#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

V.

QUALICAPS CO., LTD, Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00203 Patent 6,649,180

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107



## LIST OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
Ex. 2001	HARD CAPSULES (K. Ridgway ed., 1987)
Ex. 2002	Toshihiro Ogura, Yoshihiro Furuya, & Seinosuke Matsuura, <i>HPMC Capsules</i> — <i>An Alternative to Gelatin</i> , 20(11) J. PHARM. TECH. EUROPE 32 (November 1998)
Ex. 2003	THE HANDBOOK OF PHARMACEUTICAL EXCIPIENTS ("HPE") Second Edition 229–32 (Ainley Wade and Paul J. Weller, eds., 1994)
Ex. 2004	Jae-Hwang Lee, et al., Specific PCR assays to determine bovine, porcine, fish and plant origin of gelatin capsules of dietary supplements, 211 FOOD CHEMISTRY 253 (2016)
Ex. 2005	Federal Standard No. 285A, Capsules (For Medicinal Purposes) (October 19, 1976)
Ex. 2006	E. Bradbury & C. Martin, <i>The effect of temperature of preparation on the mechanical properties and structure of gelatin films</i> , 214 PROC. R. SOC. LONDON SERIES A 183 (1952)
Ex. 2007	U.S. Pat. No. 2,526,683 (issued Oct. 24, 1950 to Murphy)
Ex. 2008	U.S. Pat. No. 2,810,659 (issued Oct. 22, 1957 to Greminger, et al.)
Ex. 2009	intentionally left blank
Ex. 2010	J. C. Stone, <i>Objective Visual Evaluation of the Relative Content of Major and Minor Defects in Tablets and Capsules</i> , 59(9) J. Pharm. Sci. 1364 (1970)
Ex. 2011	I. H. Coopes, Structure Formation in Gelatin Films, PHOTOGRAPHIC GELATIN II, PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROYAL PHOTOGRAPHIC SOCIETY SYMPOSIUM 121 (R. J. Cox, ed., 1974)
Ex. 2012	J. E. Jolley, <i>The Microstructure of Photographic Gelatin Binders</i> , 14(3) Photogr. Sci. Eng'g 169 (1970)



EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
Ex. 2013	George A. Digenis, Thomas B. Gold, & Vinod P. Shah, Cross- Linking of Gelatin Capsules and Its Relevance to Their In Vitro-In Vivo Performance, 83(7) J. PHARM. SCI. 915 (1994)
Ex. 2014	James Hogan, et al., Investigations into the Relationship Between Drug Properties, Filling, and the Release of Drugs from Hard Gelatin Capsules Using Multivariate Statistical Analysis, 13(6) PHARM. RES. 944 (1996)
Ex. 2015	THE UNITED STATES PHARMACOPOEIA, at 774–76 (1994)
Ex. 2016	THE JAPANESE PHARMACOPOEIA, at i–vii; 750–51, 800–804 (13th ed. 1996)
Ex. 2017	Dow Methocel Cellulose Eithers Handbook (1978)
Ex. 2018	Jaime Curtis-Fisk, et al., Effect of Formulation Conditions on Hypromellose Performance Properties in Films Used for Capsules and Tablet Coatings, 13(4) AAPS PHARMSCITECH 1170 (December 2012)
Ex. 2019	Linda Felton, <i>Film Coating of Oral Solid Dosage Forms</i> , in ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHARMACEUTICAL TECHNOLOGY, at 1729–47 (J. Swabrick ed., 3rd ed., 2007)
Ex. 2020	U.S. Pat. No. 4,001,211 (issued Jan. 4, 1977 to Sarkar)
Ex. 2021	Document comparison by Workshare Compare software: comparison of Petition and Declaration of Arthur H. Kibbe
Ex. 2022	U.S. Pat. No. 5,431,917 (issued Jul. 11, 1995 to Yamamoto, et al.)
Ex. 2023	U.S. Pat. No. 6,326,026 (issued Dec. 4, 2001 to Parekh, et al.)
Ex. 2024	U.S. Pat. No. 6,228,416 (issued May 8, 2001 to Reibert, et al.)
Ex. 2025	U.S. Pat. No. 4,365,060 (issued Dec. 21, 1982 to Onda, et al.)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<ul> <li>I. INTRODUCTION</li></ul>	2
SOLVED, THE PROBLEM OF GELLING AID PRECIPITATION IN HPMC CAPSULE TECHNOLOGY.  A. Background of the technology.  B. The specification and file history of the '180 patent establish the inventors' unexpected discovery.  III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF BOTH GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE PETITION FAILS TO ADDRESS PATENT OWNER'S UNEXPECTED RESULTS EVIDENCE.  A. Petitioner's asserted art does not "inherently" disclose the claimed HPMC capsules.  B. Petitioner's asserted art does not discuss the problem of gelling aid precipitation, or its relationship to HPO/MO content.  IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF BOTH GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE OFFICE ALREADY DETERMINED THAT THE '180 PATENT CLAIMS	
B. The specification and file history of the '180 patent establish the inventors' unexpected discovery	2
the inventors' unexpected discovery	
GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE PETITION FAILS TO ADDRESS PATENT OWNER'S UNEXPECTED RESULTS EVIDENCE.  A. Petitioner's asserted art does not "inherently" disclose the claimed HPMC capsules.  B. Petitioner's asserted art does not discuss the problem of gelling aid precipitation, or its relationship to HPO/MO content.  IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF BOTH GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE OFFICE ALREADY DETERMINED THAT THE '180 PATENT CLAIMS	4
B. Petitioner's asserted art does not discuss the problem of gelling aid precipitation, or its relationship to HPO/MO content  IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF BOTH GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE OFFICE ALREADY DETERMINED THAT THE '180 PATENT CLAIMS	9
aid precipitation, or its relationship to HPO/MO content  IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF BOTH GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE OFFICE ALREADY DETERMINED THAT THE '180 PATENT CLAIMS	11
GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE OFFICE ALREADY DETERMINED THAT THE '180 PATENT CLAIMS	13
ARE PATENTABLE IN VIEW OF THE SAME HPMC	
TEACHINGS ASSERTED IN GROUNDS 1 AND 2	17
A. The teachings of Petitioner's asserted references do not differ materially from those already considered during prosecution	18
B. Petitioner cites no new reason why the asserted references would motivate a POSA to develop the claimed invention	20
1. Petitioner fails to explain why Yamomoto would give a POSA reason to develop the inventors' claimed HPMC substitution ranges	22



	2. Petitioner fails to explain why C POSA reason to develop the inv	e e	$\varepsilon$	
	substitution ranges		.3	
V	CONCLUSION	2	6	



# DOCKET A L A R M

# 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.

