

Filed on behalf of OmniActive Health Technologies, Inc.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

OMNIACTIVE HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

KEMIN INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case No. to Be Assigned
Patent No. 9,226,940

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,226,940
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§311–319 AND 37 C.F.R. §42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. §42.8(a)(1)).....	5
	A. Real Party-in-interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1)).....	5
	B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2)).....	5
	C. Lead and Back-up Counsel (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(3)).....	6
	D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(3)).....	6
III.	Fees (37 C.F.R. §42.103).....	6
IV.	Requirements for IPR Under 37 C.F.R. §42.104.....	7
	A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. §42.104(a)).....	7
	B. Prior Art Publications Relied Upon.....	7
	C. Claims and Statutory Grounds (37 C.F.R. §§42.104(b)(1) &(b)(2)).....	8
V.	Summary of the '940 Patent.....	9
VI.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	14
VII.	Claim Construction.....	14
VIII.	Summary of References Applied in This Petition.....	16
	A. Snider (Ex. 1003).....	16
	B. McLaughlan (Ex. 1004).....	20
	C. Chaine (Ex. 1005).....	21
	D. Richer (Ex. 1006).....	23
	E. Ciolkowski (Ex. 1007).....	24
IX.	The Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable.....	25
	A. Summary of Obviousness Arguments.....	25

B.	Ground I - Claims 1–6 and 9 of the '940 Patent are unpatentable as obvious over Snider.....	30
1.	Claim 1 (preamble) - “A method of reducing the increased blue and ultraviolet light damage to the retina of a subject having a condition that causes such blue or ultraviolet light to fall disproportionately on or in front of the retina relative to the blue and ultraviolet light damage present in a subject having no such condition, wherein the condition is presbyopia or hyperopia or astigmatism, comprising”	30
2.	Claim 1 (body) - “administering to the subject having such condition a composition comprising a therapeutically effective amount of one or more ocular antioxidants.”	37
3.	Claim 2 - “The method of claim 1, wherein said ocular antioxidant is selected from the group consisting of antioxidant vitamins, carotenoids, antioxidant minerals, natural antioxidant extracts and synthetic antioxidants.”	39
4.	Claim 4 - “The method of claim 2, wherein the carotenoid is selected from the list consisting of lutein, zeaxanthin, beta-carotene, retinoids, retinal, retinaldehyde, and meso-zeaxanthin.”	40
5.	Claim 9 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said therapeutically effective amount of said carotenoid is between 0.0001 and 2 mg per kilogram of body weight of said subject per day.”	41
6.	Claim 3 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said antioxidant vitamin is selected from the list consisting of vitamins A, C, and E.”	43
7.	Claim 5 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said antioxidant mineral is selected from the list consisting of zinc, copper, and selenium.”	45

8.	Claim 6 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said natural extract is selected from the list consisting of polyphenols, quercitin, anthocyanins, and anthocyanidins.”	46
C.	Ground II - Claims 8, 10, and 12 of the ’940 Patent are unpatentable as obvious over the combination of Snider and Richer.	47
1.	Claim 8 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said therapeutically effective amount of said antioxidant vitamin is between 0.02 (1 IU) and 15 mg (150 IU) per kilogram of body weight of said subject per day.”	47
2.	Claim 10 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said therapeutically effective amount of said antioxidant mineral is between 0.0001 and 5 mg per kilogram of body weight of said subject per day.”	50
3.	Claim 12 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said therapeutically effective amount of said natural extract is between 0.0001 and 20 mg per kilogram of body weight of said subject per day.”	53
D.	Ground III - Claims 7, 11, and 13 of the ’940 Patent are unpatentable as obvious over the combination of Snider and Ciolkowski.....	56
1.	Claim 7 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said synthetic antioxidant is selected from the list consisting of BHT, BHA, and BTHQ.”	56
2.	Claim 11 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said therapeutically effective amount of said synthetic antioxidant is between 0.001 and 15 mg per kilogram of body weight of said subject per day.”	59
3.	Claim 13 - “The method of claim 2, wherein said therapeutically effective amount of said synthetic antioxidant is between 0.0001 and 20 mg per kilogram of body weight of said subject per day.”	62
X.	Conclusion	65

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. 9,226,940 (“the ’940 Patent”)
Ex. 1002	Prosecution History of the ’940 Patent
Ex. 1003	Lloyd Snider, Evidence Supports New Approaches for Reducing the Risk of Macular Degeneration, <i>Optometric Management</i> (November 2008) (“Snider”)
Ex. 1004	Barbara McLaughlan, Awareness of Age-related Macular Degeneration and Associated Risk Factors, AMD Alliance International (September 2005) (“McLaughlan”)
Ex. 1005	Gilles Chaine, Case-control study of the risk factors for age related macular degeneration (“Chaine”), <i>British Journal of Ophthalmology</i> (September 1998)
Ex. 1006	Stuart Richer, Double-masked, placebo-controlled, randomized trial of lutein and antioxidant supplementation in the intervention of atrophic age-related macular degeneration: the Veterans LAST study (Lutein Antioxidant Supplementation Trial), <i>Optometry</i> (April 2004) (“Richer”)
Ex. 1007	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2009/0239836 to Ciolkowski (“Ciolkowski”)
Ex. 1008	Declaration of Dr. John Landrum
Ex. 1009	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Dr. John Landrum
Ex. 1010	Declaration of Rachel Watters A
Ex. 1011	Declaration of Rachel Watters B
Ex. 1012	Declaration of Raymond Weschler
Ex. 1013	WIPO International Publication No. WO2007118095 A2
Ex. 1014	Shirley Sarkes, Relationship of Basal Lamina Deposit and Membranous Debris to the Clinical Presentation of Early Age-Related Macular Degeneration, <i>Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science</i> (March 2007)
Ex. 1015	John T. Landrum & Richard A. Bone, Chapter 22: Mechanistic Evidence for Eye Diseases and Carotenoids, <i>Carotenoids in Health and Disease (Oxidative Stress and Disease)</i> (September 30, 2004)
Ex. 1016	Johanna M. Seddon, MD, et al., Dietary Carotenoids, Vitamins A, C, and E, and Advanced Age-Related Macular Degeneration, <i>The JAMA Network</i> (November 9, 1994)

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.