

Paper No. _____
Filed: January 6, 2017

Filed on behalf of Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.
By: Gary J. Speier
Mark D. Schuman
CARLSON, CASPERS, VANDENBURGH,
LINDQUIST & SCHUMAN, P.A.
225 South Sixth Street, Suite 4200
Minneapolis, MN 55402

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

ALLERGAN, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2017-00583
Patent No. 8,633,162

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,633,162**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. OVERVIEW 3

 A. Brief Overview of the '162 Patent 3

 B. Brief Overview of the Prosecution History 5

 C. Brief Overview of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art 8

 i. U.S. Patent No. 5,474,979 to Ding *et al.*
 ("Ding '979," EX1006) 8

 ii. Sall *et al.*, Two Multicenter, Randomized Studies of
 the Efficacy and Safety of Cyclosporine Ophthalmic
 Emulsion in Moderate to Severe Dry Eye Disease,
 107 OPTH. 631 (2000) (EX1007) 10

 iii. A. Acheampong *et al.*, Cyclosporine Distribution into
 the Conjunctiva, Cornea, Lacrimal Gland, and Systemic
 Blood following Topical Dosing of Cyclosporine to
 Rabbit, Dog, and Human Eyes, 2 LACRIMAL GLAND,
 TEAR FILM, AND DRY EYE SYNDROMES 1001 (1998)
 ("Acheampong," EX 1008) 11

 iv. U.S. Patent No. 5,578,586 to Glonek *et al.*
 ("Glonek," EX1009) 11

 D. Brief Overview of the Level of Skill in the Art 12

III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING 13

IV. Mandatory Notices under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 13

V. Statement of the Precise Relief Requested 15

VI. STATEMENT OF NON-REDUNDANCY 16

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 16

 A. "buffer" 17

B.	“substantially no detectable concentration”	17
C.	“effective,” “substantially therapeutically effective as,” and “as much therapeutic effectiveness as”	18
D.	“adverse events” and “side effects”	19
E.	“breaks down”	19
VIII.	BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE IN THE ART PRIOR TO SEPTEMBER 15, 2003	20
IX.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY	26
A.	[Ground 1] Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 22-24 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979 and Sall	26
i.	Claims 1-10, 12, 18-20, and 22-24	26
ii.	Claims 13 and 14.....	42
iii.	Claims 16-18	44
B.	[Ground 2] Claims 11 and 21 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979, Sall, and Acheampong	47
C.	[Ground 3] Claim 15 is Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979, Sall, and Glonek ’586	48
X.	No Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness.....	50
A.	No Unexpected Results	51
B.	No Evidence of Commercial Success	62
C.	No Industry Praise	64
D.	No Long-Felt, Unmet Need.....	64
E.	No Failure of Others.....	65
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	65
XII.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	67
XIII.	PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(A) AND 42.103	68

XIV. APPENDIX – LIST OF EXHIBITS69

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 311 and § 6 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), and to 37 C.F.R. Part 42, Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (“Petitioner” or “Teva”) hereby requests review of U.S. Patent No. 8,633,162 to Acheampong *et al.* (“the ’162 patent,” EX1001) that issued on January 21, 2014. PTO records indicate the ’162 patent is assigned to Allergan, Inc. (“Patent Owner”). This Petition demonstrates that there is a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-24 of the ’162 patent are unpatentable for failing to distinguish over prior art. Additional petitions are being filed to address related patents that are assigned to Patent Owner. All challenged patents are continuations from the same family and are terminally disclaimed over one another. The patents claim an ophthalmic emulsion for the treatment of overlapping ocular disorders, or conventional methods of administering the emulsion.

The ’162 patent claims concern conventional methods of treating dry eye disease by the “twice a day” topical ophthalmic administration of an emulsion containing cyclosporin A (“CsA”), castor oil, and other standard ingredients, as generally claimed in U.S. Patent No. 8,685,930. Each element of the emulsion, including the claimed CsA and castor oil percentages and methods for administering them to treat dry eye disease, were disclosed in a single prior art reference (Ding ’979). During prosecution of a parent application, applicants

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.