

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC
Petitioner

v.

CIPLA LTD.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,168,620
Issue Date: May 1, 2012
Title: COMBINATION OF AZELASTINE AND STEROIDS

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2017-00807

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8..... 1

 A. Real Parties-In-Interest under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) 1

 B. Related Matters under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) 1

 C. Lead and Backup Counsel under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)..... 1

 D. Service Information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)..... 2

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104..... 2

 A. Grounds For Standing under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a) 2

 B. Identification of Challenge under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) 2

III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 2

IV. THE '620 PATENT..... 4

 A. Overview 4

 B. Prosecution History 6

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 6

VI. LACK OF ENTITLEMENT TO FOREIGN PRIORITY DATE 8

VII. LEVEL OF SKILL AND KNOWLEDGE IN THE ART..... 10

 A. Hettche (Ex. 1007) 12

 B. Astelin® Label (Ex. 1008) 12

 C. Phillipps (Ex. 1009)..... 13

 D. Flonase® Label (Ex. 1010) 13

 E. Cramer (Ex. 1011)..... 14

 F. Segal (Ex. 1012)..... 15

VIII. CLAIM-BY-CLAIM EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY 16

 A. Ground 1: Claims 1 and 25 are anticipated by Segal..... 16

 B. Ground 2: Claims 1, 4-6, 24-26, 29 are obvious over Hettche, Phillipps, and Segal 21

 1. All claim elements were known..... 22

 a. Claims 1 and 4..... 22

 b. Claims 5-6, 26, and 29 23

 c. Claims 24 and 25..... 25

 2. Reasons to select and to combine azelastine and fluticasone ... 33

 a. Selection..... 33

 b. Motivation to combine..... 33

 3. Known techniques to make the co-formulation..... 35

 4. Combination yields predictable results..... 41

 C. Ground 3: Claims 42-44 are obvious over Hettche, Phillipps, Segal, and Flonase® Label..... 43

IX. NO SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS.....52

- A. No Teaching Away.....53
- B. No unexpected results compared to closest prior art54
- C. No long-felt unmet need in the art55
- D. Blocking patents negate secondary considerations56
- E. Commercial success evidence is weak and lacks nexus58

X. NO BASIS TO DENY THE PETITION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D)59

CONCLUSION.....61

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....62

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	40
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	8, 9, 10
<i>Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices Inc.</i> , 848 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	17
<i>Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus.</i> , 807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	10
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	53
<i>Ecolochem Inc. v. S.Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	58
<i>Elan Pharms., Inc. v. Mayo Found. for Med. Educ. & Research</i> , 346 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	16
<i>In re Epstein</i> , 32 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	39
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	57
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	11
<i>Great Atl. & Pac. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equip. Corp.</i> , 340 U.S. 147 (1950).....	49
<i>Ex parte Jellá</i> , 90 USPQ2d 1009 (BPAI 2008).....	58
<i>King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267,1281 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	58
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	21, 22, 49

<i>Mars Inc. v. H.J. Heinz Co.</i> , 377 F.3d 1369, 71 USPQ2d 1837 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	57
<i>Meda Pharms. Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 14-cv-01453 (D. Del.).....	1, 7
<i>Meda Pharms. Inc. v. Perrigo UK Finco Ltd.</i> , 16-cv-00794 (D. Del.).....	1
<i>Meda Pharms. Inc. v. Teva Pharms.</i> , 15-cv-00785 (D. Del.).....	1
<i>Media Techs. Licensing, LLC v. Upper Deck Co.</i> , 596 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	59
<i>Merck v. Biocraft</i> , 874 F.2d 804 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	16
<i>Merck v. Gnosis</i> , 808 F.3d 829 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	53
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	16
<i>Perricone v. Medicis Pharm. Corp.</i> , 432 F.3d 1368 (Fed.Cir.2005).....	19
<i>In re Petering</i> , 301 F.2d 676 (CCPA 1962)	16, 19
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	24
<i>Pharmastem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	41, 48
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	8
<i>In re Schaumann</i> , 572 F.2d 312 (CCPA 1978)	16
<i>Senju Pharm. Co. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 717 F. Supp. 2d 404 (D. Del. 2010).....	48
<i>Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC</i> , 683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	19, 58

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.