| UNITED STATES PATENT | AND TRADEMARK OFFICE |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| BEFORE THE PATENT T | RIAL AND APPEAL BOARD |
| APOT | EX CORP. EX, INC. itioner |
| | V. |
| | GAN, INC. at Owner |
| | |
| | .2015-01284 8,648,048 |

PATENT OWNER ALLERGAN, INC.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



Case IPR2015-01284 Attorney Docket No: 13351-0062IP1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | INTR | RODUCTION | 1 |
|------|----------|--|----|
| II. | BAC | KGROUND OF THE '048 PATENT | 7 |
| | A. | Dry Eye Disease is a Serious Disease | 7 |
| | B. | Palliative Treatments Only Alleviate the Symptoms of Dry Eye Disease. | 7 |
| | C. | Allergan's Development of RESTASIS® | 8 |
| III. | THE | '048 PATENT | 9 |
| | A. | It was counterintuitive to combine 0.05% cyclosporin with a vehicle containing 1.25% castor oil | |
| | 1. | Castor oil is cytotoxic and an irritant | 10 |
| | 2. | Increasing the amount of castor oil in the emulsion would be expected to reduce the thermodynamic activity of the emulsion | |
| | 3. | PK data predicted 0.05% cyclosporin/1.25% castor oil would be less effective than 0.05% cyclosporin/0.625% castor oil and 0.1% cyclosporin/1.25% castor oil | |
| | В. | During prosecution the Examiner agreed that the performance of the claimed emulsion relative to the Ding '979 patent emulsions was unexpected | |
| IV. | ARGUMENT | | |
| | A. | An emulsion that is "effective in treating" disease, or therapeutically effective" must treat the underlying disease | |
| | B. | Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-20. and 22-23 would not have been obvious over Ding '607/Ding '979 plus Sall | 24 |
| | 1. | The inventors proceeded contrary to the teachings of the prior art and developed an emulsion that has surprising therapeutic efficacy again dry eye disease. | st |



Case IPR2015-01284

Attorney Docket No: 13351-0062IP1

| | 2. | There was no reasonable expectation that increasing castor oil concentration would increase therapeutic efficacy | 29 |
|----|-----|--|----|
| | 3. | The differences between the claimed emulsion and the Ding '979 emulsions are differences in kind, not degree | 33 |
| | 4. | Allergan did not admit that the claims were unpatentable | 35 |
| | C. | Claims 11 and 21 would not have been obvious over Ding '607/Din' '979 plus Sall plus Acheampong | _ |
| | D. | Claim 15 would not have been obvious over Ding '607/Ding '979 plus Sall plus Glonek | 36 |
| V. | CON | ICLUSION | 36 |



Case IPR2015-01284 Attorney Docket No: 13351-0062IP1

LIST OF EXHIBITS

| Exhibit No. | Description |
|-------------|--|
| EX. 2001 | NDA 21-023 Cyclosporine Ophthalmic Emulsion 0.05%, Original NDA Filing, Vol. 1 (Feb. 24, 1999) |
| EX. 2002 | U.S. Pat. No. 4,839,342 |
| EX. 2003 | Said et al., Investigative Opthamology & Visual Science, vol. 48, No. 11 (Nov. 2007):5000-5006 |
| EX. 2004 | Alba et al., Folia Ophthalmol. Jpn. 40:902-908 (1989) |
| EX. 2005 | Stedman's Medical Dictionary, definition of therapeutic |
| EX. 2006 | Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary, definition of therapeutic |
| EX. 2007 | Stedman's Medical Dictionary, definition of palliative |
| EX. 2008 | Excerpts from the prosecution history of U.S.S.N. 13/967,168 |



Case IPR2015-01284 Attorney Docket No: 13351-0062IP1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|------------|
| Cases | |
| Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc., No. 2014-1275, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Aug. 4, 2015) | passim |
| Arkie Lures, Inc. v. Gene Larew Tackle, Inc., 119 F.3d 953 (Fed. Cir. 1997) | 32 |
| In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, No. 2014-1301, slip op. (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 21 |
| In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig., 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 29 |
| Galderma Laboratories L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc., 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 25, 26, 33 |
| <i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.,</i> 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 21 |
| Other Authorities | |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) | 21 |
| 37 CFR §§ 42.6(e)(4) and 42.205(b) | 38 |



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

