

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.
Petitioner,

v.

3M COMPANY
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 6,743,413 to Schultz *et al.*
Issue Date: June 1, 2004
Title: Suspension Aerosol Formulations

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2015-_____

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,743,413
Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. OVERVIEW 1

 A. The '413 Patent 1

 B. The Priority Date of the '413 Patent 2

 1. The Earliest Effective Date for the Claims of the '413 Patent is May 4, 1992..... 2

 a) The '791 Application Does Not Provide Adequate Support for the Claims of the '413 Patent 2

 b) The '401 Application Does Not Provide Adequate Support for Claims of the '413 Patent..... 3

 c) Applicant Admitted that the Effective Priority Date of the '413 Patent is May 4, 1992..... 4

III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS 5

IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1))..... 5

 A. Each Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) 5

 B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))..... 6

 1. Judicial Matters Involving the '413 patent 6

 2. Administrative Matters 6

 C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) 6

 D. Notice of Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))..... 7

V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)) 7

VI. THE '413 PATENT AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 7

VII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”) & STATE OF THE ART 8

VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))..... 9

IX. Invalidity analysis 10

 A. The '011 Publication Anticipates Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 10, 12, 14-20, and 22-24 10

1.	Independent Claim 1	11
2.	Independent Claim 4	15
3.	Independent Claim 6	16
4.	Independent Claim 12	18
5.	Independent Claim 14	21
6.	Independent Claim 17	22
7.	Independent Claims 20 and 22.....	23
8.	Dependent Claim 2.....	25
9.	Dependent Claim 7.....	25
10.	Dependent Claim 10	26
11.	Dependent Claims 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, and 24.....	27
B.	The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Given the '011 Publication Alone or in Combination	28
1.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	28
2.	Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art	28
a)	Claims 1, 2, and 4 Would Have Been Obvious.....	28
b)	Claim 3 Would Have Been Obvious	29
c)	Claims 5 and 14 Would Have Been Obvious	31
d)	Claim 6 Would Have Been Obvious	33
e)	Claim 7 Would Have Been Obvious	34
f)	Claims 8-11 Would Have Been Obvious	35
g)	Claim 12 Would Have Been Obvious	36
h)	Claim 13 Would Have Been Obvious	37
i)	Claim 17 Would Have Been Obvious	38
j)	Claim 20 Would Have Been Obvious	38
k)	Claims 21 and 22 Would Have Been Obvious.....	39
l)	Dependent Claims 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, and 24 Would Have Been Obvious	39
C.	The '333 Publication Anticipates Claims 1-5, 14, and 20-22.....	41
1.	Independent Claim 1	42
2.	Independent Claim 3	45
3.	Independent Claim 4	46
4.	Independent Claims 5 and 14.....	47
5.	Independent Claims 20, 21, and 22.....	48
6.	Dependent Claim 2.....	49
D.	The '333 Publication Alone or in Combination Renders Obvious All of the Challenged Claims of the '413 Patent.....	50
1.	The Base Limitations of Every Claim Would Have Been Obvious	50

2.	Equipping the Aerosol Canister with a Metering Valve Would Have Been Obvious	52
3.	Selecting Therapeutically Effective Amounts/Doses Would Have Been Obvious	52
4.	The Dispersibility/Flocculation Element Would Have Been Obvious	54
5.	Selecting a Micronized Drug Particulate, or a Particulate Drug wherein 90% or More of the Particles Have a Diameter of Less than 10 microns, Would Have Been Obvious	55
6.	Selecting a Formulation that Exhibits Substantially No Growth in Particle Size Would Have Been Obvious	56
7.	Using Surfactant-Less or Substantially Surfactant-Free Formulations for the Treatment of Asthma or COPD Would Have Been Obvious	57
E.	Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness	58
X.	CONCLUSION.....	59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00368	58
<i>Augustine Med., Inc. v. Gaymar Indus.</i> , 181 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	4
<i>Celeritas Techs., Ltd. v. Rockwell Int’l Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1354, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1516 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	14, 18
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	11, 43
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	58
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955)	31, 33, 35, 54
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	29, 30
<i>In re Kalm</i> , 378 F.2d 959 (C.C.P.A. 1967)	28, 50, 51, 52
<i>In re Malagari</i> , 499 F.2d 1297,1303 (C.C.P.A. 1974)	53
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	29
<i>In re Paulson</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	10
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	53

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.