

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

SENJU PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.  
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,784,789 to Higashiyama  
Issue Date: July 22, 2014

Title: Aqueous Liquid Preparations and Light-Stabilized Aqueous Liquid  
Preparations

---

*Inter Partes* Review No.: IPR2016-00626

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,784,789  
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 '789 Patent..... 1

III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS ..... 3

IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1))..... 3

    A. Each Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))..... 3

    B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))..... 3

        1. Judicial Matters Involving the '789 patent ..... 3

        2. Administrative Matters ..... 4

    C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) ..... 4

    D. Notice of Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)) ..... 5

V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)) ..... 5

VI. THE '789 PATENT AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 5

VII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”)..... 6

VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)) ..... 7

IX. Invalidity analysis..... 7

    A. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art ..... 7

        1. Bepotastine Besilate was Known as Having Good Properties and Considered Suitable for Ophthalmic Preparations ..... 7

            a) Tanabe Press Release (“Tanabe”) (EX1008)..... 8

        2. Adding Excipients, Including a Tonicity Agent, in Aqueous Liquid Preparations was Common ..... 9

            a) U.S. Patent No. 6,174,914 (“Yanni”) (EX1004)..... 10

            b) Remington: The Science and Practice of Pharmacy 20th Ed. (“Hecht”) (EX1005)..... 11

        3. Sodium Chloride was Known to Have Light-Stabilizing Properties and Testing for Light-Stability was Routine..... 13

B.	Ground 1A: Claims 1-11 are Obvious over Tanabe in view of Yanni.....	14
1.	Independent Claim 1 .....	14
	a) Tanabe and Yanni together teach a bepotastine besilate ophthalmic formulation.....	15
	b) Yanni teaches “a light-stabilizing effective amount” of water-soluble metal chloride .....	16
	c) A POSA would have been motivated to combine Tanabe and Yanni .....	19
	<b>(1)</b> Tanabe provides motivation to prepare an ophthalmic formulation and Yanni provides a conventional ophthalmic formulation.....	19
	<b>(2)</b> Using sodium chloride and adjusting the amount would have been obvious .....	20
	<b>(3)</b> Yanni discloses commonly used additives, thus combining it with Tanabe according to known methods would have yielded predictable results .....	22
2.	Independent Claim 9 .....	24
3.	Independent Claim 10.....	26
4.	Dependent Claims 2 and 8 .....	28
5.	Dependent Claims 3 and 4 .....	29
6.	Dependent Claim 5 .....	30
7.	Dependent Claims 6 and 7 .....	30
	a) Yanni teaches “an eye drop”.....	30
	b) Using Yanni’s formulation for “a nasal drop” would have been obvious.....	31
8.	Dependent Claim 11 .....	32
C.	Ground 2A: Claims 1-11 are Obvious over Tanabe in view of Hecht.....	32
1.	Independent Claim 1 .....	32
	a) Tanabe and Hecht together teach a bepotastine besilate ophthalmic formulation.....	33
	b) Hecht teaches “a light-stabilizing effective amount” of water-soluble metal chloride .....	35
	c) A POSA would have been motivated to combine Tanabe and Hecht .....	36
	<b>(1)</b> Tanabe provides motivation to prepare an ophthalmic formulation and Hecht provides a conventional ophthalmic formulation.....	36

(2)	Using sodium chloride and adjusting the amount would have been obvious. ....	37
(3)	Hecht discloses commonly used additives, thus combining it with Tanabe according to known methods would have yielded predictable results .....	38
2.	Independent Claim 9 .....	39
3.	Independent Claim 10 .....	42
4.	Dependent Claims 2 and 8 .....	44
5.	Dependent Claims 3 and 4 .....	44
6.	Dependent Claim 5 .....	45
7.	Dependent Claims 6 and 7 .....	46
a)	Hecht teaches “an eye drop” .....	46
b)	Using Hecht’s formulation for “a nasal drop” would have been obvious.....	46
8.	Dependent Claim 11 .....	47
D.	Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness.....	48
1.	No Unexpected Results Over the Closest Prior Art.....	49
a)	The range disclosed by the prior art is within the claimed ranges and thus would have the same properties.....	50
b)	A POSA would have expected light-stabilizing effects. ....	52
c)	The alleged unexpected results are not commensurate in scope with the claim.....	52
2.	Other Objective Indicia.....	55
X.	CONCLUSION .....	56

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	passim
<i>Allergan Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	50
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	56
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	22
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	17, 36
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	23
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057.....	50
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d at 1331 .....	53, 55
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F. 3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	31, 46
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	6, 20, 38
<i>Newell Cos., Inc. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.</i> , 864 F.2d 757 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	49, 55
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	55
<i>Purdue Pharma Prods. L.P. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 377 Fed App’x 978 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	56

# 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.