

Paper No. _____

Filed on behalf of Akorn Inc.

By: Michael R. Dzwonczyk

Azy S. Kokabi

Travis Ribar

Sughrue Mion, PLLC

2100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20037

Telephone: 202-293-7060

Facsimile: 202-293-7860

email: mdzwonczyk@sughrue.com

akokabi@sughrue.com

tribar@sughrue.com

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AKORN INC.

Petitioner

v.

ALLERGAN, INC.

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00596

Patent No. 8,629,111

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,629,111**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Brief Overview of the '111 Patent	3
B. Brief Overview of the Prosecution History.....	4
C. Brief Overview of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	8
i. U.S. Patent No. 5,474,979 to Ding <i>et al.</i> (“Ding ’979,” EX1006).....	9
ii. Sall <i>et al.</i> , <i>Two Multicenter, Randomized Studies of the Efficacy and Safety of Cyclosporine Ophthalmic Emulsion in Moderate to Severe Dry Eye Disease</i> , 107 OPTH. 631 (2000) (“Sall” EX1007).....	10
iii. A. Acheampong <i>et al.</i> , <i>Cyclosporine Distribution into the Conjunctiva, Cornea, Lacrimal Gland, and Systemic Blood following Topical Dosing of Cyclosporine to Rabbit, Dog, and Human Eyes</i> , 2 LACRIMAL GLAND, TEAR FILM, AND DRY EYE SYNDROMES 1001 (1998) (“Acheampong,” EX1008).....	11
D. Brief Overview of the Level of Skill in the Art	11
II. Grounds For Standing.....	13
III. Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	13
IV. Statement Of The Precise Relief Requested For Each Claim Challenged....	15
V. Statement Of Non-Redundancy.....	16
VI. Claim Construction.....	16
A. “buffer”.....	17

B.	“substantially no detectable concentration”	17
C.	“effective,” and “therapeutically effective”	18
VII.	Background Knowledge In The Art Prior To September 15, 2003	19
VIII.	Detailed Explanation Of Grounds For Unpatentability.....	25
A.	[Ground 1] Claims 1-27 are Anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Ding ’979.....	25
i.	Claims 1-10, 12-15, and 18-19	25
ii.	Claims 17, 20-27	32
iii.	Claims 11 and 16.....	34
B.	[Ground 2] Claims 1-27 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979 and Sall.....	41
i.	Claims 1-16, and 18-19.....	41
ii.	Claims 17, 20-27	44
iii.	Claims 11 and 16.....	45
C.	[Ground 3] Claims 11 and 16 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ding ’979, Sall, and Acheampong	49
IX.	No Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness.....	51
A.	No Unexpected Results	52
B.	No Evidence of Commercial Success	63
C.	No Industry Praise	64
D.	No Long-Felt, Unmet Need.....	65
E.	No Failure of Others.....	65
X.	Conclusion	66
XI.	Certificate Of Compliance.....	67

XII. Payment Of Fees Under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(A) and 42.103.....68

XIII. Appendix – List Of Exhibits.....69

I. INTRODUCTION

On December 8, 2016, the Board instituted IPR2016-01128, stating that there was a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 8,629,111 to Acheampong *et al.* (“the ’111 patent,” EX1001) are unpatentable as anticipated and/or obvious. *Mylan Pharm., Inc. v. Allergan, Inc.*, IPR2016-01128, slip op. at 22 (PTAB December 8, 2016) (Paper 8). The present Petition presents the same grounds of unpatentability and the same arguments and evidence as the Petition in IPR2016-01128. The present Petitioner has received permission from Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc., the petitioner in IPR2016-01128, to rely upon the same expert. The present Petition is substantially identical to the Petition filed in IPR2016-01128. Accordingly, it is believed that the present Petition should be granted for the same reasons that the Board instituted IPR2016-01128.

In particular, Akorn Inc. (“Petitioner”) requests review of the ’111 patent that issued on January 14, 2014. PTO records indicate the ’111 patent is assigned to Allergan, Inc. (“Patent Owner”). This Petition demonstrates that there is a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-27 of the ’111 patent are unpatentable for failure to distinguish over the asserted 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

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.