

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SLAYBACK PHARMA LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

EYE THERAPIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-00142
U.S. Patent No. 8,293,742

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I. Preliminary Statement2

A. The '742 patented invention: a clinically acclaimed, instant marketplace success2

B. The '742 patented invention: prima facie non-obvious3

C. Strong objective evidence of non-obviousness6

II. The POSA7

III. The '742 Patent.....8

IV. Technical Background9

A. Anatomy of the eye and drug delivery9

B. Ocular Conditions.....12

1. Glaucoma12

a. Overview12

b. Treatments.....13

2. Eye Redness13

C. State of the art of adrenergic receptor agonists15

1. Adrenergic receptors mediate different effects.....15

2. Not all α -adrenergic receptor agonists characterized as “vasoconstrictors” work similarly.....15

a. Vasoconstriction(an α -1 effect).....16

b. Vasodilation (an α ₂ effect)18

D. Brimonidine.....19

1. Background19

a. Prior art brimonidine products were associated with significant adverse events, including hyperemia (redness)21

b.	Prior art brimonidine products established that brimonidine’s redness reduction effects were concentration dependent.....	22
2.	Chemistry of brimonidine	22
E.	Ophthalmic product formulation is complex and unpredictable.....	24
V.	Claim Construction.....	25
A.	“ocular condition”	25
B.	“about 0.025%”	27
1.	A concentration of “about 0.025%” brimonidine does not encompass 0.03% brimonidine	28
2.	The specification clearly conveys the clinical distinction between 0.025% and 0.03% brimonidine	31
3.	“about 0.025%” means “0.025% plus or minus 10%,” equating to an upper limit of 0.0275%	35
4.	Petitioner’s reasons for asserting that “about 0.025%” includes 0.03% are unavailing	36
VI.	Petitioner has failed to establish that any of the claims of the ’742 patent are unpatentable.....	39
A.	Ground 1: Example 1 of the ’553 patent (EX-1004) does not inherently anticipate claims 1-2	40
B.	Ground 2: Walters (EX-1005) does not inherently anticipate claims 1-2	43
C.	Ground 3: Petitioner has failed to establish that claims 1-6 are obvious	44
1.	Petitioner has failed to establish that claim 3 of the ’742 patent is obvious.....	45
a.	A POSA would not have been motivated to use brimonidine, let alone with any reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art taught away from doing so.....	45

b.	It would not have been obvious to use brimonidine at a concentration between about 0.001% and about 0.025%, and the prior art taught away from doing so.....	49
c.	The art teaches away from the claimed pH.....	51
d.	Petitioner’s combination of asserted references does not render claim 3 obvious.....	53
i.	The ’553 patent does not suggest a method of reducing redness	53
ii.	A POSA would not have combined Norden 2002 with ’553 patent	55
iii.	None of Petitioner’s other cited references cure the deficiencies of the ’553 patent and Norden 2002.....	56
2.	Petitioner has failed to establish that claims 1-2, 4-6 are obvious	58
D.	Objective, real-world evidence of non-obviousness	59
1.	Unexpected superiority of the ’742 patent’s invention over prior art.....	59
a.	The claimed low-concentration brimonidine was unexpectedly better than tetrahydrozoline	61
b.	The claimed low-concentration brimonidine was unexpectedly better than naphazoline.....	62
c.	The claimed low-concentration brimonidine was unexpectedly better than oxymetazoline	63
d.	The cascade of real-world benefits attributable to the claimed invention.....	66
2.	Lumify’s rapid, significant industry praise.....	67
3.	Commercial Success, Licensing, and Copying Further Demonstrate Nonobviousness.....	69
VII.	Conclusion	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	67
<i>Biogen, Inc. v. Berlex Lab'ys, Inc.</i> , 318 F.3d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	28
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	26
<i>Cohesive Techs. v. Water Corp.</i> , 483 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	30, 34, 38
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	67
<i>In re Glatt Air Techniques, Inc.</i> , 630 F.3d 1026 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	67, 70
<i>Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.</i> , 52 F.3d 1043 (Fed.Cir.1995)	41, 43
<i>Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.</i> , 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	59
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	67, 70
<i>Jansen v. Rexall Sundown, Inc.</i> , 342 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	26
<i>Kingston Tech. Co. v. SPEX Techs., Inc.</i> , 798 F. App'x 629 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	44
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	28

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.