

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC. and MYLAN LABORATORIES
LIMITED,
Petitioner,

v.

UCB PHARMA GMBH,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00510
Patent 6,858,650 B1

Mailed: February 2, 2016.

Before PAUL SULLIVAN, *Trial Paralegal*

NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED TO PETITION
AND
TIME FOR FILING PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The petition for *inter partes* review in the above proceeding has been accorded the filing date of January 28, 2016.

A review of the petition identified the following defect(s):

The Petition contains arguments in the claim charts on the following pages: p. 31 (“A person of ordinary skill would have been motivated to look at improving 5-HMT administration in view of tolterodine.”); p. 33 (“A

IPR2016-00510
Patent 6,858,650 B1

person of ordinary skill would have been led to prodrug optimization and fumarate salt forms.”); p. 35 (“Acid additional salts were known.”); and pp. 40, 51 (“5-HMT and its prodrug, tolerodine, were known to be associated with the treatment of urinary incontinence.”). Placing arguments in a claim chart, which may be single-spaced, circumvents the page limit requirement, which requires double-spacing. 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(2)(iii). **This defect can be remedied by removing the above-identified arguments and uploading the corrected Petition in PRPS.**

The attached Certificate of Service declares that a “Power of Attorney” was served on the Patent Owner, not the attached Petition and accompanying exhibits as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), 42.105. This defect can be remedied by attaching a corrected Certificate of Service to the corrected Petition.

Petitioner must correct the defect(s) within **FIVE BUSINESS DAYS** from this notice. Failure to correct the defect(s) may result in an order to show cause as to why the Board should institute the trial. No substantive changes (e.g., new grounds) may be made to the petition.

Patent Owner may file a preliminary response to the petition no later than three months from the date of this notice. The preliminary response is limited to setting forth the reasons why the requested review should not be instituted. Patent Owner may also file an election to waive the preliminary response to expedite the proceeding. For more information, please consult the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), which is available on the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

IPR2016-00510
Patent 6,858,650 B1

Patent Owner is advised of the requirement to submit mandatory notice information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(2) within 21 days of service of the petition.

The parties are encouraged to use the heading on the first page of this Notice for all future filings in the proceeding.

The parties are advised that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The parties are authorized to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Such motions shall be filed in accordance with the “Order -- Authorizing Motion *for Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, a copy of which is available on the Board Web site under “Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices.”

The parties are reminded that unless otherwise permitted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2), all filings in this proceeding must be made electronically in the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS), accessible from the Board Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB>.

If there are any questions pertaining to this notice, please contact Paul Sullivan at 571-272-0338 or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at 571-272-7822.

PETITIONER:

Mitchell G. Stockwell
D. Clay Holloway
Alyson L. Wooten
Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 2800

IPR2016-00510
Patent 6,858,650 B1

Atlanta, GA 30309

mstockwell@kilpatricktownsend.com
cholloway@kilpatricktownsend.com
awooten@kilpatricktownsend.com

PATENT OWNER:

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004

NOTICE CONCERNING ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR)

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) strongly encourages parties who are considering settlement to consider alternative dispute resolution as a means of settling the issues that may be raised in an AIA trial proceeding. Many AIA trials are settled prior to a Final Written Decision. Those considering settlement may wish to consider alternative dispute resolution techniques early in a proceeding to produce a quicker, mutually agreeable resolution of a dispute or to at least narrow the scope of matters in dispute. Alternative dispute resolution has the potential to save parties time and money.

Many non-profit organizations, both inside and outside the intellectual property field, offer alternative dispute resolution services. Listed below are the names and addresses of several such organizations. The listings are provided for the convenience of parties involved in cases before the PTAB; the PTAB does not sponsor or endorse any particular organization's alternative dispute resolution services. In addition, consideration may be given to utilizing independent alternative dispute resolution firms. Such firms may be located through a standard keyword Internet search.

CPR INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION	AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION (AIPLA)	AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION (AAA)	WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)	AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (ABA)
Telephone: (212) 949-6490	Telephone: (703) 415-0780	Telephone: (212) 484-3266	Telephone: 41 22 338 9111	Telephone : (202) 662-1000
Fax: (212) 949-8859	Fax: (703) 415-0786	Fax: (212) 307-4387	Fax: 41 22 733 5428	N/A
575 Lexington Ave New York, NY 10022	241 18th Street, South, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22202	140 West 51st Street New York, NY 10020	34, chemin des Colombettes CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	1050 Connecticut Ave, NW Washington D.C. 20036
www.cpradr.org	www.aipla.org	www.adr.org	www.wipo.int	www.americanbar.org

If parties to an AIA trial proceeding consider using alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would like to know whether the parties ultimately decided to engage in alternative dispute resolution and the reasons why or why not. If the parties actually engage in alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would be interested to learn what mechanism (e.g., arbitration, mediation, etc.) was used and the general result. Such a statement from the parties is not required but would be helpful to the PTAB in assessing the value of alternative dispute resolution to parties involved in AIA trial proceedings. To report an experience with ADR, please forward a summary of the particulars to the following email address: PTAB_ADR_Comments@uspto.gov