UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ETON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., Petitioner

v.

EXELA PHARMA SCIENCES, LLC, Patent Owner

> Case PGR2020-00064 Patent No. 10,478,453

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

DOCKET

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | Introduction1 | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| II. Background | | | | | | |
| | A. | L-Cysteine Is an Essential Amino Acid, Primarily Administered to Infants, that Posed Devastating Health Risks Due to its High Aluminum Content Before Exela's Invention | | | | |
| | B. | The Patented Invention Solved the Long-Standing and Complex Problem to Fulfill an Unmet Need for a Stable, Highly Pure Low- Aluminum L-Cysteine TPN Component14 | | | | |
| III. | Cl | Claim Construction18 | | | | |
| IV. | Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art18 | | | | | |
| V. | | stitution Should Be Denied Because Eton Has Not Demonstrated at the Allergy Process Qualifies as Prior Art19 | | | | |
| | A. | Eton Does Not Demonstrate That the Allergy Process Qualifies as a "Public Use" | | | | |
| | | 1. The Johnson Declaration Does Not Support a Conclusion of Public Use21 | | | | |
| | | 2. The Johnson Declaration Lacks the Required Corroboration23 | | | | |
| | | 3. Eton's Case Law Does Not Support a Finding of Public Accessibility | | | | |
| | B. | Eton's "Embodiment" Theory Lacks Merit27 | | | | |
| VI. | Institution Should Be Denied Because The Petition Fails to Meet the Particularity Requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 322(A)(3) | | | | | |
| | A. | Grounds 1-3 Lack Particularity Because Eton Is Improperly Blending Different Types of Prior Art Within the Definition of the "Sandoz Label" | | | | |
| | B. | Grounds 1-3 Lack Particularity Because of Eton's "Catch-all" Approach | | | | |

DOCKET

| VII. | Institution Should Be Denied Because Eton Cannot Prevail as to Any Challenged Claim | | | | |
|-------|--|--------|--|--|--|
| | A. | Bee | ound 1: Eton Fails to Demonstrate That Claims 1-14 Would Have on Obvious Over the Sandoz Label in View of the Knowledge of a SITA | | |
| | | 1. | The Sandoz Label Does Not Disclose or Suggest the Claimed Limitations | | |
| | | 2. | Eton's "Routine Optimization" Argument Is Based on Hindsight- Infected Assumptions and Ignores the Complex Interplay Between the Claimed Composition's Features | | |
| | B. | Wo | ound 2: Eton Fails to Demonstrate That Claims 15-20 and 22 uld Have Been Obvious Over the Sandoz Label in View of the spira Label in View of the Knowledge of a POSITA | | |
| | C. | Bee | ound 3: Eton Fails to Demonstrate That Claim 21 Would Have on Obvious Over the Sandoz Label in View of the Allergy Process View of the Knowledge of a POSITA | | |
| VIII. | Co | onclus | ion68 | | |

EXHIBIT LIST

| Exhibit No. | Description |
|-------------|---|
| 2001 | Declaration of Dr. Robert J. Kuhn |
| 2002 | Aileen B. Sedman et al., <i>Evidence of Aluminum Loading in Infants</i> <i>Receiving Intravenous Therapy</i> , 312 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1337 (1985) |
| 2003 | Nicholas J. Bishop et al., <i>Aluminum Neurotoxicity in Preterm</i> <i>Infants Receiving Intravenous-Feeding Solutions</i> , 336 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1557 (1997) |
| 2004 | ELCYS [®] Label, Exela Pharma Sciences, LLC |
| 2005 | Amended Complaint (Redacted), <i>Exela Pharma Sciences, LLC v.</i> <i>Sandoz, Inc.</i> , No. 1:20-cv-00645-MN (D. Del. June 1, 2020), ECF No. 12 |
| 2006 | Amended Complaint, <i>Exela Pharma Sciences, LLC v. Eton</i> <i>Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , No. 20-365-MN (D. Del. July 28, 2020), ECF No. 14 |
| 2007 | Declaration of Mark Hartman (Redacted), <i>Exela Pharma Sciences</i> , <i>LLC v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , No. 19-cv-00318-MR (W.D.N.C. Dec. 6, 2019), ECF No. 26-1 |
| 2008 | Megan Fortenberry et al., <i>Evaluating Differences in Aluminum</i> <i>Exposure Through Parenteral Nutrition in Neonatal Morbidities</i> , 9 NUTRIENTS 1249 (2017) |
| 2009 | Kathleen M. Gura, <i>Aluminum Contamination in Parenteral</i> <i>Products</i> , 17 CURR. OPIN. CLIN. NUTR. & METAB. CARE 551 (2014) |
| 2010 | Gordon L. Klein et al., <i>Hypocalcemia Complicating Deferoxamine</i> <i>Therapy in an Infant with Parenteral Nutrition-Associated</i> <i>Aluminum Overload: Evidence for a Role of Aluminum in the Bone</i> <i>Disease of Infants</i> , 9 J. PED. GASTR. & NUTR. 400 (1989) |
| 2011 | Jay M. Mirtallo, <i>Aluminum Contamination of Parenteral Nutrition</i> <i>Fluids</i> , 34 J. PARENTERAL & ENTERAL NUTR. 346 (2010) |
| 2012 | Robert L. Poole et al., <i>Aluminum Exposure From Pediatric</i> <i>Parenteral Nutrition: Meeting the New FDA Regulation</i> , 32 J. PARENTERAL & ENTERAL NUTR. 242 (2008) |

i

I. INTRODUCTION

Exela's U.S. Patent No. 10,478,453 ("the '453 patent;" Ex. 1001) relates to inventions for stable, highly pure L-cysteine compositions for parenteral administration to, primarily, preterm and underweight infants to nourish them during their fragile first days, weeks, or sometimes months of life. While prior Lcysteine formulations contained up to 5,000 ppb¹ of toxic aluminum, the inventive compositions contain no more than 250 ppb of aluminum, and in certain claims even less.² Unlike prior L-cysteine compositions which, as Eton acknowledges, had aluminum levels that were known to increase over time,³ the aluminum and other impurity levels in the claimed compositions are stable over time so as to remain safe for administration to infants throughout the product's shelf life.⁴ Exela's invention solved what was by 2013 already a "decades old and still

¹ "ppb" is also referred to as "mcg/L" or "µg/L" ("micrograms per Liter").

² See, e.g., Ex. 1001 ('453 Patent) at 59:8–9; *id.* at 59:38–39; Ex. 1005 (Sandoz Label) at 10.

³ Paper 1 at 34, 41, 45; *see also* Ex. 1008 (Bohrer 2001) at 1, 4, Table 2 and Fig. 2.

⁴ See, e.g., Ex. 1001 ('453 Patent) at 16:44–47, 59:2.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.