#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CIPLA LIMITED, Petitioner

**V** .

ALCON RESEARCH, LTD., Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 9,533,053 to Gamache *et al*.

Issue Date: January 3, 2017

Title: High Concentration Olopatadine Ophthalmic Composition

Inter Partes Review No. 2018-01021

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,533,053 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>Pa</u>	<u>ge</u>
I.	INTE	ODUCT	ION		• • • • • • •			1
II.	OVERVIEW1							
III.							PROCEDURAL	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))							
	B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))							
	1. Judicial Matters						3	
	2. Administrative Matters						3	
	C.	_					l and Service (37 d 42.10(b))	4
V.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a))						4	
VI.	THE	'053 PAT	CENT	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • •			4
	A.	Claim C	onstruc	tion	• • • • • • •			5
VII.	NONE OF THE CLAIMS ARE ENTITLED TO THE PRIORITY DATE OF PROVISIONAL APPLICATION 61/487,7897						7	
VIII.	A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART9					9		
IX.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b))					10		
X.	INVALIDITY ANALYSIS							11
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1-13 are Rendered Obvious by Bhowmick in View of Yanni, Castillo, and Abelson					•	12	
					•		tinent Art and the	13



	2.	Differences between the Claims and the Prior Art					
		<ul><li>a. Claim 1</li><li>b. Claim 8</li><li>c. Claim 2</li></ul>	30				
		d. Claims 3 and 9	31				
		e. Claims 4 and 10	32				
		f. Claims 5 and 11	32				
		g. Claims 6 and 12					
		h. Claims 7 and 13	34				
B.		Ground 2: Claims 1-13 Are Rendered Obvious by Schneider in View of Hayakawa, Bhowmick, Castillo, and Abelson					
		·	,,,,,				
	1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art and the Scope and Content of the Prior Art	38				
		•					
	2.	Differences between the Claims and the Prior Art	38				
		a. The Prior Art	38				
		a. Claim 1	40				
		b. Claim 8	46				
		c. Claim 2	47				
		d. Claims 3 and 9	48				
		e. Claims 4 and 10	48				
		f. Claims 5 and 11	49				
		g. Claims 6 and 12	49				
		h. Claims 7 and 13	50				
C.		Ground 3: Claims 1-13 Are Rendered Obvious by Bhowmick, Schneider, Castillo, and Abelson					
	1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art and the Scope and Content of the Prior Art					
	2.	Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art	51				
	2.						
		a. Claim 1					
		b. Claim 8					
		c. Claim 2					
		d. Claims 3 and 9					
		e. Claims 4 and 10	57				



			f. Claims 5 and 11	57
			g. Claims 6 and 12	58
			h. Claims 7 and 13	
	D.		District Court's Decision Not to Invalidate the '154 Patent ald Not Dissuade the PTAB from Instituting Review	59
		1.	The District Court Did Not Rule on the Validity of the '053 Patent	59
		2.	The Board Instituted Review of the Claims of the '154 Patent	60
		3.	The District Court Focused Too Heavily on Preferred Embodiments	60
		4.	The District Court Focused Too Heavily on the Commercial Formulations.	61
	E.	Obje	ctive Indicia of Non-Obviousness	62
		1.	No Unexpected Results	62
		2.	No Commercial Success	63
		3.	No Failure of Others	63
VΙ	CON		SION	61



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
Cases	
Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Cipla Limited, 1-17-cv-01244 (D. Del.)	3, 20
Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Lupin Limited, 1-17-cv-00321 (D. Del.)	3
Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Watson Labs. Inc., 1-17-cv-00252 (D. Del.)	3
Amneal Pharms. LLC v. Hospira, Inc., IPR2016-01577	62
Amneal Pharms. LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., IPR2016-01412	38, 61
Amneal Pharms. LLC v. Purdue Pharma L.P., IPR2016-01413	38
Amneal Pharms., LLC v. Supernus Pharms., Inc., IPR2013-00368.	61
Apotex, Inc. v. Alcon Research Ltd., IPR2016-01640	1
Argentum Pharm. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd., IPR2016-00544.	1
Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	8
Bayer Pharma AG v. Watson Laboratories, Inc., 874 F. 3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	61
Chi Mei Innolux Corp. v. Semiconductor Energy Lab. Co., Ltd., IPR2013-00028	11



# 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.

