

IPR2015-01778
Patent No. 8,603,506

Patent Owner Docket No.: 105153-0104

Paper No. _____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD. and
DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.
Petitioner

v.

GALDERMA LABORATORIES, INC.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,603,506
Issue Date: December 10, 2013

Title: METHOD OF TREATING ACNE

Case IPR2015-01778

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE '506 PATENT4

III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART5

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION6

 A. LEGAL STANDARD6

 B. “ROSACEA”6

 C. “PAPULES” AND “PUSTULES”8

V. STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR INSTITUTION.....9

VI. PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE
 LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS10

 1. The Application Group Leading to the '506 Patent describes
 treatment of “rosacea”14

 2. The Application Group Leading to the '506 Patent expressly
 describes papules and pustules of rosacea as a symptom to be
 treated in accordance with the claims17

 3. The Application Group Leading to the '506 Patent describes
 treating papules and pustules of rosacea with doxycycline25

 4. The Application Group Leading to the '506 Patent describes
 treating papules and pustules of rosacea with the claimed doses of
 doxycycline26

 5. The Application Group Leading to the '506 Patent describes
 treating papules and pustules of rosacea “without administering a
 bisphosphonate compound”28

6. The Application Group Leading to the '506 Patent provides an example of treating inflammatory papules and pustules— symptoms of acne rosacea.....30

7. The '506 Patent's discussion of "antibiotic" and "sub-antibiotic" dosing is unambiguous and inconsequential to written description32

8. Whether the claimed method can also treat telangiectasia is immaterial.....34

9. Each Ground of Unpatentability in the Petition relies on unsupported, conclusory statements in the Payette Declaration (Ex. 1004).....35

VII. THE SPECIFICATION OF THE '506 PATENT IS IDENTICAL TO EACH OF THE THREE NON-PROVISIONAL DOCUMENTS IN THE CONTINUOUS PRIORITY "CHAIN" CONSTITUTING THE "APPLICATION GROUP LEADING TO THE '506 PATENT"37

VIII. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION BASED ON ITS STATUTORILY VESTED DISCRETION39

A. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT IS A THINLY VEILED ATTEMPT TO CIRCUMVENT 35 U.S.C. § 311(B).....39

B. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) AS DUPLICATIVE OF EXAMINATION.....42

IX. CONCLUSION.....45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.,
745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....30

Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....30

Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)..... 14, 19

Falkner v. Inglis,
448 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....30

Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.,
802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....19

In re Cuozzo Speed Techs.,
778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....6

In re Gosteli,
872 F.2d 1008 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....19

In re Johnson,
558 F.2d 1008 (CCPA 1977)29

In re Paulsen,
30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....17

In re Translogic Tech., Inc.,
504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....6

Inphi Corporation v. Netlist, Inc.,
No. 2015-1179 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 13, 2015).....29

Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.,
79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....10

Research Found. of State Univ. v. Mylan Pharms., Inc.,
809 F. Supp. 2d. 296 (D. Del. 2011)1

Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.,
694 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....29

United States Steel Corp. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.,

865 F.2d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....34
Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar,
935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....19

Statutes

21 U.S.C. § 355(b)(2)(A)(IV)22
35 U.S.C. § 102 39, 42
35 U.S.C. § 103 39, 42
35 U.S.C. § 112 41, 42
35 U.S.C. § 120 40, 42
35 U.S.C. § 1323
35 U.S.C. § 311 passim
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)9
35 U.S.C. § 315(e)..... 41, 42
35 U.S.C. § 112 passim
35 U.S.C. § 313 1, 9, 10
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)..... 9, 10, 42
35 U.S.C. § 316(e).....10
35 U.S.C. § 321 4, 40
35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....42

Legislative Material

America Invents Act of 2011 (H. Rpt. 112-98, Pt. 1)42

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b).....6
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2)41
37 C.F.R. § 42.65.....35

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.