

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICRO LABS LIMITED AND MICRO LABS USA INC.
Petitioners,

v.

SANTEN PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD. AND ASAHI GLASS CO., LTD.
Patent Owners.

Case: To be Assigned
Patent No. 5,886,035

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 5,886,035
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311 AND C.F.R. § 42.108**

Mail Stop Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....	4
	A. Real Parties-In-Interest under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).	4
	B. Related Matters under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	4
	C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(3).	5
	D. Service Information – 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	5
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(a) AND 42.103	6
IV.	POWER OF PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(a) AND 42.103	6
V.	POWER OF ATTORNEY – C.F.R. §42.10(b)	6
VI.	GROUND FOR STANDING AND PROCEDURAL STATEMENT	6
VII.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22(a)(1) and 42.104(b).....	7
VIII.	THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW	10
IX.	STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED	10
X.	OVERVIEW	12
	A. Summary of U.S. Patent No. 5,886,035	12
	B. Prosecution Background of the '035 Patent.....	14
XI.	TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART PRIOR TO DECEMBER 26, 1996	15
XII.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	23
XIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	25
XIV.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	26

A.	European Patent Application Publication EP0639563A2 (“Klimko”) (Ex. 1003)	26
B.	U.S. Patent No. 5,292,754 (“Kishi”) (Ex. 1005).....	34
A.	Ueno Japan (Ex. 1006)	37
C.	Bezuglov 1982 (Ex. 1007)	39
D.	Bezuglov 1986 (Ex. 1008)	40
XV.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY	41
A.	GROUND 1: Claims 1-14 of the ’035 Patent Are Obvious Over Klimko, Kishi and Ueno Japan	41
a.	Claims 1-3 Directed to Compounds Are Obvious over Klimko in view of Kishi and Ueno Japan.....	41
i.	Klimko Discloses Compound C - A Lead Compound Possessing Significant IOP-Reducing Activity	45
ii.	Kishi Teaches that Removal of the Hydroxyl Group at the C-15 Position of Compound C Eliminates Hyperemia	50
iii.	Ueno Japan Teaches Substitution of a Difluoro Group in Place of the Hydroxyl Group at the C-15 Position of Compound C	51
b.	Claims 4-6 Directed To Medicines Containing Tafluprost Are Obvious Over Klimko, Kishi and Ueno Japan.	54
c.	Claims 7-11 Directed to Medicines Containing Tafluprost Are Obvious Over Klimko, Kishi and Ueno Japan.....	57
d.	Claims 12-14 Directed to Medicines Containing Tafluprost Are Obvious Over Klimko, Kishi and Ueno Japan.....	60

B.	GROUND 2: Claims 1-14 of the '035 Patent Are Obvious Over Klimko, Kishi and Ueno Japan in further view of Bezuglov 1982 and/or Bezuglov 1986	62
a.	Klimko and Kishi Teach Removal of the Hydroxyl Group at the C-15 Position to Eliminate Hyperemia.....	62
b.	Bezuglov 1982 and Bezuglov 1986 Teach Monofluorine Substitution of the C-15 Position of the Hydroxyl Group.....	63
c.	Ueno Japan Teaches Difluorination at the C-15 Position.....	65
XVI.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS DO NOT REBUT THE <i>PRIMA FACIE</i> CASE.....	66
A.	No Unexpected Results Over the Closest Prior Art.....	67
B.	No Long-Felt and Unmet Need.....	68
XVII.	CONCLUSION.....	69

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014), reh’g and reh’g en banc denied 769 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	passim
<i>Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i> , 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	8
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S.Ct. 2131 (2016).....	26
<i>DyStar Textilfarben GmbH v. C.H. Patrick, Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	10
<i>Eisai Co. Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9
<i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharma, Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	9
<i>In re De Blauwe</i> , 736 F.2d 699 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	69
<i>In re Deuel</i> , 51 F.3d 1552 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	9
<i>In re Dillon</i> , 919 F.2d 688 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	9, 55
<i>In re Grabiak</i> , 769 F.2d 729 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	9
<i>In re Longi</i> , 759 F.2d 887 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	9
<i>In re Muchmore</i> , 433 F.2d 824 (CCPA 1970)	45

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.