

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. 8,791,154 to Gamache *et al.*
Case No.: IPR2018-01020

U.S. Patent No. 9,533,053 to Gamache *et al.*
Case No.: IPR2018-01021

DECLARATION OF DR. PAUL A. LASKAR PH.D.

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS	2
III.	LIST OF MATERIALS CONSIDERED	6
IV.	LEGAL STANDARD	7
A.	Obviousness.....	7
V.	NONE OF THE CLAIMS ARE ENTITLED TO THE PRIORITY DATE OF PROVISIONAL APPLICATION 61/487,789	10
VI.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”).....	12
VII.	THE GAMACHE PATENTS.....	14
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
IX.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	18
A.	Olopatadine	19
B.	Cyclodextrins.....	21
C.	Ophthalmic Formulations of Olopatadine For Treatment of Allergic Conjunctivitis	25
1.	Bhowmick	25
2.	Yanni	26
3.	Castillo	27
4.	Schneider.....	27
5.	Hayakawa.....	28
6.	Abelson	29
X.	INVALIDITY OF THE ’154 PATENT	30
A.	Claims 1-27 of the ’154 Patent are Rendered Obvious by Bhowmick in View of Yanni and Castillo	30
1.	Claim 1	31

Declaration of Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D.

a)	“An aqueous ophthalmic solution for treatment of ocular allergic conjunctivitis, the solution comprising”.....	31
b)	“at least 0.67 w/v % olopatadine dissolved in the solution”.....	32
c)	“PEG having a molecular weight of 300 to 500”	34
d)	“polyvinylpyrrolidone”.....	36
e)	“hydroxypropyl- γ -cyclodextrin”	38
f)	“benzalkonium chloride”.....	39
g)	“Water”.....	39
h)	Even if Yanni May Teach Suspensions in Certain Instances that Would Not Render the Gamache Patents any Less Obvious.....	40
i)	The Skilled Artisan Would Not Be Dissuaded From Using Multiple Solubilizing Agents	44
j)	Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	47
2.	Claims 4 and 8.....	48
3.	Claim 21	54
4.	Claims 2, 5, and 9.....	56
5.	Claims 3, 6, 10, and 18	57
6.	Claims 7 and 11.....	58
7.	Claims 19 and 20.....	58
8.	Claim 24.....	59
9.	Claims 12-14 and 25-27.....	60
10.	Claims 15-17 and 22	61
11.	Claim 23	62
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-27 are Rendered Obvious by Schneider in view of Hayakawa, Bhowmick, and Castillo	63
1.	Claim 1	63
a)	“An aqueous ophthalmic solution for treatment of ocular allergic conjunctivitis, the solution comprising”.....	63
b)	“at least 0.67 w/v % olopatadine dissolved in the solution”.....	64
c)	“PEG having a molecular weight of 300 to 500”	65
d)	“polyvinylpyrrolidone”.....	66
e)	“hydroxypropyl- γ -cyclodextrin”	67

Declaration of Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D.

f)	“benzalkonium chloride”	68
g)	“Water”	68
h)	Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	68
2.	Claim 4 and 8	69
3.	Claim 21	73
4.	Claims 2, 5, and 9.....	76
5.	Claims 3, 6, 10, and 18	77
6.	Claims 7 and 11.....	77
7.	Claims 19 and 20.....	78
8.	Claim 24.....	79
9.	Claims 12-14 and 25-27.....	80
10.	Claims 15-17 and 22	80
11.	Claim 23	81
XI.	INVALIDITY OF THE '053 PATENT	83
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-13 are Rendered Obvious by Bhowmick in view of Yanni, Castillo, and Abelson	83
1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art and the Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	83
2.	Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art	83
a)	Claim 1.....	83
(1)	“An aqueous ophthalmic solution for treatment of ocular allergic conjunctivitis, the solution comprising”	83
(2)	“at least 0.67 w/v % olopatadine dissolved in the solution”	84
(3)	“PEG having a molecular weight of 200 to 800”	86
(4)	“polyvinylpyrrolidone”	88
(5)	“a cyclodextrin selected from the group consisting of SAE-β-cyclodextrin, hydroxypropyl-β-cyclodextrin and hydroxypropyl-γ-cyclodextrin; and”	90
(6)	“Water”.....	90
(7)	Reasonable Expectation of Success	91
b)	Claim 8.....	91

Declaration of Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D.

c)	Claim 2.....	92
d)	Claims 3 and 9	93
e)	Claims 4 and 10	93
f)	Claims 5 and 11	94
g)	Claims 6 and 12	94
h)	Claims 7 and 13	95
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-13 are Rendered Obvious by Schneider in view of Hayakawa, Bhowmick, Castillo, and Abelson.....	97
1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art and the Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	97
2.	Differences Between the Claims and the Prior Art	98
a)	The Prior Art.....	98
b)	Claim 1.....	98
(1)	“An aqueous ophthalmic solution for treatment of ocular allergic conjunctivitis, the solution comprising”	98
(2)	“at least 0.67 w/v % olopatadine dissolved in the solution”	98
(3)	“PEG having a molecular weight of 200 to 800”	99
(4)	“polyvinylpyrrolidone”	101
(5)	“a cyclodextrin selected from the group consisting of SAE- β -cyclodextrin, hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin and hydroxypropyl- γ -cyclodextrin; and”	102
(6)	“Water”.....	102
(7)	Reasonable Expectation of Success	103
c)	Claim 8.....	103
d)	Claim 2.....	104
e)	Claims 3 and 9	105
f)	Claims 4 and 10	105
g)	Claims 5 and 11	106
h)	Claims 6 and 12	106
i)	Claims 7 and 13	107

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.