

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INNOPHARMA LICENSING, INC., INNOPHARMA LICENSING LLC,
INNOPHARMA INC., INNOPHARMA LLC,
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC., MYLAN INC., LUPIN LTD., and LUPIN
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

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

Case IPR2015-00903¹
Patent 8,129,431

Filed: March 18, 2016

Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response to Petition

¹ IPR2015-01871 has been joined with IPR2015-00903.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENT	1
A.	Patent Owner Fails to Consider the Full Scope of the Prior Art.....	1
1.	Complexation of Acidic NSAIDs and BAC Was Known	1
2.	Ethoxylated Octylphenols Were Known to Solve the Complexation Problem	5
3.	BAC Was Commonly Used for Ophthalmic Products	9
B.	The Claims are Obvious under Patent Owner’s Theory that a POSA Would Have Used Antioxidants to Stabilize Bromfenac	11
1.	Tyloxapol is in the Class of Alkylphenols Disclosed in Doi.....	12
2.	Tyloxapol’s General Antioxidant Properties Were Known.....	12
C.	A POSA Would Have Expected Tyloxapol to Improve Stability and Preservative Efficacy	14
D.	A POSA Would Have Considered Ogawa Example 6 and Sallmann Example 2.....	16
1.	Bromfenac Was an NSAID with Superior Efficacy and a POSA Would Have Considered Ogawa Example 6	17
2.	A POSA Would Have Considered Sallmann Example 2	18
E.	A POSA Would Have Arrived at the Appropriate Concentration of Tyloxapol through Routine Optimization.....	18

F.	Patent Owner’s Evidence of Alleged Objective Indicia is Not Probative of Patentability	20
1.	Patent Owner Did Not Compare to the Closest Prior Art.....	20
2.	Patent Owner’s Evidence of Secondary Considerations are Not Commensurate with the Scope of the Claims	20
3.	Evidence of Commercial Success Lacks Factual Support and Nexus with the Claims	23
4.	Patent Owner’s Arguments Regarding Licensing and Copying are Misplaced	25
III.	CONCLUSION.....	25
	CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE.....	1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
 CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 2015-1171, 2016 WL 761884 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 26, 2016).....	7, 10
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	25
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb v. Teva Pharm. USA</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	20
<i>In re Harris</i> , 409 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	21
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	21
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	25
<i>ISTA Pharms., Inc. v. FDA</i> , 898 F. Supp. 2d 227 (D.D.C. 2012).....	24
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	23
 STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 103	1
 OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. 42.65(a).....	16

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner requests cancellation of claims 1-22 (“challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,129,431 (“the ’431 patent”) (EX1001). The Board instituted IPR of Claims 1-5, 7-14, and 18-19 as obvious over Ogawa and Sallmann under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and Claims 6, 15-17, and 20-22 as obvious over Ogawa, Sallmann, and Fu under 35 U.S.C. § 103. (“Decision,” Paper 15). Nothing in Patent Owner’s Response (“Response,” Paper 34) should change the Board’s conclusion.

II. ARGUMENT

A. Patent Owner Fails to Consider the Full Scope of the Prior Art

Patent Owner does not dispute that the prior art disclosed the combination of bromfenac with tyloxapol, (*see* EX1005, 3:23-39), but asserts that only hindsight would provide a reason for that combination. Those arguments, however, are based on inaccurate recitations of the state of the prior art and clear mischaracterization of

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (EX2114, 260:15-22).

1. Complexation of Acidic NSAIDs and BAC Was Known

Patent Owner suggests that there is no teaching in the prior art that bromfenac and BAC will form complexes. (Resp. at 5; EX2105, ¶37, 76; EX2082, ¶63). Not true: the complexation problem between acidic NSAIDs (*e.g.*, bromfenac) and BAC was well known. Fu described the prior art as teaching “an insoluble complex was



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.