IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC AND AMNEAL

PHARMACEUTICALS INC., Petitioners,

PHARMACEUTICALS OF NEW YORK, LLC, and MYLAN

V.

ALMIRALL, LLC, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-00207 Patent 9,517,219 B2

[REDACTED] PETITIONERS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ADDRESSING NEW EVIDENCE FROM ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY

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

INTRODUCTION			
I.	-	WARNER'S <i>TARO</i> ACTION TESTIMONY FURTHER FIRMS THE '219 PATENT IS <i>PRIMA FACIE</i> OBVIOUS	2
II.		WARNER'S <i>TARO</i> ADMISSIONS DEFEAT ALMIRALL'S EGATIONS OF UNEXPECTED RESULTS	4
	A.	Almirall's evidence of incompatibility between Carbopol and 40% ethoxydiglycol was not unexpected and has no nexus to the '219 patent claims	4
	B.	A POSA would have expected Sepineo to be compatible with 40% ethoxydiglycol.	
	C.	The smaller particle size of undissolved dapsone in the dapsone-Sepineo composition does not have a nexus to the claims and, in any event, was not unexpected.	
CONCLUSION			, 10



INTRODUCTION

Dr. David Osborne is the *only* Almirall expert has alleging unexpected results in this proceeding. Dr. Osborne's *only* evidence and basis for alleging unexpected results is the declaration submitted by co-inventor Dr. Kevin Warner during prosecution (the "Warner Declaration" AMN1017, 289-293). EX2057, ¶173-194 (citing AMN1017, 289-293). Dr. Osborne has no personal knowledge of the experiments Dr. Warner described. AMN1040, 76:23-82:8, 108:11-15; AMN1043, ¶70-71. Nor did Dr. Osborne know who actually conducted the testing or what their level of skill was. *See* AMN1040, 107:15-108:15. Importantly, Dr. Osborne conceded that he would have liked to have had additional information about the Warner Declaration. *See* AMN1040, 108:11-15.

Accordingly, Petitioner Amneal tried for months to secure Dr. Warner's deposition in this IPR, which Almirall repeatedly refused, until his deposition was ordered by the Board. Paper 39, 8-9. Even then, Almirall failed to comply with that order. Paper 44, 2-3. Dr. Warner was, however, previously deposed in a related district court litigation, *Almirall LLC v. Taro Pharmas. Indus. Ltd.*, 17-663 (D. Del.), (the "*Taro* action") involving the '219 patent at issue here.

After Amneal finally received the *Taro* action transcript, the reason for Almirall's steadfast refusal to make Dr. Warner available and to produce his litigation transcript soon became apparent. Dr. Warner made critical admissions in the *Taro* action that (1) further confirm Petitioner Amneal's obviousness case and



Case IPR2019-00207 Patent 9,517,219 B2

(2) entirely disproves any unexpected results alleged by Almirall and Dr. Osborne. These admissions are additional reasons the Board should find that the '219 patent's claims are unpatentable as obvious.

I. DR. WARNER'S *TARO* ACTION TESTIMONY FURTHER CONFIRMS THE '219 PATENT IS *PRIMA FACIE* OBVIOUS.

At his deposition in the *Taro* action, Dr. Warner provided critical admissions that support Amneal's obviousness case and undercut Almirall's defenses.

Dr. Warner's approach is precisely what the prior art taught. As Dr. Michniak-Kohn explained, Garrett taught that an amount between 5% and 10% w/w dapsone could be used once- or twice- daily. AMN1043, ¶19; AMN1004, 12:20-30. Further, Dr. Michniak-Kohn explained that because the prior art Aczone Gel 5% product was administered twice-daily, a POSA would have been motivated



to optimize to once-daily dosing. AMN1043, ¶19. This testimony shows that a POSA would have been motivated to use amounts of ethoxydiglycol greater than 25%, defeating Almirall's assertion of teaching away. As explained by Dr. Michniak-Kohn, these qualities of Sepineo were all previously known in the art from at least Nadau-Fourcade (AMN1005, 48:5-9), Bonacucina (AMN1015, 2, 7), the Sepineo brochure (AMN1026, 1), and Andersson (AMN 1055, 4). Dr. Michniak-Kohn also explained that these qualities would have motivated a POSA to use Sepineo. AMN1043, ¶¶55-69. Thus, Dr.



Warner's testimony confirms a POSA's reasons to select Sepineo as a thickener.

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.

