

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LIQUIDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00769

Patent 9,593,066

Patent Owner Preliminary Response Under
35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '066 PATENT	2
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	4
	A. “Pharmaceutical Product”	5
	B. “A Pharmaceutical Composition Comprising Treprostinil or a Pharmaceutically Acceptable Salt Thereof”	5
	C. Additional terms require construction.....	7
	1. Starting Batch.....	7
	2. Stored, Storing, Storage	8
IV.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 325(D)	9
	A. The <i>Advanced Bionics</i> Two-Part Framework	10
	B. Liquidia Relies on the Same Art (<i>Becton</i> Factors (a) & (b))	12
	C. Liquidia Relies on the Same Arguments (<i>Becton</i> Factor (d)).....	18
	D. Liquidia Fails to Prove the Examiner Erred in A Manner Material to The Patentability of Challenged Claims.....	21
	1. Factor (c) – the examiner thoroughly evaluated the same art and substantially the same arguments in a variety of permutations.....	22
	2. Factors (e) & (f) – Liquidia has failed to show an error warranting reconsideration.....	23
V.	LIQUIDIA’S ARGUMENTS ARE NOT SUPPORTED BY RELIABLE EVIDENCE	27
VI.	LIQUIDIA’S “THREE STRONG BASES FOR INVALIDATION” ARE FACTUALLY IRRELEVANT OR INCOMPLETE	28
	A. A Known Synthesis of Treprostinil Is Not the Issue	29
	B. Existence of a “Standard Chemical Purification Known in the Art” Is Not the Issue.....	29

C.	The Board’s Findings In the ’393 IPR Do Not Render the ’066 Claims Obvious	31
VII.	THE GROUNDS SHOULD BE DENIED ON THE MERITS	32
A.	Scope and Content of the Prior Art	32
1.	Liquidia Focuses on the Wrong Problem	32
2.	Liquidia’s Positions Lack Basis.....	35
3.	The ’393 Patent and the ’066 Patent Are Not Directed to the Same Invention	40
4.	Phares and Moriarty are Directed to Different Problems	48
5.	The Prior Art Does Not Teach Stability	50
B.	Liquidia Misidentifies the Person of Ordinary Skill.....	54
C.	Liquidia Ignores the Differences Between the Claimed Invention and Phares	56
1.	Ground 1: Phares Did Not Render Claims 1-7 Obvious.....	56
2.	Ground 2: Phares Did Not Anticipate Claims 8-10	58
3.	Ground 3: Moriarty and Phares Did Not Render Claims 1-10 Obvious	61
VIII.	LIQUIDIA IGNORES OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF OBVIOUSNESS	65
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

American Hoist & Derrick Co. v. Sowa & Sons, 725 F.2d 1350, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 13, 26

Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966) 40, 56

Griffin v. Bertina, 285 F.3d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....6

In re Chudik, 851 F.3d 1365, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017)58

In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride, 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....65

In re Jung, 637 F.3d 1356, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....58

In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 1481 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....20

In re Soni, 54 F.3d 746, 750 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....65

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 406 (2007)29

Monolithic Power Sys., Inc. v. O2 Micro Int’l Ltd., 558 F.3d 1341, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2009)24

Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc., 848 F.3d 987, 993 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....30

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)4

Süd-Chemie Inc. v. Multisorb Technologies, 554 F.3d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....67

Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd., 550 F.3d 1356, 1363-64 (Fed. Cir. 2008)28

<i>United States v. Adams</i> , 383 U.S. 39 (1966).....	4, 32
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	14, 42, 58
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....	26, 64
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	11
35 U.S.C. §316.....	68
35 U.S.C. 314(a)	64
Other Authorities	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte Gmb</i>	passim
<i>Hunting Titan, Inc. v. DynaEnergetics Europe GmbH</i> , IPR2018-00600, Paper 67 (2020) (precedential).....	21
<i>Puma v. Nike</i> , IPR2019-01042, Paper 10 (informative).....	12, 13, 26
<i>Stryker Corp. v. KFx Medical</i> , IPR2019-00817, Paper 10, 28-29 (2019).....	68
Rules	
37 C.F.R. §42.100(b)	4
37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)	64
37 C.F.R. §42.63(b)	42

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.