

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COLLEGIUM PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., PURDUE PHARMACEUTICALS L.P.,  
AND THE P.F. LABORATORIES INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case PGR2018-00048  
U.S. Patent No: 9,693,961

---

**PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,693,961**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	3
III. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	4
A. Real Party-in Interest (§ 42.8(b)(1)).....	4
B. Related Matters (§ 42.8(b)(2)) .....	4
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (§ 42.8(b)(3)) .....	5
D. Service Information (§ 42.8(b)(4)).....	6
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGED CLAIMS AND PRECISE RELIEF SOUGHT.....	6
V. OPIATE ABUSE AND METHODS OF ABUSE DETERRENCE ....	6
VI. SUMMARY OF THE '961 PATENT DISCLOSURE AND THE ALLEGED INVENTIONS.....	11
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)(3).....	17
VIII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	21
IX. APPLICATIONS IN THE PRIORITY CHAIN OF THE '961 PATENT .....	21
X. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR PGR.....	24
A. A Patent is Eligible for PGR if it Cannot Properly Claim Priority to a Parent Application Predating March 16, 2013.....	25
B. The Related Applications do not Provide Written Description Support for the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims .....	26
1. The '534 Provisional does not Provide Written Description Support for the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims .....	28

a.	The inventors were not in possession of the full scope of “abuse deterrent dosage forms” .....	28
b.	The claimed dosage form is the result of impermissible “picking and choosing” from the specification of the ’534 Provisional .....	33
2.	The NP Related Applications do not Provide Written Description Support for the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims .....	39
C.	The Related Applications do not Enable the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims .....	40
1.	The ’534 Provisional does not Enable the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims. ....	42
a.	The Challenged Claims are exceedingly broad ...	43
b.	The ’534 Provisional contains no working examples of any purported embodiment of the ’961 patent .....	46
c.	The ’534 Provisional Provides no direction or guidance .....	47
d.	The art is unpredictable and the claims of the ’961 patent likely encompass numerous inoperative formulations .....	50
e.	Nature of the invention and state of the art inform the quantity of experimentation necessary to enable the full scope of the claims of the ’961 patent.....	56
2.	The NP Related Applications do not Enable the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims .....	65
XI.	IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE. ....	67
A.	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims Lack Written Description Support .....	67

PGR2018-00048

Patent: 9,693,961

B.	Ground 2: The Challenged Claims Lack Enablement Support	68
C.	Ground 3: The Challenged Claims are Indefinite .....	69
D.	Ground 4: The Challenged Claims are Anticipated .....	70
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	85
XIII.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE .....	85
XIV.	PAYMENT OF FEES .....	87

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Acorda Therapeutics Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , No. 07-4937, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102875 (D.N.J. Sept. 6, 2011) .....	50, 64
<i>Alza Corp. v. Andrx Pharms., LLC</i> , 603 F.3d 935 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	44, 57
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , 872 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	53
<i>Amneal Pharms., LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P.</i> , IPR2016-01027, Paper 48 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 8, 2017).....	5
<i>Amneal Pharms. LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P.</i> , IPR2016-01412, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 14, 2017).....	5
<i>Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	27, 32, 33
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	30
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont De Nemours &amp; Co.</i> , 750 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	42, 56
<i>Auto. Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. BMW of N. Am., Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	46, 47
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	21
<i>Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Prods., Inc.</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	29
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (1016).....	17

# 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.