

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SABINSA CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

FRANCO CAVALERI,

Patent Owner.

Case No. PGR2022-00015

U.S. Patent No. 10,945,970

**PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,945,970**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PGR REQUIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.204	1
A.	Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a)	1
B.	Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a).....	1
1.	Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....	1
2.	Relief Requested	2
C.	Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8	3
1.	Real Party-in-Interest Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	3
2.	Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	3
3.	Identification of Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....	3
4.	Service Information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)	3
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE '970 PATENT	4
A.	The '970 Patent Specification	4
B.	The '970 Patent Claims	10
C.	Summary of Relevant Portions of the File History.....	11
IV.	THIS PETITION IS NOT REDUNDANT WITH ANY PRIOR PETITIONS OR THE ARGUMENTS PRESENTED IN PROSECUTION.....	13
V.	BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF TECHNOLOGY	15
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	17
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)(3).....	17
VIII.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	18
A.	Li.....	18
B.	Rhema.....	19
C.	Grebow	21
D.	Yang	22
E.	Pushpakumari	24
F.	Hong	26
G.	Kim.....	29

H.	Antony	31
IX.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	34
A.	Lack of Priority	35
1.	Claims 1–7 of the '970 patent lack priority to the '554 Provisional Application	36
2.	Claims 1–6 of the '970 patent lack priority to the '275 PCT Application	40
3.	Conclusion	42
B.	Ground 1: Claim 4 of the '970 patent is anticipated by Li.	42
C.	Ground 2: Claims 5 and 6 of the '970 patent are obvious over Li and the knowledge of a POSA.....	46
1.	Claim 5	46
2.	Claim 6	48
D.	Ground 3: Claim 5 of the '970 patent is obvious over Li in combination with Rhema and Grebow.....	49
E.	Ground 4: Claim 6 of the '970 patent is obvious over Li in combination with Yang	51
F.	Ground 5: Claims 1–3 and 7 of the '970 patent are obvious over Pushpakumari in combination with Hong and Kim.....	52
1.	Claims 1, 2, and 7.....	52
2.	Claim 3	55
G.	Ground 6: Claim 3 of the '970 patent is obvious over Pushpakumari in combination with Hong, Kim, and Yang	57
H.	Ground 7: Claim 7 of the '970 patent is obvious over Antony in combination with Pushpakumari.....	58
I.	Ground 8: Claims 1–2, 4–5, and 7 of the '970 patent are invalid for lack of written description and lack of enablement.....	61
J.	Ground 9: Claims 1–7 of the '970 patent are invalid for indefiniteness.....	69
1.	Claims 1–7 do not indicate on what basis the percentages of curcuminoids are measured	70
2.	The claims and specification do not indicate whether the percentages of curcuminoids is based on the total amount	

	of the curcuminoids, or the total amount of the entire composition including excipients and carriers.....	73
3.	The numerous methods of calculation render claims 1–7 indefinite.	75
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	76
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	77
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	- 1 -
	CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE	- 2 -

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	35, 62, 63
<i>Arthrocare Corp. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 406 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	42
<i>Becton Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , Case IPR2017-01586, slip op. (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017).....	14
<i>Bosch Auto. Serv. Sols., LLC v. Matal</i> , 878 F.3d 1027 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	60
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chems. Corp. (Canada)</i> , 803 F.3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	69, 75, 76
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc.-Fla.</i> , 764 F.3d 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	18
<i>Gardner v. TEC Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	47
<i>Gen. Hosp. Corp. v. Sienna Biopharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 888 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	36, 38, 39
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	19
<i>Harris Corp. v. IXYS Corp.</i> , 114 F.3d 1149 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	63
<i>Jazz Pharms., Inc. v. Amneal Pharms., LLC</i> , 895 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	20
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	35

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.