UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FLATWING PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC and MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., Petitioners,

v.

ANACOR PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00168 (Patent 9,549,938 B2) Case IPR2018-00169 (Patent 9,566,289 B2) Case IPR2018-00170 (Patent 9,566,290 B2) Case IPR2018-00171 (Patent 9,572,823 B2)¹

> Record of Oral Hearing Held: March 1, 2019

Before GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, TINA E. HULSE, and JACQUELINE T. HARLOW, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

¹ Cases IPR2018-01358, -1359, -1360, and -1361 have been joined with Cases IPR2018-00168, -169, -170, and -171, respectively.

DOCKE.

APPEARANCES:

DOCKET

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

PHILIP D. SEGREST, JR., ESQUIRE Husch Blackwell LLP 120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200 Chicago, Illinois 60606

STEVEN W. PARMELEE, ESQUIRE Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati One Market - Spear Tower, Suite 3300 San Francisco, California 94105

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

AARON P. MAURER, ESQUIRE TONY SHEH, ESQUIRE Williams & Connolly LLP 725 Twelfth Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20005

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Friday, March 1, 2019, commencing at 1:00 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

1	P R O C E E D I N G S
2	
3	JUDGE OBERMANN: Please be seated. It's going to take us just a
4	few minutes to wake up our computers.
5	JUDGE HULSE: Good morning, everyone. I'm Judge Hulse in
6	California; and with you in Alexander is Judge Obermann; and in Denver is
7	Judge Harlow. We are here for the final hearing in IPR2018-00168, -169, -
8	170, and -171, to which IPR2018-01358, -1359, -1360, and -1361 have been
9	joined.
10	Let's begin with appearances, starting with Petitioner FlatWing,
11	please.
12	MR. SEGREST: Yes, Your Honor, Philip Segrest for the Petitioner,
13	FlatWing. Also in the gallery is the counsel for the co-Petitioners, Mylan.
14	MR. PARMELEE: Steve Parmelee, Your Honor.
15	JUDGE HULSE: Would counsel for Mylan like to introduce himself?
16	MR. PARMELEE: Steve Parmelee. I'm from Wilson Sonsini for
17	Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
18	JUDGE HULSE: Thank you; and for Patent Owner?
19	MR. MAURER: Good afternoon, Your Honors. Aaron Maurer for
20	Patent Owner; and in court with me here today is my colleague Tony Sheh.
21	JUDGE HULSE: Thank you. Welcome everyone. As we stated in
22	our hearing order, each party will have 45 minutes of time to present their
23	arguments. We'll start with Petitioner and then hear Patent Owner's
24	response; and then assuming that both parties reserve time, we'll hear
25	Petitioner's rebuttal and Patent Owner's sur-rebuttal. Please remember that

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

1 neither Judge Harlow nor I can see what's on the screen; so if you could 2 please be very specific as to where in the slides you are referring -- what 3 slide number, etc. We do have them electronically, so we can follow along from here. 4 Judge Obermann will be timing you. She's in the room with you; and 5 6 so she'll let you know how much time you have left. Does anyone have any 7 questions? 8 MR. SEGREST: Does the display here show the time left or is that --9 JUDGE OBERMANN: You're going to see the lights. They'll go 10 from green -- I think the yellow is going to be a two or three minute 11 warning. I can let you know; and then red means you're out of time. I'm 12 sorry we don't have the display -- but wait, maybe we will. I see the 13 display's up there. 14 MR. SEGREST: There's one here. I just didn't know if it was 15 working. 16 JUDGE OBERMANN: Yeah. You tell me how much time you want 17 to reserve and I'll put it on the clock. 18 MR. SEGREST: 15 minutes. 19 JUDGE OBERMANN: Fifteen; so, you're going to have 30 minutes to start. Are you seeing that amount of time floating up there? 20 21 MR. SEGREST: Yes. 22 JUDGE OBERMANN: Okay. So, you'll have full warning. Let me 23 just get it to 30; and I won't begin the clock until you begin speaking. 24 JUDGE HULSE: Okay. Are we all set then? Mr. Segrest, you may 25 begin.

R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

MR. SEGREST: Thank you. May it please the Board, I'm going to start pursuant to the guides the Board gave us -- departing a bit from the slides -- I want to look first at this question of what's the scope of issues still in dispute, especially in light of the previous IPRs. I'd like to refer the board to Exhibit 1017. It's the decision in one of the three previous IPRs, page 50; and there's a paragraph there which I think explains where we're at in this case as well.

8 It reads that, further, for the same reason set forth above with respect 9 to claim 6, we credit Dr. Murthy's testimony that "formulating" 10 pharmaceutical compositions was well known in the art of cosmetics and 11 topical pharmaceuticals. And a number of non-toxic pharmaceutical acceptable solvents were known, including water and ethanol." And 12 13 "formulating pharmaceutical compositions involve nothing more than 14 routine experimentation based on well-known protocols." And that the '657 15 Patent does not "describe any unexpected results attributable to the claimed 16 pharmaceutical formulation of claim 9. Of course, we're looking a different 17 patent now, but the same principle still applies -- formulating pharmaceutical 18 compositions. It's still well known to those in the art. It still involves 19 routine experimentation.

At this point, we're down to one claim limitation that we're looking at which is the 5 percent white weight of Tavaborole in the claims that are still asserted. Most of the claims have dropped out. That 5 percent white weight of Tavaborole doesn't have any unexpected results associated with it. There needs to be something special about it because the prior art showed ranges all around this. There's nothing special about 5 percent. There're no

DOCKET A L A R M



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.