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 IPR2015-00903 (Patent 8,129,431)¹

Filed: April 6, 2016

Petitioner's Response to Patent Owner' Motion for Observation Regarding Cross-Examination of Reply Witnesses Dr. Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D. and Ivan T. Hofmann, CPA/CFF, CLP

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



Pursuant to the Scheduling Order (Papers 17 and 29), Petitioner hereby files its response to Patent Owner's Motion for Observation (Paper 61).

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner's Motion for Observation mischaracterizes the testimony of Dr. Laskar and Mr. Hofmann, and further includes several arguments to the merits, which is an improper use of the Motion for Observation as a vehicle to make arguments in sur-reply. Furthermore, those arguments to the merits, which ultimately fail to contradict any of Petitioner's positions in this proceeding, further show why Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude Dr. Laskar's Reply Declaration and associated exhibits (Paper 59 at 8-10) is without merit. Accordingly, the Board should expunge or give no weight to Patent Owner's purported observations.

II. RESPONSES TO OBSERVATIONS ON CROSS-EXAMINATION

Observation #1: Patent Owner cites a small part of Dr. Laskar's testimony to imply that Dr. Laskar lacks qualification to provide the testimony in his reply declaration (EX1104).

Dr. Laskar is plainly qualified even under Patent Owner's definition of a POSA. Indeed, Dr. Davies, Patent Owner's own expert, states a POSA would have at least a Bachelor's degree in a field of science which includes "pharmaceutical sciences or a related discipline with about three to five



years of work experience in this area, or a comparable level of education and training." EX2105, ¶ 41. Dr. Laskar also is qualified under Dr. Williams's definition of a POSA and the definition of a POSA in the Patent Owner's Response. EX2082, ¶ 41; Patent Owner's Response, Papers 34 at 6. Petitioner provide a more complete response as to Dr. Laskar's proper qualifications for the offered opinions and testimony in his Reply Declaration in the concurrently filed Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude.

Observation #2: Patent Owner mischaracterizes Dr. Laskar's testimony to suggest his testimony is inconsistent with his statement regarding tyloxapol's antioxidant properties. Patent Owner distorts the record by mischaracterizing Dr. Laskar's answer to Patent Owner's vague and ambiguous questioning. EX2272, 69:3-4 (Petitioner objecting to the question as vague and ambiguous). Dr. Laskar testimony is consistent with the teaching that tyloxapol has antioxidant properties.

See EX1104, ¶¶ 30-31; EX1012, Tables 4 and 5. Dr. Laskar did not state that tyloxapol was not an antioxidant. This aspect of Dr. Laskar's testimony is clear when read in context of his Reply Declaration (EX1104) and his cross-examination testimony on November 4, 2015 (EX2114),



See EX2272, 68:10-19; EX1104, ¶ 6;

EX2114, 157:25-158:3 (

). In Yasueda Table

4, formulations A and B contain tyloxapol, which has two functions (i.e., antioxidant and surfactant), whereas formulation E contains BHT, which has a single function as an antioxidant and thus a "traditional antioxidant." Indeed, Dr. Laskar cited a wide range of prior art references to support his statement that tyloxapol is an antioxidant. EX1104, ¶¶ 6-7, 14-29.

Observation #3: Patent Owner improperly mischaracterizes Dr. Laskar's testimony. Patent Owner suggests that Dr. Laskar's testimony in response to "preliminary questions" that are incomplete hypotheticals vaguely directed to somehow shows that the teaching in the Merck Index and Remington do not apply to the '431 patent and '290 patent.

See EX2272, 29:11, 29:15. Dr. Laskar's testimony is consistent with the teaching that tyloxapol has antioxidant properties and does not contradict it.

, EX2272, 112:16-22),

much like the statement in the Merck Index and Remington that tyloxapol is "oxidized by metals." EX1089, 1751; EX1106, 1415.

Furthermore, Patent Owner's allegation is not a proper distinction of the general teaching in the Merck Index and Remington, which provide a more



generalized teaching that tyloxapol has antioxidant properties. EX1089, 1751; EX1106, 1415; EX1080, 114:6-16; EX1104, ¶¶21-22. If tyloxapol were not an antioxidant, and instead an oxidizing agent (which it is not), then it would not be oxidized by oxidizing agents. Whether or not the sodium in bromfenac sodium is in cation form or not has no relevance to Dr. Laskar's analysis.

Observation #4: Patent Owner's questions seeking legal conclusions whether a prior art is relevant in view of the preamble of the claims is improper and misleading. EX2272, 32:20, 33:6. Furthermore, Patent Owner omits other parts Dr. Laskar's testimony,

EX2272, 127:13-17;

EX1104, ¶¶ 25-26.

Indeed, Patent Owner's own expert's testimony contradicts Patent' Owner's improper legal conclusion, stating that inhalation and nasal formulations have the same characteristics as ophthalmic formulations. EX1079, 20:13-21 ("I -- I study - these often involve solution formulations and suspension formulations especially the one for the inhalation and nasal. So the characteristics are the same, but my application at the current time is not necessarily for the eye but for the lungs and nasal. So the properties of the materials I, mean, to me -- to a person of skill in the art would be quite similar."). Moreover, the '431 patent and Ogawa similarly involve nasal formulations. EX1001, 4:10-13, 11:48-51; EX1004, 4:60-62,



DOCKET

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.

