#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

**v** .

COSMO TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED, Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,784,888 to Villa *et al.*Issue Date: June 22, 2014
Title: Controlled Release and Taste Masking Oral Pharmaceutical Compositions

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2017-01034

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,784,888 Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

								<u>Page</u>	
I.	INTR	RODUC	CTION					1	
II.	OVERVIEW						1		
III.			•		-		PROCEDURAL	1	
IV.	IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1))							2	
	A. Each Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))								
	B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))							2	
		1.	Judicial N	latters				2	
		2.	Administr	rative Matt	ers			2	
	C.						and Service (37 142.10(b)):	3	
V.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFORE (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a))						4		
VI.	THE	'888 P	ATENT	•••••				4	
	A.	Claim	Construct	tion				5	
VII.	A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART						7		
VIII.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))						8		
IX.	INVALIDITY ANALYSIS9								
	A.	Obvio	Ground 1: Claims 1-9 of the '888 Patent Would Have Been Obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,239,120 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,681,584						
		1.			-		tinent Art and the	10	
			a The	e '120 Pate	nt			11	



		b.	The '584 Patent	12		
	2.	Differences Between the Prior Art and the Claims at Issue				
		•••••		14		
		a.	Claim 1	14		
		b.	Claims 2, 4, 6, 8: "at least one hydrogel-forming hydrophilic excipient comprises at least one	27		
		c.	hydroxyalkyl cellulose"			
		d.	Claims 5 and 9: "at least one lipophilic excipient	20		
			comprises stearic acid or magnesium stearate"	30		
		e.	Claim 7: "at least one amphiphilic excipient comprises lecithin"	31		
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-9 of the '888 Patent Would Have Been Obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,681,584		32			
	1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art and the Scope and Content of the Prior Art				
	2.	Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art				
		a.	Claim 1	32		
		a.	Claims 2, 4, 6, 8: "at least one hydrogel-forming hydrophilic excipient comprises at least one			
		b.	hydroxyalkyl cellulose"			
		c.	Claims 5 and 9: "at least one lipophilic excipient comprises stearic acid or magnesium stearate"			
		d.	Claim 7: "at least one amphiphilic excipient comprises lecithin"			
		e.	Reasonable Expectation of Success			
C.			Claims 1-9 are Anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub.	49		
	1.	Effec	etive Filing Date of the '888 Patent	49		



			a. Legal Standard for Priority Dates	49
			b. "Other Than Gum" Limitation	51
			c. The '888 Patent Cannot Have a Priority Date Earlier	
			Than September 14, 2012	51
		2.	The '208 Publication is Prior Art	57
		3.	Disclosure of the '208 Publication	58
D.		Obje	ctive Indicia of Non-Obviousness	64
		1.	No Long-Felt Unmet Need	65
		2.	No Failure of Others	65
		3.	No Unexpected Results Over the Closest Prior Art	66
		4.	No Commercial Success	67
X	CON	ICLUS	JION	68



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Pag	ge(s)
CASES	
Amneal Pharmaceuticals. LLC v. Hospira, Inc., IPR2016-01577, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 9, 2017)	66
Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc., IPR2013-00368, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 17, 2013)	64
Amneal Pharms, LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., IPR2016-01412, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 14, 2017)	12
Amneal Pharms, LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., IPR2016-01413, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 18, 2017)	12
Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	49
Automotive Data Solutions, Inc. v. AAMP of Florida, Inc., IPR2016-00061, Paper 23 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2016)	49
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	64
Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., 636 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	50
Chi Mei Innolux Corp. v. Semiconductor Energy Lab. Co., Ltd., IPR2013-00028, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 21, 2014)	9
Coalition For Affordable Drugs II, LLC v. Cosmo Technologies, Ltd., IPR2015-00988, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 7, 2015)	9, 34
Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	7
Dow Jones & Co. v. Ablaise Ltd.,	10



# DOCKET

# 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.

