

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BAUSCH HEALTH IRELAND LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-01104
Patent 9,919,024

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO
PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE¹**

¹ This paper was authorized in the Trials email on November 9, 2022.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

<i>Code200, UAB v. Bright Data Ltd.</i> , IPR2022-00861, Paper 18 (precedential).....	5
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (CCPA 1955)	5
<i>In re Morsa</i> , 803 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	5
<i>SolarEdge Techs. Ltd v. SMA Solar Tech. AG</i> , IPR2020-00021, Paper 31.....	4

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §314(a)	5
35 U.S.C. §325(d)	1

Bausch's POPR (at 23-40) takes the prosecution history out of context and ignores material differences between the present challenge and the prosecution.

The petition identified material error resulting from faulty unexpected-results arguments and declarations. Pet., 65, 9-10. The examiner correctly found the unit doses result from routine optimization of prior-art ranges and maintained this finding. *E.g.*, EX1022 (a parent application), 4449, 5104; EX1021, 388-402, 726; EX1002, ¶¶57-63, 109-13, 195-98. The examiner also held formulating plecanatide tablets with a low-moisture carrier and a lubricant was *prima facie* obvious. *E.g.*, EX1022, 4449-51. The examiner only allowed the claims when Bausch amended its claims to exclude excipients other than a low-moisture carrier and lubricant, and argued that the *storage stability* was unexpectedly improved after 6, 9 and 12 months using low-moisture versus regular-grade carriers without additional stabilizing excipients. EX1022, 0369-86, 5079-94 (“dramatic” stability increase); 4973-77 (adding “consisting of”), 5098-5104 (allowance); EX1021, 698, 702-06, 720-27 (similar for later application); EX1002, ¶¶57-67, 72-79, 591-92.

Yet the petition and supporting testimony showed the alleged unexpected results failed to overcome the claims' *prima facie* obviousness. Pet., 60-65; EX1002, ¶¶593-602. For example, Bausch conflated multiple variables instead of evaluating the low-moisture carrier's effect in a tablet-to-tablet comparison. Pet., 60-61. Bausch also exaggerated differences between its formulations, alleging a

“dramatic” 30-34% degradation reduction after storage showed unexpected stability. Pet., 61-64 & cited exhibits. A more apt tablet-to-tablet comparison “shows essentially identical levels of change in degradants over time.” *Id.* Moreover, less peptide degradation was the *intended result* for a low-moisture carrier. Pet., 64. Bausch’s flawed data strongly indicate the claimed storage stability was the *expected result* when formulating plecanatide in this routine, conventional manner. Pet., 8-9, 28-29, 47-50.

The POPR rebuts none of the factual problems with the data and prosecution arguments; instead, it pivots to a new argument that the unexpected result was not storage stability, but the *initial* purity difference between capsules and tablets before storage. POPR, 2, 18-23. This conclusory attorney argument is unsupported and absurd. The claims recite a “storage” stability limitation, not starting purity. Moreover, prosecution focused on narrowing the claims to correspond better to Bausch’s alleged unexpected results without additional stabilizing excipients. POPR, 21 (“6, 9, and 12 months”). As Dr. Buckton explained, maintaining the same *differential* over time indicates little or no storage advantage from using low-moisture carrier. EX1002, ¶¶593-601. Also, Bausch assumes without support that initial purity resulted from carrier-moisture difference (rather than, e.g., capsule moisture or starting plecanatide purity in the different dosage forms). Indeed, Bausch’s pivot to a new, baseless “unexpected results” argument confirms trial

institution is appropriate, and refutes Bausch's assertion (POPR, 39) that unexpected results played no role in allowance.

Without contrary evidence rebutting expert testimony supporting the petition, Bausch instead asks the Board to ignore this testimony and also attacks Drs. Buckton and Christians individually. POPR, 39-40. But Bausch ignores the POSA is part of a team, Dr. Buckton's eminent qualifications as a formulator, and Dr. Christians' eminent qualifications as an M.D. with clinical-pharmacology experience specific to uroguanylin peptides and extensive experience designing and conducting clinical trials. Pet., 11-13; EX1004, ¶¶1-9, 37-40; EX1002, ¶¶1-10, 81-84. Dr. Christians testified he knows the level of skill based on his education, experience, and training. EX1004, ¶¶38; EX1002, ¶¶83-84 (Buckton). If relevant, Bausch can test these renowned experts' qualifications during the trial.

The petition also noted the examination failed to apply *applicant admissions* (e.g., in Shailubhai) that formulating plecanatide in a tablet and determining the amount to administer were routine matters well-within the ordinary skill. *See, e.g.*, Pet., 18, 32 (plecanatide tablets “may be made using methods well known in the art” and “selection of carrier” is “well within the level of skill in this art” (citing EX1005, 13:18-52)); EX1005, 15:10-17. These admissions prove plecanatide formulation was routine using standard formulation texts (e.g., Remington), which teach a direct-compression tablet consisting of the active ingredient, an inert

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.