

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CIPLALIMITED,
Petitioner

v.

ALCON RESEARCH, LTD.,
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,791,154 to Gamache *et al.*

Issue Date: July 29, 2014

Title: High Concentration Olopatadine Ophthalmic Composition

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2018-01020

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,791,154 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. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW	1
III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS).....	2
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)).....	2
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
1. Judicial Matters	2
2. Administrative Matters.....	3
C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3), 42.8(b)(4), 42.10(a), and 42.10(b))	3
V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)).....	4
VI. THE '154 PATENT	4
A. Claim Construction	4
VII. NONE OF THE CLAIMS ARE ENTITLED TO THE PRIORITY DATE OF PROVISIONAL APPLICATION 61/487,789	7
VIII. A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	8
IX. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))	9
X. INVALIDITY ANALYSIS.....	10
A. Ground 1: Claims 1-27 Are Rendered Obvious by Bhowmick in View of Yanni, and Castillo	10
1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art and the Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	11

	(i)	Bhowmick	12
	(ii)	Yanni.....	13
	(iii)	Castillo.....	14
2.		Differences between the Claims and the Prior Art	14
	a.	Claim 1	14
		(i) “An aqueous ophthalmic solution for treatment of ocular allergic conjunctivitis, the solution comprising”	14
		(ii) “at least 0.67 w/v % olopatadine dissolved in the solution”	15
		(iii) “PEG having a molecular weight of 300 to 500”	17
		(iv) “polyvinylpyrrolidone”	19
		(v) “hydroxypropyl- γ -cyclodextrin”	20
		(vi) “benzalkonium chloride”	21
		(vii) “Water”	21
		(viii) The Fact That Yanni May Teach Suspensions In Certain Instances Should Not Dissuade the Board from Instituting IPR.....	21
		(ix) The Skilled Artisan Would Not Be Dissuaded from Using Multiple Solubilizing Agents.....	25
		(x) Reasonable Expectation of Success	26
	b.	Claims 4 and 8.....	27
	c.	Claim 21.....	30
	d.	Claims 2, 5, and 9	33
	e.	Claims 3, 6, 10 and 18.....	34
	f.	Claims 7 and 11.....	35
	g.	Claims 19 and 20.....	35
	h.	Claim 24.....	36
	i.	Claims 12–14 and 25–27.....	37
	j.	Claims 15–17 and 22.....	38
	k.	Claim 23.....	38
B.		Ground 2: Claims 1–27 Are Rendered Obvious by Schneider in View of Hayakawa, Bhowmick, and Castillo	40
	1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art and the Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	42

2.	Differences between the Claims and the Prior Art	42
a.	The Prior Art.....	42
	(i) Schneider.....	42
	(ii) Hayakawa.....	43
b.	Claim 1	44
	(i) “An aqueous ophthalmic solution for treatment of ocular allergic conjunctivitis, the solution comprising”	44
	(ii) “at least 0.67 w/v % olopatadine dissolved in the solution”	44
	(iii) “PEG having a molecular weight of 300 to 500”	45
	(iv) “polyvinylpyrrolidone”	47
	(v) “hydroxypropyl- γ -cyclodextrin”	47
	(vi) “benzalkonium chloride”	48
	(vii) “Water”	48
	(viii) Reasonable Expectation of Success	48
c.	Claim 4 and 8.....	49
d.	Claim 21.....	53
e.	Claims 2, 5, and 9	56
f.	Claims 3, 6, 10 and 18.....	56
g.	Claims 7 and 11.....	57
h.	Claims 19 and 20.....	58
i.	Claim 24.....	59
j.	Claims 12–14 and 25–27.....	59
k.	Claims 15–17 and 22.....	60
l.	Claim 23.....	61
C.	The District Court’s Decision Not to Invalidate the ’154 Patent Should Not Dissuade the PTAB from Instituting Review	62
1.	The Challenge before the Board Is Not the Same Challenge That Was before the District Court.....	62
2.	The District Court Focused Too Heavily on Preferred Embodiments	63
3.	The District Court Focused Too Heavily on the Commercial Formulations.....	64

D.	Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness.....	65
1.	No Unexpected Results.....	65
2.	No Commercial Success.....	66
3.	No Failure of Others.....	67
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	67

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.