

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC and PAR PHARMACEUTICAL,
INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

JAZZ PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00545
Patent 8,589,182 B1

Before JACQUELINE WRIGHT BONILLA, BRIAN P. MURPHY, and
JON B. TORNQUIST, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MURPHY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)

I. INTRODUCTION

Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Request for Rehearing following our Final Written Decision determining all challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,589,182 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’182 patent”) to be unpatentable. Paper 69 (“Decision”); Paper 70 (“Rehearing Request” or “Req. Reh’g”). Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC and Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. (together “Petitioner”) filed a Response to Patent Owner’s Rehearing Request. Paper 71 (“Opp.”). Patent Owner seeks reconsideration of the Board’s determination that claims 19–25 of the ’182 patent are unpatentable for obviousness over the Advisory Committee Art (Exs. 1003–1006, collectively “the ACA”). Req. Reh’g 1. Patent Owner argues that the Board: (i) misapprehended the limitation in independent claim 19 reciting “verifying two or more of the following using the computer processor prior to providing the single prescription drug to the narcoleptic patient: patient name; patient address; that the patient has received educational material regarding the single prescription drug; a quantity of the single prescription drug; and dosing directions for the single prescription drug;” (the “verifying” step) and (ii) overlooked the actual disclosures of the ACA in finding the ACA disclosed the “verifying” step. *Id.* Petitioner opposes the rehearing request. Opp. 2–5.

Having considered the parties’ submissions on Patent Owner’s Rehearing Request, Patent Owner’s request is *denied*.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A party who requests rehearing bears the burden of showing that a decision should be modified. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The party must identify

all matters the party believes we misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was addressed previously in a motion, an opposition, or a reply. *Id.* “A Request for Rehearing is not an opportunity to re-argue old arguments.” *Histologics, LLC v. CDX Diagnostics, Inc.*, Case IPR2014-00779, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2014) (Paper 9). With the aforementioned principles in mind, we address the rehearing arguments presented by Patent Owner.

III. ANALYSIS

Independent claim 19 of the ’182 patent recites a method step for entering patient identifying information into a computer database: “entering, using the computer processor, into the single computer database information sufficient to identify the narcoleptic patient.” Ex. 1001, 11:9–11. The ’182 patent describes a patient’s identifying information—name, address (“contact information”), and the prescription amount located on the “Rx/enrollment form” received from the prescribing physician—as being input into the central computer database by an “intake reimbursement specialist” using a computer processor. *Id.* at 4:17–44, Fig. 2A (202–210). The ’182 patent generally describes an intake reimbursement specialist “entering the patient and physician information into an application/database referred to as CHIPS . . . a client home infusion program (CHIP) for Xyrem®.” *Id.* at 4:39–43, Fig. 2A (210).

Claim 19 also recites a step for

verifying two or more of the following *using the computer processor* prior to providing the single prescription drug to the narcoleptic patient: patient name; patient address; that the patient has received educational material

regarding the single prescription drug; a quantity of the single prescription drug; and dosing directions for the single prescription drug.

Id. at 11:23–29 (emphasis added). The ’182 patent describes how an intake reimbursement specialist verifies the patient information that has been input into the computer database, as follows: “CONTACTS MD TO VERIFY RECIEPT & ACCURACY OF THE PATIENT’S RX & THIS CONTACT IS RECORDED IN CHIPS.” *Id.* at Fig. 2A (220); 4:51–55 (“[T]he MD is contacted at 220 to verify receipt and accuracy of the patient’s Rx. This contact is recorded in CHIPS [Client Home Infusion Program database].”). Thus, the ’182 patent specification informs a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”) that the intake reimbursement specialist uses the computer processor to enter the patient’s information into the computer database and then verifies the information by “contacting” the prescribing physician. *Id.* at 4:17–55. The ’182 patent does not further describe or limit how the prescribing physician is contacted or how the intake reimbursement specialist verifies the patient information in the computer database.

Patent Owner’s Rehearing Request repeats the same argument it made in the Patent Owner’s Response, namely that the ACA discloses verification of the recited information “by a human” not “by a computer processor.” *Compare* PO Resp. 26–30 *with* Req. Reh’g 2–3. The argument is based on an implicit claim interpretation by Patent Owner that would prohibit a human being, such as an intake reimbursement specialist, from contacting a prescribing physician by telephone to verify the recited patient information that had been entered into the database using a computer processor. Not only is such an interpretation at odds with the ’182 patent specification, but

we considered and rejected Patent Owner’s argument in our Decision. Dec. 42–45. We stated:

The claim limitation at issue does not recite that the patient information must be verified “by” a computer processor and not a human, only that the computer processor is used (presumably by a human) to verify the patient information. For example, page 310 of the Briefing Booklet (Ex. 1005) in the ACA material describes that “a physician . . . will write a prescription for Xyrem and fax it to the specialty pharmacy.” Ex. 1005, 310 ¶ 4. After receiving the prescription, “the specialty pharmacy will contact the physician’s office to confirm patient information,” as a vehicle to “‘catch’ any prescriptions written on stolen or counterfeit prescription pads.” *Id.* at 310 ¶ 5. The same paragraph on this page also states that “[d]uring the call, the patient’s name, social security number, telephone number and insurance information will also be obtained.” *Id.* Notably, on this page, the ACA indicates that the “specialty pharmacy,” i.e., a “single, central pharmacy” (Ex. 1005, 306, 308), “confirm[s]” patient information, for example during a call to the prescribing doctor’s office. *Id.* at 310 ¶ 5 (emphasis added). Thus, the Briefing Booklet in the ACA at least suggests, if not discloses, that the central pharmacy obtained patient information from the prescription faxed by the physician, entered the patient information into the computer database using the computer processor, and then “confirms” the patient information in the database during the call.

Dec. 43. We further found “the ACA discloses that the pharmacy has patient registry information available for entry into the computer database, prior to dispensing the drug—and a natural use for that database information would be to verify the patient’s name, address, and other information ‘using the computer processor’ as recited in claim 19.” *Id.* at 44 (citing Ex. 1007 ¶ 62). Patent Owner’s Rehearing Request overlooks the salient portions of

our analysis and supporting citations where we considered the “verifying” step in claim 19. We did not misapprehend the “verifying” step or Patent Owner’s argument regarding the “verifying” step.

Patent Owner’s further argument—that the Xyrem video evidence relied upon by Dr. Valuck depicts a pharmacist on the telephone using pen and paper, but not a computer processor, to verify the patient information (Req. Reh’g 3–5)—is misinformed for the reasons given above and in our Decision. Our Decision cited and considered Dr. Valuck’s deposition testimony and the related ACA disclosures being challenged by Patent Owner in its Rehearing Request. Dec. 43–45 (citing Ex. 2044, 163:18–164:2). As Dr. Valuck testified under cross-examination by Patent Owner’s counsel:

[The “verifying” step is] described in the art [ACA], displayed in the video, declared on the slides, presented at the advisory committee meeting, and would be, in addition, implicit based on the skill and experience of a POSA. . . .

The use of the computer is described at various places in the advisory committee art, particularly the transcript, the slides, the video, the briefing booklet, and the preclinical safety review. All of the advisory committee art, the computer is -- is interwoven at nearly every step of the process, and the POSA would understand and interpret that to be the computer is being used for verifying.

Ex. 2044, 164:3–165:8. Furthermore, the video cited by Patent Owner in the Rehearing Request shows a pharmacist sitting in front of a computer keyboard at a workstation while on the telephone verifying the patient’s information. Req. Reh’g 4 (citing Ex. 1006, V9 00:14–00:30, V10 00:05–00:40). Having viewed the video content cited by Patent Owner, in addition

to the video transcript and related evidence cited in our Decision (Dec. 24 n.12, 42–44), particularly Dr. Valuck’s deposition testimony, we reaffirm that our Decision did not overlook the actual disclosures of the ACA with regard to the “verifying” step.

Our Decision also cited Dr. Valuck’s Declaration testimony that the ACA discloses to a POSA that patient information is entered into a secure computer database using a computer processor. Dec. 42, 44 (citing 1007 ¶¶ 60, 62, 85 (citing ¶¶ 60–63)). We reiterate that once a patient’s information is entered into the computer database using a computer processor, the method step for verifying the information is generally described in the ’182 patent as being executed by the intake reimbursement specialist “contacting” the prescribing physician. Telephone contact suffices, and no further limitation of the “verifying” step is warranted by the ’182 patent specification or argued by Patent Owner as a matter of claim construction in this trial proceeding. *See* PO Resp. 23–25 (arguing only for an express construction of a “wherein” clause in dependent claims 7, 14, and 25); Dec. 12–17 (addressing only the construction of the “wherein” clause in claims 7, 14, and, 25). The evidence cited by Petitioner and in our Decision, therefore, appropriately supports our determination that the ACA discloses the “verifying” step in independent claim 19. Opp. 2–4.

Patent Owner’s Response to the Petition and its Rehearing Request cite to Dr. Bergeron’s Declaration testimony in support. PO Resp. 26–29 (citing Ex. 2047 ¶¶ 27–30); Req. Reh’g 2–5 (citing Ex. 2047 ¶¶ 27–30). Although we did not cite to Dr. Bergeron’s Declaration testimony in our Decision regarding claims 19–25, we did consider Dr. Bergeron’s Declaration testimony. Dec. 2. Dr. Bergeron’s Declaration testimony

simply restates Patent Owner’s Response arguments, including the argument that the ACA discloses “the verification is being done by a human, not a computer processor.” Ex. 2047 ¶ 28. We take this opportunity to make explicit that we are not persuaded by Dr. Bergeron’s cited Declaration testimony (Ex. 2047 ¶¶ 27–30) on the issue of whether the ACA discloses or suggests the “verifying” step in claim 19, for the same reasons given in our Decision and above.

Therefore, Patent Owner’s Rehearing Request is denied.

IV. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s Rehearing Request is denied.

IPR2015-00545
Patent 8,589,182 B1

FOR PETITIONER:

Matthew C. Ruedy
Steven A. Maddox
MADDOX EDWARDS PLLC
mruedy@meiplaw.com
smaddox@meiplaw.com

Janine A. Carlan
Richard J. Berman
Bradford C. Frese
ARENT FOX LLP
janine.carlan@arentfox.com
richard.berman@arentfox.com
bradford.frese@arentfox.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

F. Dominic Cerrito
Evangeline Shih
Frank C. Calvosa
Eric C. Stops
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
nickcerrito@quinnemanuel.com
evangelineshih@quinnemanuel.com
frankcalvosa@quinnemanuel.com
ericstops@quinnemanuel.com

John V. Biernacki
JONES DAY
jvbiernacki@jonesday.com