

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., and MYLAN INC.
Petitioners,

v.

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

Case IPR2015-00903
Patent 8,129,431

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	2
A.	Background of related litigations	2
B.	InnoPharma's failed <i>prima facie</i> case of obviousness	4
C.	Senju's compelling objective evidence of patentability	9
II.	Statement of relief requested	13
III.	Claim construction	14
IV.	Level of skill in the art	15
V.	The petition should be denied for failing to establish a reasonable likelihood that any of the challenged claims is unpatentable	16
A.	The inventive ophthalmic preparations of the '431 patent	16
B.	The combination of Ogawa and Sallmann, in either direction, does not render any claim of the '431 patent obvious	17
C.	InnoPharma has established no reason, other than hindsight, to focus on Ogawa and bromfenac preparations	19
D.	Ogawa in view of Sallmann: a combination the person of ordinary skill in the art would not have made	20
1.	Ogawa and the problem it sought to solve	20
2.	Sallmann's singular purpose does not align with Ogawa's	23
3.	It would not have been obvious to modify Ogawa's Example 6 in view of Sallmann's Example 2	24
4.	InnoPharma's arguments of motivation and expectation of success ring hollow in view of the demonstratively strong evidence counseling against the proposed combination of Ogawa in view of Sallmann	28

E.	Sallmann in view of Ogawa: a hindsight-laden combination that would not have been made prior to invention	33
1.	The proposed combination destroys the essential purpose of Sallmann, ignores the blaze marks in the art, and runs afoul of the '431 patent's claim language	33
2.	InnoPharma's arguments to modify Sallmann's Example 2 in view of Ogawa's Example 6 are legally insufficient, internally inconsistent, and belied by the very art it relies on	37
F.	Fu does not remedy the deficiencies in InnoPharma's combination of Ogawa and Sallmann	42
1.	A POSA would not have looked to Fu	42
2.	InnoPharma's attempted connection between Fu and tyloxapol is untenable	43
3.	InnoPharma has failed to demonstrate unpatentability of claims 6, 15-17, and 20-22, requiring a tyloxapol concentration of about 0.02 w/v %	47
VI.	Senju's compelling objective evidence of patentability enhances an already strong case of no prima facie obviousness, which InnoPharma fails to adequately rebut	49
A.	InnoPharma fails to offer evidence refuting unexpected results	50
1.	The '431 patent compares against the closest prior art for purposes of showing unexpected results	50
2.	Polysorbate 80's expected ability to stabilize	51
3.	Tyloxapol's unexpectedly superior stabilizing effect	53
B.	Additional compelling objective evidence of patentability	56
VII.	Conclusion	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	36
<i>Cadence Pharm. Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Catalina Lighting, Inc. v. Lamps Plus, Inc.</i> , 295 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	49, 58
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	37
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	8, 33
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	27
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (2011).....	55
<i>Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	18, 35, 43
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	13, 58
<i>Janssen Pharm. NV v. Mylan Pharm., Inc.</i> , 456 F. Supp. 2d 644 (D.N.J. 2006), <i>aff'd per curiam</i> , 223 Fed. Appx. 999 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	57
<i>Kao Corp. v. Unilever U.S., Inc.</i> , 441 F.3d 963 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	49
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	15, 17, 20, 39

In re Kubin,
561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)19, 28

Leo Pharm. Prod., Ltd. v. Rea,
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)32, 33

Novartis Pharm. Corp. v. Watson Labs., Inc.,
No. 2014-1799, 2015 WL 2403308 (Fed. Cir. May 21, 2015)
(unpublished)7, 19, 25

Ortho-McNeil Pharm. Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)28, 49

Pfizer Inc. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.,
No. 10-528-GMS, 2014 WL 5388100 (D. Del. Oct. 22, 2014).....*passim*

RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc.,
730 F.2d 1440 (Fed. Cir. 1984)13, 58

In re Soni,
54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995)5

Specialty Composites v. Cabot Corp.,
845 F.2d 981 (Fed. Cir. 1988)57

Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)15, 18, 19

In re Wesslau,
353 F.2d 238 (C.C.P.A. 1965)32, 34

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 10315

35 U.S.C. § 11916

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)2, 13

35 U.S.C. § 315(b)3

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.