

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. 8,877,168 to Higashiyama
Issue Date: November 4, 2014
Title: Aqueous Liquid Preparations and Light-Stabilized Aqueous Liquid
Preparations

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2016-01163

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,877,168
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 '168 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))..... 4

 1. Judicial Matters Involving the '168 patent 4

 2. Administrative Matters 4

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

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

VI. THE '168 PATENT AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 5

VII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”)..... 5

VIII. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))..... 6

IX. Invalidity analysis..... 7

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

 1. Bepotastine Besilate was Known as Having Good Properties and was 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 8

 a) U.S. Patent No. 6,174,914 (“Yanni”) (EX1004)..... 9

 b) Remington: The Science and Practice of Pharmacy 20th Ed. (“Hecht”) (EX1005)..... 10

 3. Sodium Chloride was Known to Have Light-Stabilizing Properties and Testing for Light-Stability was Routine 12

B.	Ground 1: Claims 1-14 and 16-30 are Obvious over Tanabe in view of Yanni	12
1.	Independent Claim 1	12
a)	Tanabe and Yanni together teach a bepotastine besilate ophthalmic formulation	14
b)	Yanni teaches “a light-stabilizing effective amount” of water-soluble metal chloride	15
c)	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Tanabe and Yanni	17
(1)	Tanabe provides motivation to prepare an ophthalmic formulation, which Yanni provides	18
(2)	A POSA would have conducted routine testing to determine the appropriate dose.....	18
(3)	Using sodium chloride and adjusting the amount would have been obvious	19
(4)	Yanni discloses commonly used additives, thus combining it with Tanabe according to known methods would have yielded predictable results	21
2.	Independent Claim 16	22
3.	Independent Claim 23	25
4.	Dependent Claims 2 and 14	27
5.	Dependent Claims 3, 17, and 24	28
6.	Dependent Claim 4.....	28
7.	Dependent Claims 5-7, 18, 19, 25	29
8.	Dependent Claims 8-10, 20-22, 26-28.....	30
9.	Dependent Claims 11 and 12	31
a)	Yanni teaches “an eye drop”	31
b)	Using Yanni’s formulation for “a nasal drop” would have been obvious	32
10.	Dependent Claim 13	32
11.	Dependent Claims 29 and 30	33
C.	Ground 2: Claims 1-14 and 16-30 are Obvious over Tanabe in view of Hecht	34
1.	Independent Claim 1	34
a)	Tanabe and Hecht together teach a bepotastine besilate ophthalmic formulation	36
b)	Hecht teaches “a light-stabilizing effective amount” of water-soluble metal chloride	37

c)	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Tanabe and Hecht	38
(1)	Tanabe provides motivation to prepare an ophthalmic formulation and Hecht provides a conventional ophthalmic formulation	39
(2)	A POSA would have conducted routine testing to determine the appropriate dose.....	40
(3)	Using sodium chloride and adjusting the amount would have been obvious.....	41
(4)	Hecht discloses commonly used additives, thus combining it with Tanabe according to known methods would have yielded predictable results.....	42
2.	Independent Claim 16	43
3.	Independent Claim 23	46
4.	Dependent Claims 2 and 14	48
5.	Dependent Claims 3, 17, and 24	49
6.	Dependent Claim 4.....	49
7.	Dependent Claims 5-7, 18, 19, and 25.....	50
8.	Dependent Claims 8-10, 20-22, and 26-28	51
9.	Dependent Claims 11 and 12	52
a)	Hecht teaches “an eye drop”	53
b)	Using Hecht’s formulation for “a nasal drop” would have been obvious	53
10.	Dependent Claim 13	54
11.	Dependent Claims 29 and 30	55
D.	Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness	56
1.	No Unexpected Results Over the Closest Prior Art.....	56
a)	The range disclosed by the prior art is within the claimed ranges and thus would have the same properties	57
b)	A POSA would have expected light-stabilizing effects.....	59
c)	The alleged unexpected results are not commensurate in scope with the claim.....	60
2.	Other Objective Indicia.....	62
X.	CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 265 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	1
<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)	56
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	16
<i>Bausch & Lomb Incorporated et al. v Apotex Inc. et al.</i> , 1:15-cv-03879 (D.N.J.)	4
<i>Bausch & Lomb Incorporated et al. v Micro Labs USA, Inc. et al.</i> , No. 1:15-cv-03113 (D.N.J.)	4
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	61
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955)	passim
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	20
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	15, 37
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	56
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	passim
<i>In re Lee</i> , 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	59

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.