

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.
Petitioner

v.

3M COMPANY et al.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-02002
Patent 6,743,413

**PATENT OWNER 3M COMPANY'S
RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 4

 A. In December 1991, There Were Two Types of Aerosol Formulations for Metered Dose Inhalers: Solution Aerosol Formulations and Suspension Aerosol Formulations 5

 B. Suspension Aerosol Formulations are Physically Unstable Systems..... 7

 C. Replacing CFC Propellants in Aerosol Formulations Was Challenging 9

 D. Formulators Believed That Suspensions Containing Only HFA 134a and Drug Were Not Sufficiently Stable for Therapeutic Use..... 12

 E. Formulators Tried to Prepare Stable Suspensions with HFA 134a by Adding Surfactants and/or Co-Solvents..... 13

III. THE ‘413 PATENT..... 14

IV. CLAIMS 14-19 AND 22-24 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE ‘011 PCT APPLICATION..... 16

 A. The only suspension formulations the ‘011 PCT application teaches as suitable for treating patients contain HFA 134a and surfactant-coated drug particles 17

 B. The ‘011 PCT application’s teaching regarding surfactants is consistent with the understanding in the art in December 1991 that suspension formulations containing only HFA 134a and drug were not therapeutically useful 19

 C. The controls of Formulations 7 and 8 of the ‘011 PCT application that lacked surfactant would not have taught a

formulator to treat patients with suspensions containing only HFA 134a and drug..... 22

1. A formulator would not have drawn conclusions regarding the therapeutic usefulness of Control Formulations 7 and 8 based upon the Drug Deposition Potential (DDP) metric used in Example 1..... 23

2. Dr. Smyth’s statistical analysis of Formulations 7 and 8 is flawed..... 25

3. The only purpose of the controls in Example 1 of the ‘011 PCT application is to establish a baseline for assessing the surfactant-containing test formulations..... 27

D. The ‘011 application does not anticipate claims 14-19 and 22-24..... 30

E. The ‘011 PCT application does not render claims 14-19 and 22-24 obvious..... 32

V. CLAIMS 14-19 AND 22-24 ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE ‘333 PCT APPLICATION..... 36

A. The ‘333 PCT application does not suggest that suspension formulations containing only HFA 134a and drug would have been therapeutically useful..... 40

B. Dr. Smyth’s declaration is flawed because he mischaracterized the ‘333 PCT application..... 42

C. A person of ordinary skill would read the ‘333 PCT application in the context of the state of the art, which taught that suspension formulations containing only HFA 134 and drug were not therapeutically useful..... 43

D. Mylan ignores the state of the art..... 44

VI. CONCLUSION..... 45

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
EX. 2001	Johnson et al., U.S. 5,126,123 (“the Johnson ‘123 patent”)
EX. 2002	WO93/11743
EX. 2003	“CFC-Free Aerosols-The Final Hurdle,” <i>Manufacturing Chemist</i> , 63(7):22-23 (1992) (“Manufacturing Chemist”)
EX. 2004	Purewal et al., U.S. 5,225,183 (“the Purewal ‘183 patent”)
EX. 2005	Dalby, “Special Considerations in the Formulation of Suspension Type Metered Dose Inhalers,” <i>Aerosol Age</i> (Oct. 1990) (“Aerosol Age”)
EX. 2006	“Orange Book: Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations”, http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/ob/newobpat.cfm (12/28/15)
EX. 2007	Statutory Disclaimer
EX. 2008	Sheila D’Souza, The Montreal Protocol and Essential Use Exemptions, <i>J. Aerosol Med.</i> , 8 (Suppl 1): S13–S17 (1995).
EX. 2009	Richard N. Dalby et al., CFC Propellant Substitution: P-134a as a Potential Replacement for P-12 in MDIs, <i>Pharm. Tech.</i> , March 1990 at 26.
EX. 2010	Richard N. Dalby et al., Medical Devices for the Delivery of Therapeutic Aerosols to the Lungs, <i>in Inhalation Aerosols</i> 441 (1996).
EX. 2011	Declaration of Richard N. Dalby, Ph.D.
EX. 2012	Curriculum vitae of Richard N. Dalby, Ph.D.
EX. 2013	Excerpts from the prosecution history of EP 0493437

EX. 2014	Transcript of the deposition of Dr. Hugh Smyth (6/14/16)
EX. 2015	Boring, Edwin G. 1954. "The Nature and History of Experimental Control." <i>The American Journal of Psychology</i> , 67(4):573-589 ("Boring").
EX. 2016-2020	Reserved
EX. 2021	Crowder et al., "2001: An Odyssey In Inhaler Formulation and Design," <i>Pharmaceutical Technology</i> , 99-113 (July 2001).
EX. 2022	Smyth et al., "Alternative Propellant Aerosol Delivery Systems," <i>Critical Reviews™ in Therapeutic Drug Carrier Systems</i> , 22(6):493–534 (2005),
EX. 2023	Smyth, "The Influence of Formulation Variables on the Performance of Alternative Propellant Driven Metered-Dose Inhalers," <i>Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews</i> , 55:807-828 (2003).
EX. 2024	Smyth, "Tuning Aerosol Particle Size Distribution of Metered-Dose Inhalers Using Cosolvents and Surfactants," <i>BioMed Research International</i> , vol. 2013, pp. 1-7 (2013).

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.