

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
MSN LABORATORIES PRIVATE LTD.,
and MSN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

BAUSCH HEALTH IRELAND LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-00722¹
Patent 7,041,786

**PETITIONER MYLAN'S REPLY
SUPPORTING MYLAN'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE
37 C.F.R. §42.64(c)**

¹ IPR2023-00016 has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Reasons for Relief.....	1
A. EX2001-EX2007 – Fintiv Exhibits	1
B. EX2024 and EX2025 – Expert Declarations.....	1
C. EX2027 and EX2028 – Shailubhai Reports; EX2040 – Unauthenticated Hearsay Attributed to Dr. Pennington.....	4
III. Conclusion	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Pages</u>
Cases	
<i>Aptor Miitors v. Kamstrup A/S</i> , 887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	5
<i>Chen v. Bouchard</i> , 347 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	4
<i>Genetics Institute v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	2
<i>Institute Pasteur v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	2
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems v. Illumina Cambridge</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2
<i>Kumho Tire v. Carmichael</i> , 526 U.S. 137 (1999).....	4
<i>U.S. Gypsum v. Lafarge N. Am.</i> , 670 F.Supp.2d 737 (N.D. Ill. 2009)	1, 2
Rules	
Federal Rule of Evidence 703.....	4

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board should exclude Bausch EX2001-EX2007, EX2024, EX2025, EX2027, EX2028, and EX2040.

II. REASONS FOR RELIEF

A. EX2001-EX2007 – Fintiv Exhibits

Mylan moved for exclusion from formal consideration or, alternatively, for limitation of the exhibits to the forfeited purpose for which they were submitted. Paper 54 (“MtE”). Bausch does not respond. Paper 59 (“Opp.”) passim.

B. EX2024 and EX2025 – Expert Declarations

Mylan moved to exclude Bausch’s expert declarations for improper legal standards and misunderstanding the prior art. MtE 1-8. Bausch argues the motion improperly discusses the merits and its authority is distinguishable. Opp. 1-9. Bausch is wrong on both points. Showing how testimony is used improperly necessarily involves discussing how it was used and why it was improper.

Bausch argues *U.S. Gypsum v. Lafarge N. Am.*, 670 F.Supp.2d 737, 745 (N.D. Ill. 2009), is distinguishable. Opp. 3-4. Yet, as Mylan’s motion showed, Bausch and its experts persist in pushing a discredited single-lead compound theory. MtE 2-3, citing EX2024, ¶¶92, 99, 141-41; EX2025, ¶¶64-73. Similarly, for reasonable expectation of success, Bausch requires “seeking to make a better anti-constipation drug,” in an attempt to read in unclaimed features; yet claim 1 simply defines a sequence nearly identical to a natural ligand already identified for

treating constipation. The reasonable expectation of success inquiry is defined by what is claimed. *Intelligent Bio-Systems v. Illumina Cambridge*, 821 F.3d 1359, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (if not claimed, it is “of no moment” to REOS); *accord* *Institute Pasteur v. Focarino*, 738 F.3d 1337, 1348-49 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (remanding claims that did not “require” successful cleavage and break repair for consideration of other motivations for what was claimed). As *U.S. Gypsum* shows, expert testimony based on an improper legal standard should be excluded to create a clear record and discourage similar testimony in other cases.

Bausch accuses Mylan of “conflat[ing]... reasonable expectation of success and unexpected results.” Opp. 5, citing MtE 5. Yet, in its reasonable expectation of success section, Bausch cites a decision on *unexpected results*. *Genetics Institute v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics*, 655 F.3d 1291, 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

Bausch attempts to defend the experts’ technical errors by changing the subject. Opp. 5-6, discussing MtE 5-6. Mylan’s motion explained how Bausch’s experts misunderstood Fig. 3 in Li (EX1006, 49), one of the principal grounds references, regarding relative potency. MtE 5. Bausch first mischaracterizes Li Fig. 3 as a comparison between different GCC ligands, Opp. 5-6, rather than as comparisons of pre- and post-incubation pairs of the same ligands. Next, Bausch changes the focus (Opp. 6) to Li’s prediction that rat, human, and opossum uroguanylin would have similar affinities—a different point that supports Mylan’s

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.