

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

1201 NORTH MARKET STREET
P.O. BOX 1347
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19899-1347

(302) 658-9200
(302) 658-3989 FAX

JACK B. BLUMENFELD
(302) 351-9291
jblumenfeld@mmat.com

September 18, 2018

The Honorable Richard G. Andrews
United States District Court for the District of
Delaware
844 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –
PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL**

FILED UNDER SEAL

Re: *Bayer Intellectual Property GmbH v. Taro Pharmaceutical Industries, Ltd.*
C.A. No. 17-462 (RGA)

Dear Judge Andrews:

Plaintiffs Bayer Intellectual Property GmbH, Bayer AG, and Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) write to bring an additional claim construction dispute to the Court’s attention, and to seek the Court’s guidance on how to proceed. This dispute arises from

On July 3, 2018, this Court issued a *Markman* Order construing the term “rapid-release tablet” in U.S. Patent Number 9,539,218 (“the ’218 patent”). *See* D.I. 91. The Court adopted Plaintiffs’ proposed construction, which was based on the express definition of the phrase provided in the ’218 patent’s specification: “a tablet which, according to the USP release method using apparatus 2 (paddle), has a Q value (30 minutes) of 75%.” *Id.*

MYLAN - EXHIBIT 1066

Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Bayer Intellectual Property GmbH

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Mylan did not suggest [REDACTED] during the original claim construction proceedings, and Plaintiffs were unaware of it until well after the Court's *Markman* Order had issued. [REDACTED]

Plaintiffs then sought further clarity in a meet and confer call. Had Mylan timely raised this issue, the parties could have addressed it during the claim construction process.

Plaintiffs are prepared to brief this issue for the Court on an accelerated briefing schedule with short submissions by each side. Proceeding in this way would simplify expert discovery and the presentation of evidence at trial, including potentially eliminating the presentation of a doctrine of equivalents case in the alternative. Plaintiffs therefore proposed that the parties jointly seek supplemental claim construction; Mylan, however, rejected Plaintiffs proposal. Alternatively, the issue that Mylan has raised is straightforward and could also be addressed at trial rather than now, if that is the Court's preference.

Plaintiffs are available to discuss this issue further at the Court's convenience.

Respectfully,

/s/ Jack B. Blumenfeld

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)

JBB/bac
Enclosure

cc: Clerk of the Court (via hand delivery; w/enclosure)
Counsel of Record Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. (via electronic mail; w/enclosure)

Exhibit A
Excerpt of Petition in
IPR2018-01143

Filed on behalf of: Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.

By: Steven W. Parmelee

Michael T. Rosato

Jad A. Mills

Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BAYER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GMBH,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2018-01143

Patent No. 9,539,218

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,539,218**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Brief Overview of the '218 Patent.....	3
B.	Brief Overview of the Prosecution History	4
C.	Brief Overview of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art	6
D.	Brief Overview of the Level of Skill in the Art	11
II.	GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	13
III.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8	13
IV.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	15
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	15
VI.	BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE IN THE ART PRIOR TO JANUARY 31, 2005	26
VII.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY	31
A.	[Ground 1] Claims 1-4 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the '610 Publication and Kubitza Abstracts.....	31
B.	[Ground 2] Claims 1-4 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the '610 Publication, Kubitza Abstracts, and Forsman.	46
VIII.	NO UNEXPECTED RESULTS	50
IX.	CONCLUSION	55
X.	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	56
XI.	PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(A) AND 42.103	57
XII.	APPENDIX – LIST OF EXHIBITS.....	58

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.