

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

METRICS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

SENJU PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,129,431 to Sawa *et al.*

Issue Date: March 6, 2012

Title: Aqueous Liquid Preparation Containing 2-Amino-3-(4-bromobenzoyl) Phenylacetic Acid

Inter Partes Review No.: Unassigned

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,129,431 Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW	1
A. The '431 Patent	2
B. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	4
1. Aqueous Ophthalmic Preparations of Bromfenac	4
2. Tyloxapol and Related Surfactants in NSAID Aqueous Ophthalmic Preparations	5
C. The Differences Between the Challenged Claims and the Prior Art.....	5
III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS	8
IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)).....	12
A. Each Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	12
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	12
1. Judicial Matters	12
2. Administrative Matters	12
C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))	13
D. Notice of Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	13
V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a))	13
VI. THE '431 PATENT AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
VII. PERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART ("POSA") & STATE OF THE ART	16
VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	18
A. Independent Claims 1 and 18	19
1. Ogawa in View of Sallmann	19
B. Dependent Claims 2-17 and 19-22.....	35

Petition for Inter Partes Review of USPN 8,129,431

1.	Claims 2-6, 11-17, and 19-22 – sodium salt of bromfenac.....	35
2.	Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, and 20 – bromfenac concentration.....	37
3.	Claims 5 and 22.....	39
4.	Claims 11, 15-17, and 21	40
5.	Claims 3-5 and 11 – tyloxapol concentration range	41
6.	Claims 6, 15-17, and 20-22 – tyloxapol concentration.....	43
7.	Claims 12-14 – tyloxapol concentration.....	46
8.	Claims 7-10, 13, 14, 16 and 17- additives	48
9.	Claims 9 and 10 - pH	49
C.	Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness	50
1.	No Unexpected Results Over the Closest Prior Art.....	50
2.	Other Objective Indicia.....	52
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	55
X.	Appendix: Dependent Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over the Prior Art	56

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00368, Paper 8 (December, 17, 2013)	50
<i>Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	27
<i>Chapman v. Casner</i> , 315 F. App'x 294 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	36, 37, 41, 49
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335	11
<i>Friskit, Inc. v. Real Networks, Inc.</i> , 306 F. App'x 610 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	52
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	37, 39, 41, 47
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454, (C.C.P.A. 1955)	46
<i>In re De Blauwe</i> , 736 F.2d 699 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	50
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	40, 46, 51
<i>In re Woodruff</i> , 919 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	41
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co., Inc. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	37, 39, 41, 47
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	1, 14, 23
<i>Newell Cos., Inc. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.</i> , 864 F.2d 757 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	49

Petition for Inter Partes Review of USPN 8,129,431

<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	53
<i>Purdue Pharma Prods. L.P. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 377 F. App'x 978 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	53
<i>Sinclair & Carroll Co., v. Interchemical Corp.</i> , 325 U.S. 327 (1945).....	22
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	52, 53
<i>Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.</i> , 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	27
<i>Tokai Corp. v. Eason Enters., Inc.</i> , 632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	54
<i>Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC</i> , 683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23, 27, 31
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 112	<i>passim</i>
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 42.106(a).....	9

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.