

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APOTEX INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

UCB BIOPHARMA SPRL,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2019-00400  
Patent 8,633,194

---

**PATENT OWNER COMPLETE RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I.</b> PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
<b>II.</b> LEGAL STANDARD .....	2
<b>III.</b> THE '194 PATENT.....	4
A. The '194 Patent.....	4
B. The Challenged Claims .....	5
C. Prosecution of the '194 Patent.....	6
<b>IV.</b> CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	8
<b>V.</b> PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	8
<b>VI.</b> BACKGROUND .....	9
A. Principles of Pharmaceutical Formulation .....	9
B. Antimicrobial Effectiveness Testing .....	11
C. Preservatives in Pharmaceutical Formulations .....	12
D. Levocetirizine .....	15
<b>VII.</b> SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART IDENTIFIED BY PETITIONER .....	17
A. EP '203 (EX1004) .....	17
B. WO '094 (EX1007) .....	19
C. The Handbook (EX1006) .....	20
D. Petitioner's Prior Art Allegedly Teaching a 9/1 Ratio of Methylparaben to Propylparaben .....	24
<b>VIII.</b> PETITIONER'S GROUND 1 DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE UNPATENTABILITY .....	26

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Continued)**

A.	Only Hindsight Would Cause a POSA To Begin Formulation with the Syrup Example of WO '094.....	26
B.	Petitioner Does Not Show That A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine the Handbook with WO '094.....	29
C.	A POSA Would Not Reasonably Expect to Successfully Prepare the Claimed Invention. ....	33
D.	Petitioner Failed to Establish <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness as the Handbook Teaches Neither the Claimed Amount Nor Ratio of Parabens.....	35
1.	There is No Overlapping Range Disclosed Across the Prior Art. ....	35
2.	The Handbook Does Not Teach Dr. Laskar's Calculated Total Amount of Parabens. ....	38
3.	Petitioner Relies on Non-Analogous Art to Support its Finding of a 9/1 Ratio of Parabens. ....	42
E.	The Handbook and the Prior Art Teach Away from Minimizing the Amount of Preservatives Used in a Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulation. ....	44
F.	Unexpected Results Overcome Any <i>Prima Facie</i> Showing of Obviousness.....	47
G.	Dependent Claims.....	49
1.	Dependent Claim 2 .....	49
2.	Dependent Claim 4 .....	50
3.	Dependent Claim 6 .....	50
4.	Dependent Claim 11 .....	52

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Continued)**

<b>IX.</b>	<b>PETITIONER’S GROUND 2 REFERENCES DO NOT DEMONSTRATE UNPATENTABILITY .....</b>	<b>52</b>
A.	Only Hindsight Would Cause a POSA to Begin Formulation with Example 5 of EP ’203.....	53
B.	Petitioner Does Not Show that a POSA Would Be Motivated to Modify the Amount and Ratio of Parabens in Example 5 of EP ’203. ....	54
C.	Petitioner Does Not Show that a POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine the Handbook with EP ’203.....	55
D.	A POSA Would Not Reasonably Expect to Successfully Prepare the Claimed Invention. ....	56
E.	Petitioner Did Not Establish <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness Based on An “Overlapping Range.” .....	56
F.	The Handbook and the Prior Art Teach Away from Minimizing the Amount of Preservatives Used in a Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulation. ....	57
G.	Unexpected Results Overcome Any <i>Prima Facie</i> Showing of Obviousness.....	58
H.	Dependent Claims. ....	58
<b>X.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>58</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 796 F. 3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	4
<i>Arendi SARL v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	3, 46
<i>Comaper Corp. v. Antec, Inc.</i> , 596 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	49
<i>Everett Laboratories, Inc. v. Breckenridge Pharm., Inc.</i> , 573 F. Supp. 2d 855 (D.N.J. Aug. 26, 2008).....	37
<i>Galderma Labs., LP v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F. 3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	4
<i>Honeywell Int’l Inc. v. Mexichem Amanco Holding S.A. DE C.V.</i> , 865 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	49
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	42
<i>In re Coutts</i> , 726 Fed. Appx. 791 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	39
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	3, 47
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	47
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	3, 29, 34
<i>In re Papesch</i> , 315 F.2d 381 (C.C.P.A. 1963).....	48

# 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.