

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

**PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1), Petitioner Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC (“Petitioner”) submits the following objections to the exhibit identified by Exhibit Number below, which were served by Patent Owner, Cipla Ltd. (“Patent Owner”), in conjunction with Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response (paper 7). These objections are timely, having been served within ten business days of the institution of trial (Paper 11). 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1).

Exhibit No.	Federal Rule(s) of Evidence	Objection
1002	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶¶27-29; Ex. 2005 ¶¶79, 112-113; Ex. 2007 ¶¶25, 31, 37, 42-47), and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination
1008	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶112) , and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination
1034	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶82) , and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination
1035	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶¶45, 49) , and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination

1036	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶¶45, 49) , and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination
1039	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶¶45, 49) , and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination
1040	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶82) , and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination
1045	802	Inadmissible hearsay, as the document appears to be relied upon by Patent Owner for the truth of the matter asserted (e.g., Ex. 2001 ¶108) , and Petitioner has not had the opportunity to subject the declarant(s) to cross examination

<p>2001</p> <p>¶¶15-17, 19, 27-29, 45, 46, 49, 61-64, 71, 73, 77, 82, 88-92, 94, 97, 99-102, 105-106, 108, 110, 112, 116, 118-119, 121-126, 128-129, 131-132, 135-136, 138-140, 142-152</p>	<p>402/403; 802</p>	<p>402/403: Petitioner objects to Patent Owner’s evidence regarding the alleged success, copying, and other alleged secondary considerations stemming from the Duonase product marketed and sold in India as being irrelevant, and having prejudicial value that outweighs any probative value.</p> <p>802: Inadmissible hearsay, as Dr. Carr relies on various cited documents and/or other “out-of-court” statements for the truth of the matter asserted therein; Petitioner was not a party to and did not participate in the trial referenced at paragraph 13 of Dr. Carr’s declaration, and therefore has not had any opportunity to cross examine any of the witnesses or declarants that provided evidence in that case.</p>
<p>2003</p> <p>¶¶2, 11-20, 22-27</p>	<p>802</p>	<p>Inadmissible hearsay, as Dr. D’Addio relies on various cited documents and/or other “out-of-court” statements for the truth of the matter asserted therein.</p>

<p>2005 ¶¶3-4, 16-20, 22-35, 37-67, 69-71, 73-91, 93-101, 103-106, 112, 116; TABS 1-12 (pp. 54-70)</p>	<p>402/403; 702/703; 802</p>	<p>402/403: Petitioner objects to Patent Owner’s evidence regarding the alleged success, copying, and other alleged secondary considerations stemming from the Duonase product marketed and sold in India as being irrelevant, and having prejudicial value that outweighs any probative value.</p> <p>702/703/403: Inadequate showing of witness’ qualifications to opine on topics discussed in declaration; in addition, while expert testimony can rely on otherwise inadmissible evidence, Petitioner objects to the extent that it has not been provided sufficient access to such evidence, or discovery of other evidence in Patent Owner’s possession or control that may undercut or contradict the evidence relied upon by this witness, as Petitioner was not a party to the prior litigation involving Dymista; Petitioner further objects to Dr. Jarosz’s characterization of the cited exhibits being of the type normally relied upon by experts in this field.</p> <p>802: Inadmissible hearsay, as Dr. Jarosz relies on various cited documents and/or other “out-of-court” statements for the truth of the matter asserted therein; Petitioner was not a party to and did not participate in the trial involving Dymista, and therefore has not had any opportunity to cross examine any of the witnesses or declarants that provided evidence in that case</p>
--	--------------------------------------	---

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.