UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GLAXOSMITHKLINE CONSUMER HEALTHCARE HOLDINGS (US) LLC,
Petitioner

v.

CIPLA LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2020-00368
U.S. Patent No. 8,163,723

DECLARATION OF ROBERT P. SCHLEIMER, PH.D.

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Qualifications and Experience 1
II. Materials Considered 3
III. Relevant Legal Standards 11
IV. Priority Date of the '723 *Patent* and Level of Ordinary Skill 13
V. Technical Background 15
A. Azelastine and Fluticasone Nasal Sprays Were FDA-Approved and Marketed Commercially 15
1. Allergic Rhinitis 16
2. Antihistamines for Nasal Administration 19
3. Corticosteroids for Nasal Administration 28
B. Azelastine and Fluticasone Nasal Sprays Were Co-Administered for Allergic Rhinitis 31
C. The Prior Art Disclosed Pharmaceutical Nasal Formulations Comprising Both Azelastine and Fluticasone 33
1. *Cramer* (Ex. 1011) 33
2. *Segal* (Ex. 1012) 41
VI. The Challenged Claims 47
VII. The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over *PDR 1999* in view of *Segal* 47
A. Independent Claim 1 49
1. The art teaches all the claim limitations 49
2. A POSA would have been motivated to combine the art 51
3. A POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success 56
B. Claim 2 (Depends from Claim 1) 58
C. Claim 3 (Depends from Claim 1) 59
D. Claim 4 (Depends from Claim 1) 60
E. Claim 5 (Depends from Claim 1) 61
F. Claim 6 (Depends from Claim 1) 61
G. Claim 7 (Depends from Claim 1) 63

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

H. Claim 8 (Depends from Claim 1) 63
I. Claim 9 (Depends from Claim 1) 65
J. Claim 10 (Depends from Claim 1) 66
K. Claim 11 (Depends from Claim 10) 68
L. Claim 12 (Depends from Claim 1) 69
M. Claim 13 (Depends from Claim 12) 71
N. Claim 14 (Depends from Claim 12) 73
O. Claim 15 (Depends from Claim 1) 75
P. Claim 16 (Depends from Claim 15) 76
Q. Claim 17 (Depends from Claim 1) 78
R. Claim 18 (Depends from Claim 1) 79
S. Claim 19 (Depends from Claim 18) 80
T. Claim 20 (Depends from Claim 18) 81
U. Claim 21 (Depends from Claim 18) 82
V. Claim 22 (Depends from Claim 1) 83
W. Claim 23 (Depends from Claim 1) 84
X. Claim 24 (Depends from Claim 15) 85
Y. Claim 25 (Depends from Claim 17) 86
Z. Claim 26 (Depends from Claim 18) 87
AA. Claim 27 (Depends from Claim 18) 88
BB. Claim 28 (Depends from Claim 1) 89
VIII. The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over *Cramer* in View of *PDR 1999* 91
A. Independent Claim 1 92
1. The art teaches all the claim limitations 93
2. A POSA would have been motivated to combine the art 95
3. A POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success 98
B. Claim 2 (Depends from Claim 1) 100
C. Claim 3 (Depends from Claim 1) 101
D. Claim 4 (Depends from Claim 1) 102

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

E. Claim 5 (Depends from Claim 1) 103
F. Claim 6 (Depends from Claim 1) 104
G. Claim 7 (Depends from Claim 1) 105
H. Claim 8 (Depends from Claim 1) 106
I. Claim 9 (Depends from Claim 1) 107
J. Claim 10 (Depends from Claim 1) 109
K. Claim 11 (Depends from Claim 10) 111
L. Claim 12 (Depends from Claim 1) 112
M. Claim 13 (Depends from Claim 12) 115
N. Claim 14 (Depends from Claim 12) 118
O. Claim 15 (Depends from Claim 1) 121
P. Claim 16 (Depends from Claim 15) 122
Q. Claim 17 (Depends from Claim 1) 123
R. Claim 18 (Depends from Claim 1) 124
S. Claim 19 (Depends from Claim 18) 126
T. Claim 20 (Depends from Claim 18) 126
U. Claim 21 (Depends from Claim 18) 128
V. Claim 22 (Depends from Claim 1) 129
W. Claim 23 (Depends from Claim 1) 130
X. Claim 24 (Depends from Claim 15) 131
Y. Claim 25 (Depends from Claim 17) 132
Z. Claim 26 (Depends from Claim 18) 133
AA. Claim 27 (Depends from Claim 18) 134
BB. Claim 28 (Depends from Claim 1) 135
IX. No Objective Indicia Demonstrating Nonobviousness 136
A. No Unexpected Results Over the Closest Prior Art 137
1. The closest prior art is a pharmaceutical nasal formulation with both azelastine and fluticasone 138
2. Co-administration of an oral antihistamine with an intranasal corticosteroid is not the closest prior art 139

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

3. The *September 2010 Malhotra Declaration* does not compare the claimed invention to the closest prior art 148
4. The *August 2011 Maus Declaration* does not compare the claimed invention to the closest prior art 150
5. Cipla did not compare the claimed invention to the closest prior art during the Apotex litigation 157
6. The *November 2017 Carr Declaration* does not compare the claimed invention to the closest prior art 158

B. No Satisfaction of a Long-Felt But Unmet Need 160
1. The *August 2011 Rajan Declaration* does not show that the claimed invention satisfied a long-felt need 160
2. The *August 2011 Chopra Declaration* does not show that the claimed invention satisfied a long-felt need 162
3. Cipla did not show that the claimed invention satisfied a long-felt need during the Apotex litigation 164
4. The *November 2017 Carr Declaration* does not show that the claimed invention satisfied a long-felt need 164

C. No Industry Praise 166
1. *Leung* does not constitute industry praise of the claimed invention 166
2. *GlobalData* does not constitute industry praise of the claimed invention 167

D. No Prior Art Teaching Away 168

X. Operability of *Cramer*'s Example 3 169

XI. Conclusion 172

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.