

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 B2)<sup>1</sup>  
\_\_\_\_\_

Filed: September 21, 2016

**PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXPUNGE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> IPR2015-01871 has been joined with IPR2015-00903.

## I. Introduction

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.56, Petitioner InnoPharma submits this motion to expunge the previously-sealed versions of: (1) Exhibit 2109 and (2) Exhibit 2082. Pursuant to the Board’s Order on September 19, 2016 (Paper 95), Petitioner is authorized to file a motion to expunge confidential information from the records by September 21, 2016.<sup>2</sup> Patent Owner does not oppose this motion.

## II. Legal Standard

“After denial of a petition to institute a trial or after final judgment in a trial, a party may file a motion to expunge confidential information from the record.” 37 C.F.R. section 42.56. Under the rules, “information will be made public where the existence of the information is referred to in a decision to grant or deny a request to institute review or is identified in a final written decision following a trial.” Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,761. Conversely, where confidential information is not relied on by the Board, that information will generally be expunged. *Volkswagen Grp. of Am. v. Emerachem Holdings, LLC*, IPR2014-01556, Paper No. 61, at 2 (expunging confidential papers where “our consideration

---

<sup>2</sup> Sealed copies of Exhibit 2109 and Exhibit 2082 appear to have been already expunged by the Board, however, in an abundance of caution Petitioner hereby moves to expunge Exhibit 2109 and Exhibit 2082.

of the Subject Papers and Exhibits was not necessary for our determination of whether the challenged claims of the '911 patent were patentable.”).

In other *inter partes* review proceedings, the Board has held that confidential research, development, or commercial information should remain under seal. *See Otter Products, LLC, Petr.*, IPR2014-01464, Paper No. 28, pp. 2-4 (PTAB Aug. 27, 2015); *Greene’s Energy Grp., LLC, Inc. v. Oil States Energy Svcs., LLC*, IPR2014-00216, Paper 27, at 5 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2014); *Gnosis, et al. v. South Alabama Med. Science Found.*, IPR2013-00117, Paper 39, at 2 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2013); *Unified Patents Inc. v. Dragon Intellectual Property, LLC*, IPR2014-01252, Paper 40, at 7 (PTAB Feb. 27, 2015); *Microsoft Corp. v. SurfCast, Inc.*, IPR2013-00292, Paper 58, at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2014). In *Greene’s Energy Group*, the Board held that portions of an exhibit containing confidential financial information should remain under seal where the proposed redactions were reasonable and the thrust of the underlying argument or evidence was clearly discernable from the redacted versions. *Greene’s Energy Grp.*, IPR2014-00216, Paper 27, at 5. Moreover, in *Otter Products*, the Board held that it was appropriate to expunge select exhibits in support of redacted papers where the public release of such exhibits “has not been published or other made available to the public,” and where public disclosure of the exhibits “would be commercially harmful.” *Otter Products*, IPR2014-01464, Paper No. 28, at 4. Public disclosure of the information

that the parties seek to have expunged would be commercially harmful as explained further below. Further, such information is unnecessary to understand the thrust of the Board's final written decision.

### **III. Confidential Documents that Should be Expunged from the Record**

InnoPharma moves to expunge the sealed versions of (1) Exhibit 2109 that contains InnoPharma's Abbreviated New Drug Application ("ANDA") and (2) Exhibit 2082 (Declaration of Robert O. Williams, III, Ph.D.) that cite to or substantially describe the confidential information in Exhibit 2109. Because public disclosure of the contents of these documents, or descriptions of those contents, would disclose confidential business information in a highly competitive market, Petitioner requests that the sealed versions of Exhibit 2109 and Exhibit 2082 be expunged. This information has not been published and is not publicly available.

#### **1. Exhibit 2109**

As explained in Petitioner's motion to seal (Paper 88) the sealed version of Exhibit 2109 is InnoPharma's ANDA, which was filed confidentially with the FDA in order to obtain FDA approval to market InnoPharma's generic pharmaceutical product. The information the parties seek to seal contains InnoPharma's highly sensitive, confidential development information and technical, business information. InnoPharma's product has not yet been marketed and remains confidential.

This exhibit is not cited or discussed in the Board's Final Written Decision (Paper 83), therefore, the public can understand the thrust of the Board's decision without resorting to the information contained in Exhibit 2109. If InnoPharma's confidential information is made public, InnoPharma's competitors could exploit its confidential information and gain an unfair competitive advantage over InnoPharma. Accordingly, Petitioner requests that Exhibit 2109 be expunged.

## **2. Exhibit 2082**

As explained in Petitioner's motion to seal (Paper 83), the Williams Declaration (Exhibit 2082) describes the confidential information contained in the ANDA (Exhibit 2109) in connection with secondary considerations of non-obviousness. In particular, the chart at paragraph 187 shows the generic bromfenac product components described in Exhibit 2109, and the Final Written Decision (Paper 83) does not cite or rely on paragraph 187 of Exhibit 2082.

If InnoPharma's confidential information is made public, InnoPharma's competitors could exploit its confidential information and gain an unfair competitive advantage over InnoPharma. A redacted copy of Exhibit 2082 has been filed and will remain in the record, so expunging the aforementioned confidential information will not impede public understanding of the underlying arguments and evidence. Accordingly, Petitioner requests that the sealed copy of Exhibit 2082 be expunged.

# 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.