

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC

Petitioner

v.

CIPLA LIMITED

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00807

U.S. Patent No. 8,168,620

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

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

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT 1

I. INTRODUCTION 6

 A. The '620 patent.....6

 B. Background of related litigation.....7

 C. Statement of relief requested.....8

 D. Person of ordinary skill in the art.....8

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 9

III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY TRIAL ON GROUNDS 1, 2, AND 3
BECAUSE EACH HAS A THRESHOLD FAILURE. 12

 A. Anticipation Ground 1 presents the same anticipation
 argument using substantially the same art as was overcome
 during prosecution12

 B. Obviousness Grounds 2 and 3 are fatally deficient as a
 matter of law because Argentum failed to address various
 evidence of objective indicia of which it had knowledge.....16

 1. Argentum knew of Cipla's well-developed objective
 indicia evidence because it observed, and its experts
 testified about, the same evidence in the *Apotex* trial..... 16

 2. Cipla will be severely prejudiced if trial is instituted
 despite Argentum's failure to address Cipla's
 objective indicia evidence in its Petition. 19

IV. THE BOARD SHOULD ALSO DENY TRIAL ON GROUNDS 1-3
BECAUSE THEY LACK SUBSTANTIVE MERIT. 20

 A. Ground 1 Fails: Argentum has not established a reasonable
 likelihood that Claims 1 and 25 are anticipated by Segal.....21

 1. Segal does not describe azelastine and fluticasone in
 single formulation. 21

2.	Segal does not enable the “nasal spray” / “dosage form suitable for nasal administration” of claims 1 and 25.....	24
B.	Ground 2 fails: Argentum has failed to establish a reasonable likelihood that Claims 1, 4-6, 24-26, and 29 are obvious over Segal, Hettche, and Phillipps.....	27
1.	The clinical art taught away from the co-administration of an antihistamine and a steroid.	28
(a)	The art established that antihistamines and steroids had redundant mechanisms of action <i>in vivo</i>	29
(b)	Based on the results of the fixed co-administration studies, the prevailing clinical treatment Guidelines recommended using azelastine only as an “on demand” adjunct therapy.	33
(c)	A POSA would have expected azelastine to decrease compliance with a fluticasone therapy.	34
2.	The art as a whole taught away from a fixed-dose combination of an antihistamine and a steroid.	37
3.	In view of the anticipated formulation difficulties, a POSA would not have been motivated to formulate azelastine and fluticasone into a nasal spray with a reasonable expectation of success.....	38
(a)	Argentum fails to establish that co-formulating azelastine and fluticasone into a combination formulation was known in 2002.	39
(b)	No reasonable expectation of success exists because a POSA knew that combining fluticasone with another active ingredient in a suspension formulation led to aggregation.....	40
(c)	No reasonable expectation of success exists because Cramer’s Example III—the USPTO’s asserted closest prior art—is not suitable for nasal administration.	41

C.	Ground 3 Fails: Argentum has failed to establish a reasonable likelihood that claims 42-44 would have been obvious over Segal, Hettche, Phillipps, and Flonase [®] Label.	42
1.	The Petition does not articulate a motivation to combine Hettche, Phillipps, Segal, and Flonase [®] Label.	42
2.	The Board should deny trial on Ground 3 because the art taught away from the excipients recited in claims 42-44.	44
(a)	The art taught away from using microcrystalline cellulose and sodium carboxymethyl cellulose with cationic drugs like azelastine salts.	44
(b)	The art taught away from using three preservatives: benzalkonium chloride, edetate disodium, and phenyl ethyl alcohol.	46
(c)	The art taught away from using glycerin as a isotonic agent.	47
D.	Grounds 2 and 3 Fail: Compelling objective indicia of non-obviousness support the validity of the challenged claims.	48
1.	Cipla's objective indicia evidence has a nexus to the challenged claims.	48
2.	Unexpected results: The claimed formulation exhibits unexpected formulation and clinical results.	49
(a)	Dymista [®] unexpectedly surpasses the efficacy of both commercial and reformulated fluticasone.	49
(i)	The closest prior art from a clinical perspective is the fixed dosing studies, which are the only evidence of an antihistamine and steroid being dosed consistently prior to the date of invention.	49
(ii)	Dymista [®] is unexpectedly more effective, faster-acting, and safer than the prior art.	50

(b)	The claimed formulations are unexpectedly suitable for nasal administration in light of the prior art.	53
3.	Failure of Others: sophisticated pharmaceutical companies failed to develop a combined formulation.	53
4.	Acquiescence: Meda's decision to take a royalty-bearing license to Cipla's patents supports nonobviousness.	55
5.	Skepticism: Both Meda and FDA were skeptical of the feasibility and desirability of a fixed-dose azelastine/fluticasone formulation.	56
6.	Commercial Success: Sales of Dymista [®] in the U.S. and Duonase in India demonstrate nonobviousness.	57
7.	Unmet Need: Dymista [®] satisfied a long-felt but unmet need for better AR treatment.	59
8.	No alleged "blocking patents" undercut Cipla's commercial success and long-felt need evidence.	61
9.	Copying: Duonase was subjected to widespread copying in India.	63
10.	Praise: Industry leaders praised Dymista [®]	63
V.	CONCLUSION.	64

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.