

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
ARGUMENT	5
I. Legal Framework	5
II. It was obvious to combine fluticasone propionate and azelastine hydrochloride in a single nasal spray to treat allergic rhinitis.....	7
A. Persons of ordinary skill in the art	7
B. It was obvious to combine fluticasone with azelastine to treat AR.	7
1. Doctors prescribed fluticasone (Flonase®) with azelastine (Astelin®) in clinical practice.....	7
2. The prior art explains the clinical practice of combining fluticasone and azelastine to treat AR.	9
C. It was obvious to make the clinical practice of combining fluticasone and azelastine more convenient for patients by co-formulating these drugs in a single nasal spray.	11
1. Other pharmaceutical companies expressly disclosed co-formulating fluticasone and azelastine in a single nasal spray.	11
2. There were several motivations to co-formulate fluticasone and azelastine in a single nasal spray.	13
D. Federal Circuit authorities compel a finding that it was obvious to co-formulate fluticasone and azelastine into a single nasal spray to treat AR.....	15
E. Plaintiffs’ contrary arguments misstate the facts and otherwise fail as a matter of law.	16
III. It was obvious how to formulate a nasal spray that combines fluticasone and azelastine.....	23
A. Person of ordinary skill in the art.....	23
B. The prior art disclosed a finite number of obvious possible combination formulations.	23
1. Flonase® label	24
2. Astelin® label and formulation patent.....	25
3. A POSA would have arrived at a finite number of obvious possible combination formulations.	26

C.	The obvious possible combination formulations render all asserted claims obvious.....	28
1.	'428 Claim 11	28
2.	'428 Claim 10	31
3.	'428 Claim 13	33
4.	'428 Claim 15	33
5.	'428 Claim 16	34
6.	'428 Claim 29	34
7.	'428 Claims 23, 24, 26, and 30	34
8.	'620 Claim 43	34
9.	'620 Claim 44	35
10.	'620 Claim 4	35
11.	'620 Claim 29 and 42.....	35
D.	Plaintiffs' theories about potential incompatibilities would not have deterred a POSA from formulating the claimed combination product.	35
IV.	There are no secondary considerations sufficient to rebut the strong <i>prima facie</i> showing of obviousness.	39
A.	Three simultaneous inventions indicate that co-formulating azelastine and fluticasone was within the level of ordinary skill in the art.	40
B.	Two blocking patents render remaining secondary considerations weak at best.	41
C.	Meda has failed to produce any evidence of commercial success or unmet need that rebuts the strong showing of obviousness.	43
D.	There is no evidence of copying.	45
E.	There are no superior results over the closest prior art, and any improvement over individual monotherapies was expected.	45
F.	There was no industry skepticism.	46
G.	Meda has failed to produce any evidence of independent praise for Dymista®.	48
H.	MedPointe's single experiment does not constitute failure of others.	48
V.	Alternatively, the claims are not enabled.	50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	45
<i>Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.</i> , 520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	40, 44
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	43
<i>AstraZeneca LP v. Breath Ltd.</i> , 88 F. Supp. 3d 326 (D.N.J.), <i>aff'd</i> , 603 F. App'x 999 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	49
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	45
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms, Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	48
<i>Cross Med. Prods., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8
<i>Duramed Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 413 F. App'x 289 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	39
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	13, 40, 41
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	6
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	21, 42, 45, 46
<i>Geo. M. Martin Co. v. All. Mach. Sys. Int'l LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	48
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	5, 22

Great Atl. & Pac. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equip. Corp.,
 340 U.S. 147 (1950).....27, 28, 38

In re Haase,
 542 F. App'x 962 (Fed. Cir. 2013) *passim*

Insight Tech. Inc. v. SureFire, LLC,
 447 F. Supp. 2d 120 (D.N.H. 2006).....41

INVISTA N. Am. S.a.r.l. v. M & G USA Corp.,
 951 F. Supp. 2d 604 (D. Del. 2013).....43

In re Kahn,
 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... *passim*

In re Kao,
 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....33

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
 550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... *passim*

Lincoln Eng'g Co. of Illinois v. Stewart-Warner Corp.,
 303 U.S. 545 (1938).....27

Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....42

In re Mouttet,
 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....17

Novo Nordisk A/S v. Caraco Pharm. Labs., Ltd.,
 719 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... *passim*

In re O'Farrell,
 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....4, 6

Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.,
 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....44

PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.,
 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....33, 34

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....3, 36, 38

Rasmusson v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.,
 413 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....50

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.