

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. IPR2017-00586  
Patent No. 9,248,191

---

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,248,191**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. OVERVIEW .....3

    A. Brief Overview of the '191 Patent .....3

    B. Brief Overview of the Prosecution History .....4

    C. Brief Overview of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....7

        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).....9

        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," EX1008).....10

        iv. U.S. Patent No. 5,578,586 to Glonek *et al.*  
           ("Glonek," EX1009) .....10

    D. Brief Overview of the Level of Skill in the Art .....11

III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING .....12

IV. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 .....12

V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED.....14

VI. STATEMENT OF NON-REDUNDANCY .....15

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....16

    A. "buffer" .....16

;

B.	“substantially no detectable concentration” .....	17
C.	“effective,” “lacrimal gland tearing,” “overall efficacy substantially equal to,” “as much therapeutic efficacy as” .....	17
D.	“demonstrates a reduction in adverse events” .....	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 1-16 and 21-27 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979 and Sall.....	26
i.	Claims 1-16 .....	29
ii.	Claims 21-27 .....	38
B.	[Ground 2] Claims 1-16 and 21-27 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979, Sall, and Acheampong .....	48
C.	[Ground 3] Claims 17-20 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979, Sall, and Glonek.....	49
D.	[Ground 4] Claim 20 is Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979, Sall, Glonek, and Acheampong .....	53
X.	NO OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS: NO UNEXPECTED RESULTS .....	54
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 EXHIBITS .....	69

## 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. 9,248,191 to Acheampong *et al.* (“the ’191 patent,” EX1001) that issued on February 2, 2016. PTO records indicate the ’191 patent is assigned to Allergan, Inc. (“Patent Owner”). This Petition demonstrates that there is a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-27 of the ’191 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.

In particular, the ’191 patent claims concern conventional methods of treating dry eye disease, such as keratoconjunctivitis sicca (“KCS”) 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 related 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/KCS, were disclosed in a single prior art reference (Ding ’979) for use in

topical ophthalmic emulsions to enhance and restore lacrimal gland tear production and treat dry eye disease. During prosecution of a parent application, applicants admitted the claimed emulsion containing 0.05% CsA / 1.25% castor oil “is squarely within the teaching of the Ding [’979] reference” and “would have been obvious” to a person of skill in the art at the time of the invention. EX1005, 0435; EX1026, ¶20. A second 102(b) prior art reference, Sall, discloses twice-daily administration of a 0.05% CsA-in-castor oil emulsion for the same purpose.

In prosecuting a continuation application, applicants changed course and attempted to withdraw the admissions regarding Ding ’979, arguing that data collected *after* their earlier admissions established patentability. EX1004, 0803. In a parent application of the ’191 patent before the same examiner, Patent Owner alleged that patentability was established by an unexpected result that the emulsion was “equally or more therapeutically effective for the treatment of dry eye/keratoconjunctivitis sicca than the formulation containing 0.10% by weight cyclosporin A and 1.25% by weight castor oil.” EX1023, 0195; EX1026, ¶¶22-24. But the supposed “unexpected results” are weak, at best, and fail to rebut the strong evidence of obviousness. The data relied upon by applicants lack scientific parameters necessary to demonstrate statistical significance and materiality and, in many cases, appear to be copies of previously published graphs from the 102(b) prior art reference, Sall. Thus, Patent Owner’s cited evidence does not support non-

# 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.