

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

v.

ALLERGAN, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01132
Patent 9,248,191

**PATENT OWNER ALLERGAN, INC.'S
RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction1

II. Background of the ‘191 Patent.....6

 A. Lack of Tear Production is a Hallmark of Dry Eye Disease.....6

 B. Prior Treatments for Dry Eye Disease9

 C. Allergan’s Development of RESTASIS®.....10

III. The Asserted Prior Art References.....12

 A. The Ding ‘979 Patent12

 B. The Sall Paper.....13

IV. The ‘191 Patent.....16

V. Argument.....17

 A. Increasing The Amount Of Castor Oil Vehicle In The Emulsion
 Would Be Expected To Reduce The Amount of CsA Reaching The Lacrimal
 Gland.....21

 B. PK Data Predicted That The Claimed 0.05% Cyclosporin/1.25%
 Castor Oil Vehicle Emulsion Would Have Been Less Effective Than The
 0.10% Cyclosporin/1.25% Castor Oil Vehicle Emulsion At Increasing Tear
 Production.....23

 C. The Claimed Emulsion Is More Effective At Increasing Tear Production
 Than The Ding ‘979 Emulsions27

 D. The Increased Tear Production Is Not Due To Balancing Or Optimizing
 The Concentration Of The Castor Oil Vehicle.....30

 E. The Differences Between The Claimed Emulsion And The Ding ‘979
 Emulsions Are Differences In Kind, Not Degree34

 F. Objective Evidence Of Non-Obviousness.....35

 1. There was a long-felt need and unmet need for a dry eye treatment that
 increased tear production36

 2. The claimed emulsions unexpectedly were more effective at increasing
 tear production than the Ding ‘979 prior art emulsions.....37

 3. The claimed emulsions were commercially successful because they
 increased tear production37

G. Allergan Did Not Admit That The Claims Were Unpatentable.....40

H. Claims 1-16 And 21-27 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Ding ‘979
Plus Sall And Acheampong.....41

I. Claims 17-20 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Ding ‘979 Plus Sall And
Glonek.....41

J. Claim 20 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Ding ‘979 Plus Sall,
Acheampong, and Glonek42

VI. Claim Construction.....42

VII. Conclusion42

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
EX. 2001	NDA 21-023 Cyclosporine Ophthalmic Emulsion 0.05%, Original NDA Filing, Vol. 1 (Feb. 24, 1999)
EX. 2002	U.S. Pat. No. 4,839,342
EX. 2003	Said et al., Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, vol. 48, No. 11 (Nov. 2007):5000-5006
EX. 2004	Alba et al., Folia Ophthalmol. Jpn. 40:902-908 (1989)
EX. 2005	Stedman's Medical Dictionary, definition of therapeutic
EX. 2006	Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary, definition of therapeutic
EX. 2007	Stedman's Medical Dictionary, definition of palliative
EX. 2008	RESTASIS® label
EX. 2009	Murphy, R., "The Once and Future Treatment of Dry Eye," Review of Optometry, pp. 73-75 (Feb. 15, 2000)
EX. 2010	RESERVED
EX. 2011	Agarwal, Priyanka and Ilva D. Rupenthal, "Modern Approaches to the Ocular Delivery of Cyclosporine A," Drug Discovery Today, vol. 21, no. 6 (June 2016)
EX. 2012	Damato et al., "Senile Atrophy of the Human Lacrimal Gland: The Contribution of Chronic Inflammatory Disease," British Journal of Ophthalmology (1984)
EX. 2013	Higuchi, "Physical Chemical Analysis of Percutaneous Absorption Process From Creams and Ointments," Seminar, New York City (1959)
EX. 2014	Lallemand et al., "Cyclosporine a Delivery to the Eye: A Pharmaceutical Challenge," European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics (2003)

EX. 2015	das Neves et al., “Mucosal Delivery of Biopharmaceuticals: Biology, Challenges and Strategies,” Springer Science (2014)
EX. 2016	Power et al., “Effect of Topical Cyclosporin A on Conjunctival T Cells in Patients with Secondary Sjögren’s Syndrome,” Cornea 12(6): 507-511 (1993)
EX. 2017	Schaefer et al., “Skin Permeability,” Springer-Verlag (1982)
EX. 2018	Stern et al., “The Pathology of Dry Eye: The Interaction Between the Ocular Surface and Lacrimal Glands,” Cornea 17(6): 584-589 (1998)
EX. 2019	Wepierre, Jacques and Jean-Paul Marty, “Percutaneous Absorption of Drugs,” Elsevier/North-Holland Biomedical Press (1970)
EX. 2020	Williamson et al., “Histology of the Lacrimal Gland in Keratoconjunctivitis Sicca,” Brit. F. Ophthal /91973)
EX. 2021	“Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations,” U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 37 th Edition (2017)
EX. 2022	Lemp, Michael A., “Report of the National Eye Institute/Industry Workshop on Clinical Trials in Dry Eyes,” CLAO Journal, vol. 21, no. 4 (October 1995)
EX. 2023	Deposition transcript of Mansoor Amiji, Ph.D
EX. 2024	Declaration of John D. Sheppard, M.D., M.M.Sc.
EX. 2025	Declaration of Dr. Thorsteinn Loftsson, Ph.D.
EX. 2026	Declaration of Eric Rubinson
EX. 2027	Allergan PK-98-074 Report
EX. 2028	Declaration of Robert S. Maness, Ph.D.
EX. 2029	DiMasi, “Risks in New Drug Development: Approval Success Rates for Investigational Drugs,” Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, May 2001
EX. 2030	FDA Review, “The Drug Development and Approval Process”

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.