

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

METRICS, INC., MAYNE PHARMA, and
JOHNSON MATTHEY, INC.

Petitioners

v.

SENJU PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD., BAUSCH & LOMB, INC., and
BAUSCH & LOMB PHARMA HOLDINGS CORP.

Patent Owners

Case IPR2014-01041
Patent 8,129,431 Case

Before PATRICK E. BAKER, *Trial Paralegal*

CORRECTED Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,129,431
Pursuant to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's July 22, 2014 Notice of
Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Time for Filing Patent Owner
Preliminary Response

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 iii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. OVERVIEW 1

 A. The '431 Patent2

 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.....6

III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS..... 9

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 14

VII. PERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”) & STATE OF THE ART .. 16

VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))..... 19

 A. Independent Claims 1 and 1820

 1. Ogawa in View of Sallmann 20

 B. Dependent Claims 2-17 and 19-22.....36

 1. Claims 2-6, 11-17, and 19-22 – sodium salt of
 bromfenac..... 36

2.	Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, and 20 – bromfenac concentration.....	38
3.	Claims 5 and 22.....	40
4.	Claims 11, 15-17, and 21	41
5.	Claims 3-5 and 11 – tyloxapol concentration range	43
6.	Claims 6, 15-17, and 20-22 – tyloxapol concentration.....	45
7.	Claims 12-14 – tyloxapol concentration.....	48
8.	Claims 7-10, 13, 14, 16 and 17- additives	50
9.	Claims 9 and 10 - pH	51
C.	Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness	52
1.	No Unexpected Results Over the Closest Prior Art.....	52
2.	Other Objective Indicia.....	54
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	57
X.	Appendix: Dependent Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over the Prior Art	1

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
IPR2013-00368, Paper 8 (December, 17, 2013)50

Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.,
544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008)27

Chapman v. Casner,
315 F. App'x 294 (Fed. Cir. 2009)36, 37, 41, 49

Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.,
569 F.3d 1335 11

Friskit, Inc. v. Real Networks, Inc.,
306 F. App'x 610 (Fed. Cir. 2009)52

Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.,
737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)37, 39, 41, 47

In re Aller,
220 F.2d 454, (C.C.P.A. 1955)46

In re De Blauwe,
736 F.2d 699 (Fed. Cir. 1984)50

In re Peterson,
315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)40, 46, 51

In re Woodruff,
919 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990)41

Iron Grip Barbell Co., Inc. v. USA Sports, Inc.,
392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)37, 39, 41, 47

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....1, 14, 23

Newell Cos., Inc. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.,
864 F.2d 757 (Fed. Cir. 1988)49

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

Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.,
463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)53

Purdue Pharma Prods. L.P. v. Par Pharm., Inc.,
377 F. App'x 978 (Fed. Cir. 2010)53

Sinclair & Carroll Co., v. Interchemical Corp.,
325 U.S. 327 (1945).....22

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.,
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)52, 53

Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.,
550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008)27

Tokai Corp. v. Eason Enters., Inc.,
632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011)54

Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC,
683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012)23, 27, 31

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 112*passim*

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.