

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AYLA PHARMA LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVARTIS AG,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00295
Patent 9,533,053

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 3

 A. Olopatadine, Patanol®, and Pataday® 3

 B. The '154 and '053 Patents 4

 1. The Specification of the '154 and '053 Patents 4

 2. The File Histories of the '154 and '053 Patents 6

 3. The Claims of the '154 and '053 Patents 9

 C. Patent Owner's Pazeo® Product 13

 D. Prior Proceedings Involving the '154 and '053 Patents 14

 1. Argentum's 2016 IPR Petition 14

 2. The District Court Trial and Final Decision 15

 3. Cipla's 2018 IPR Petition 22

 E. Ayla's IPR Petition 23

 1. Ayla Pharma LLC 23

 2. Ayla's Petition Is a Copy of Cipla's 2018 Petition 24

 3. Ayla's Arguments Ignore the District Court's Contrary
 Factual Findings 25

 4. Ayla's Petition Presents No New Claim Construction
 Issues 27

ARGUMENT	28
The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion under §§ 325(d) and 314(a) to Deny Institution.	28
A. The Board Should Deny Institution of Ayla’s Petition under § 325(d) as a Rehash of the Same Art and Arguments Previously Presented to the Office	29
1. The Same Art and Substantially the Same Arguments Previously Were Presented to the Office	30
2. Ayla’s Petition Does Not Demonstrate that the Office Erred	38
B. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion under § 314(a) and Decline to Institute Trial	42
1. <i>Apple</i> Factors (1), (2), and (3)—Involving the Existence of a Stay, the Timing of the Trial, and the Expenditure of Resources—Weigh in Favor of Denying Institution	43
2. <i>Apple</i> Factor (4), Involving the Overlap between Issues in the Petition and the Litigation, Weighs in Favor of Denying Institution	45
3. <i>Apple</i> Factor (5), Involving the Identities of the Parties and the Duplication of the Proceedings, Weighs in Favor of Denying Institution	53
4. Under <i>Apple</i> Factor (6), Ayla’s Disregard of the District Court’s Findings of Secondary Considerations Favors Denying Institution	56
5. Ayla’s Generalized Arguments Regarding the District Court Decision Do Not Justify Institution	60
CONCLUSION	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Watson Labs., Inc.,
1:15-cv-01159 (D. Del.) (EX1030)passim

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc.,
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)28

Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene’s Energy Grp., LLC,
138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018).....28

St. Regis Mohawk Tribe v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.,
896 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2018)28

WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.,
829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)58

Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH,
IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....passim

Alarm.com Inc. v. Vivint, Inc.,
IPR2015-01967, Paper 12 (PTAB Mar. 30, 2016)40

Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,
IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)passim

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG,
IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Dec. 15, 2017).....30, 39, 41

Clim-A-Tech Ind., Inc. v. William A. Ebert,
IPR2017-01863, Paper 13 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2018).....40

E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.,
IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019)54, 55

E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.,
IPR2019-00162, Paper 16 (PTAB June 5, 2019)55

NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs. Inc.,
IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....passim

Robert Bosch Tool Corp. v. SD3, LLC,
IPR2016-01751, Paper 15 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2007)59

Stryker Corp. v. KFx Med., LLC,
IPR2019-00817, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2019).....59, 60

ZTE (USA) Inc. v. Fractus, S.A.,
IPR2018-01457, Paper 20 (PTAB Oct. 4, 2019).....38, 41

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)passim

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)passim

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.