

Paper No. ___
Filed: November 20, 2014

Filed on behalf of: Senju Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.

By: M. Andrew Holtman, Ph.D.
Jonathan R.K. Stroud
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
Telephone: 202-408-4000
Facsimile: 202-408-4400
E-mail: andy.holtman@finnegan.com
jonathan.stroud@finnegan.com

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 Owner

Case IPR2014-01041

Patent 8,129,431

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,129,431**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction..... 1

II. The Board should deny institution as creating an unjust, inefficient, and dilatory conflict between the AIA and the Hatch-Waxman Act where a second ANDA filer files an identical IPR to subvert its forum of choice. 4

 1. *The Board’s authority*..... 4

 2. *The Hatch-Waxman Act’s objectives*..... 5

 3. *Relevant concurrent proceedings* 7

 4. *Denial of institution would avoid statutory, regulatory, and administrative conflict* 9

III. The petition’s filing date should be vacated because Metrics did not identify all real parties-in-interest as required by 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2). 14

 1. *Coastal shared this petition’s contents—the references and arguments.* 15

 2. *Coastal could have controlled Metrics’ involvement in this petition.* 18

 3. *Prior decisions of the PTO support vacating the filing date in this proceeding.*..... 19

IV. Claim Construction 20

 A. Overview of the ’431 patent..... 20

 B. Standard and procedure. 22

 C. Claim terms addressed in the petition. 22

 1. *“consisting essentially of”* 22

 2. *“about”* 23

 3. *“ophthalmic”* 24

V.	The Board may decline institution on procedural grounds because the PTO already considered substantially the same references, grounds, and arguments.....	25
1.	<i>Ogawa</i>	26
2.	<i>Fu</i>	29
3.	<i>Sallmann</i>	32
4.	<i>Other exhibits—EX1002 (Metrics' "Hara")</i>	34
5.	<i>Other exhibits—Desai and Yasueda</i>	36
VI.	The petition is not reasonably likely to prevail against the challenged claims.	37
A.	Metrics alleges two grounds for unpatentability and does not raise others with particularity under 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).	38
i.	<i>Metrics improperly relies on references not identified in the stated grounds of unpatentability pursuant to § 312(a)(3) and the Board's rules, and then argues for a new ground of unpatentability not pleaded in accordance with the same statute and rules.</i>	38
ii.	<i>Sallmann in view of Ogawa is not presented with particularity, failing §312(a)(3).</i>	41
iii.	<i>The petition fails to show with particularity a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on any claim of the '431 patent.....</i>	42
B.	The petition contains multiple failures of proof for the dependent claims of the '431 patent.	43
i.	<i>The arguments for claims 3–6, 11–17, and 20–22 do not show with particularity a reasonable likelihood of prevailing.</i>	46
ii.	<i>Elements in claims 20–22 are not addressed and do not depend from any claim where those elements are addressed.....</i>	49

iii.	<i>Elements in claims 16 and 17 are not addressed by Metrics in its alleged grounds.</i>	50
iv.	<i>Metrics' attempted reliance on Iron Grip Barbell in connection with claims 12–14's specific tyloxapol concentrations does not show with particularity a reasonable likelihood it will prevail.</i>	50
v.	<i>The petition does not show with particularity a reasonable likelihood that claims 2–6, 11–17, and 19–22 reciting a bromfenac sodium salt are obvious over Ogawa in view of Sallmann.</i>	51
vi.	<i>For dependent claims 3–6, 11–17, and 20–22's concentrations of bromfenac or a bromfenac sodium salt, the petition does not show with particularity a reasonable likelihood that Metrics will prevail.</i>	53
vii.	<i>The petition's discussion of the pH values recited in claims 9 and 10 does not show with particularity a reasonable likelihood it will prevail.</i>	56
viii.	<i>The petition does not show the obviousness of adding claims 7–10, 13, 14, and 16–18's additional elements with particularity and shows no reasonable likelihood that Metrics will prevail.</i>	57
VII.	Conclusion	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	21
<i>Andrx Pharm., Inc. v. Biovail Corp.</i> , 276 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	5
<i>Asahi Glass Co. v. Toledo Eng'g Co.</i> , 505 F. Supp. 2d 423 (N.D. Ohio 2007)	15
<i>Chapman v. Casner</i> , 315 F. App'x 294 (Fed Cir. 2009)	55
<i>Davol, Inc. v. Atrium Med. Corp.</i> , 2013 WL 3013343 (D. Del. June 17, 2013)	10
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	37
<i>E.E.O.C. v. Univ. of Pa.</i> , 850 F.2d 969 (3d Cir. 1988), <i>aff'd</i> , 493 U.S. 182 (1990)	12
<i>Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	40
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC</i> , 435 F. App'x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	41, 54
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013), <i>cert. denied</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2295 (2014)	11
<i>Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	46
<i>In re Herz</i> , 537 F.2d 549 (C.C.P.A. 1976)	21

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.