1)

Claims 1, 62, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 111, 112, 115–122, and 136 are on appeal. Claim 1 is representative and reads as follows:

1. A formulation of one or more non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, comprising:
 - one or more non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs selected from the group consisting of meloxicam and piroxicam; and
 - multivesicular liposomes,wherein the multivesicular liposomes comprise a first aqueous phase and a second aqueous phase;

² “[D]rugs are typically cleared in a matter of hours from the synovial fluid.” (*Id.* ¶ 5.)

³ “Topologically, multivesicular liposomes [“MVLs”] are defined as having multiple non-concentric chambers within each particle, resembling a ‘foam-like’ matrix; whereas multilamellar vesicles contain multiple concentric chambers within each liposome particle, resembling the ‘layers of an onion.’” (*Id.* ¶ 35.)

wherein the one or more non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs are encapsulated in the first aqueous phase of the multi vesicular liposomes; and

wherein the first aqueous phase comprises at least one pH modifier, said pH modifier comprises an organic acid or an organic base, or a combination thereof.

(Appeal Br. 17.)

The following grounds of rejection by the Examiner are before us on review:

Claims 1, 62, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 111, 112, 115–122, and 136 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Weiner⁴ or McLean,⁵ Sankaram,⁶ and Gruber.⁷

Claims 1, 62, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 111, 112, and 115–122⁸ under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Weiner or McLean, Kim '573,⁹ and Gruber.

⁴ Weiner et al., US 6,759,057 B1, issued July 6, 2004.

⁵ McLean et al., US 2003/0235610 A1, published Dec. 25, 2003.

⁶ Sankaram et al., US 6,132,766, issued Oct. 17, 2000.

⁷ Gruber et al., US 2010/0035937 A1, published Feb. 11, 2010.

⁸ Additional claims were rejected by the Examiner in the Office Action from which the appeal was taken, but those claims had been canceled prior to issuance of that Office Action, and thus, are no longer pending in the Application on Appeal. (*See* Amendment and Response to Office Action dated April 20, 2017 (cancelling claims 20, 65–67, 69, 87, 89–91, 93–97, 99–102, 107, 108, 110, 123–125, and 128–135).)

⁹ Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5,759,573, issued June 2, 1998.

Claims 1, 62, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 111, 112, 115–122, and 136 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Hofland,¹⁰ Cipolla¹¹, Kim '147,¹² and Gruber.

DISCUSSION

Weiner, McLean, Sankaram, and Gruber

The Examiner finds that Weiner and McLean both teach liposomal formulations that contain a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), where piroxicam is identified as one such NSAID. (Final Action 2.) The Examiner recognizes that neither reference teaches encapsulation of the NSAID in a MVL. (*Id.*)

The Examiner finds, however, that Sankaram teaches a variety of drugs encapsulated in MVLs. (*Id.* at 3.) The Examiner finds that Sankaram indicates that the internal membranes of the MVL “serve to cover increased mechanical strength to the vesicle, while still maintaining a high volume lipid ratio compared to multi-lamellar vesicles.” (*Id.* (citing Sankaram 2:28–39).) According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art “to encapsulate NSAIDS of Weiner or McLean in the [MVL] and treat inflammation since Sankaram teaches the advantages of [MVL]” and/or because “Sankaram teaches that any drug can be encapsulated within the [MVL] and NSAIDS are known to be encapsulated within liposomes as evident from Weiner and McLean.” (*Id.*)

¹⁰ Hofland et al., US 2004/0224010 A1, published Nov. 11, 2004.

¹¹ Cipolla et al., US 2012/0244206 A1, published Sept. 27, 2012.

¹² Kim et al., US 5,723,147, issued Mar. 3, 1998.

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.