

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

POZEN INC. and HORIZON PHARMA USA, INC.,  
Patent Owners.

---

Case IPR2017-01995  
Patent 9,220,698

---

**PATENT OWNERS POZEN INC. AND HORIZON PHARMA USA, INC.'S  
PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	PETITIONER’S PETITION IS BARRED UNDER § 315.....	5
	A. Petitioner Brought the ’698 Patent Into the District Court Litigation More Than 19 Months Prior to Filing the Instant Petition.....	5
	B. Legal Standard.....	7
	C. Petitioner’s Inter Partes Review Petition is Barred Under § 315(a) by Petitioner’s Civil Action Challenging Validity of the ’698 Patent .....	8
	D. Petitioner’s Inter Partes Review Petition is Time-Barred Under § 315(b) .....	10
III.	PETITIONER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT THE ’285 PATENT IS § 102(e) PRIOR ART .....	13
	A. Legal Standard.....	14
	B. Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden to Show That the ’285 Patent Is § 102(e) Prior Art .....	15
IV.	THE PTO HAS PREVIOUSLY REJECTED SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME ARGUMENTS DURING PROSECUTION .....	16
	A. Institution of an <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is Discretionary .....	16
	B. Petitioner Has Failed to Explain Why the Board Should Reconsider Obviousness Over a Plachetka Patent .....	17
V.	CONCLUSION.....	18

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Apple Inc. v. Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG*,  
IPR2016-01841, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 17, 2017) .....16

*Apple Inc. v. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.*,  
IPR2014-00319, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. June 12, 2014) .....12

*Applied Materials, Inc. v. Gemini Research Corp.*,  
835 F.2d 279 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....13, 14

*Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Illumina, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-01093, Paper 69 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 7, 2016) .....15

*In re DeBaun*,  
687 F.2d 459 (C.C.P.A. 1982) .....15

*Johnson Health Tech Co. v. Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-01242, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2015).....7

*Riverwood Int’l Corp. v. R.A. Jones & Co.*,  
324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....14

*Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. SD3, LLC*,  
IPR2016-01750, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 3, 2017) .....14

*St. Jude Med., Cardiology Div., Inc. v. Volcano Corp.*,  
IPR2013-00258, Paper 29 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2013) .....10, 11

*Tristar Prods., Inc. v. Choon’s Design, LLC*,  
IPR2015-01883, Paper 6 (PTAB Mar. 9, 2016) .....8

*Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman*,  
IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 14, 2016) .....17

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 313 .....1

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....5

35 U.S.C. § 315.....	5, 7
35 U.S.C. § 315(a) .....	1, 8
35 U.S.C. § 315(b) .....	1, 10
35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....	5, 16

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	7
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a).....	16
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b) .....	16
157 Cong. Rec. S5429 (daily ed. Sept. 8, 2011) (stmt of Sen. Kyl).....	8

## EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description of Document
2001	Gabriel, S.E., et al., “Risk for Serious Gastrointestinal Complications Related to Use of Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Drugs,” <i>Annals of Internal Medicine</i> , Vol. 115, No. 10, pp. 787-796 (1991) (“Gabriel”)
2002	Cryer, B. and Feldman, M., “Effects of Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Drugs on Endogenous Gastrointestinal Prostaglandins and Therapeutic Strategies for Prevention and Treatment of Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Drug-Induced Damage,” <i>Archives of Internal Medicine</i> , Vol. 152, pp. 1145-1155 (1992) (“Cryer”)
2003	Fries, J.F., et al., “Nonsteroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drug-Associated Gastropathy: Incidence and Risk Factor Models,” <i>The American Journal of Medicine</i> , Vol. 91, pp. 213-222 (1991) (“Fries”)
2004	Second Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement, <i>Horizon Pharma, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-03327 (D.N.J. Feb. 10, 2016)
2005	Answer to Second Amended Complaint, Separate Defenses, And Counterclaims by Defendants Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., Mylan Laboratories Limited and Mylan Inc. , <i>Horizon Pharma, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-03327 (D.N.J. Feb. 19, 2016)
2006	Plaintiffs’ Answer to Defendants’ Counterclaims to Second Amended Complaint, <i>Horizon Pharma, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-03327 (D.N.J. Mar. 7, 2016)
2007	157 Cong. Rec. S5429 (daily ed. Sept. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl)

# 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.