

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

BAUSCH HEALTH IRELAND LIMITED,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2022-01105  
Patent 9,925,231 B2

---

**REQUEST FOR REHEARING**  
37 C.F.R. §42.71(d)(2)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Incorrect Obviousness Analysis .....	2
A.	Background .....	2
B.	Argument.....	7
1.	Peptides are Generally Sensitive to Moisture .....	7
2.	Plecanatide is a Peptide.....	10
3.	Proper Obviousness Standard is Less Rigid .....	11
4.	Bausch’s Evidence Supports Obviousness .....	15
III.	Conclusion .....	15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	14
<i>Google LLC v. Parus Holdings</i> , IPR2022-00805, Paper 7 (2022) .....	11
<i>In re Dillon</i> , 919 F.2d 688 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc) .....	11, 12
<i>In re NuVasive</i> , 841 F.3d 966 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>In re Skoll</i> , 523 F.2d 1392 (CCPA 1975) .....	10
<i>Kashiv Biosciences v. Amgen Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00797, Paper 16 (2019).....	10
<i>KSR International v. Teleflex</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	12, 13
<i>Novartis Pharm. Corp. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 611 F. App'x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	2, 13
<i>Nuseed Americas v. BASF Plant Science</i> , IPR2017-02176, Paper 16 (2018) .....	9
<i>Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.</i> , 122 F.3d 1476 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	14
<i>TradeStation Group, Inc. v. Trading Techs. Int'l, Inc.</i> , CBM2015-00161, Paper 67 (2016).....	5

### Rule

Fed. R. Evid. 703 .....	8
-------------------------	---

### Regulations

37 C.F.R. §42.15(a)(1).....	14
37 C.F.R. §42.71(d)(2).....	1

### Constitutional Provision

U.S. Const., amdt. V .....	14
----------------------------	----

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner (Mylan) respectfully requests rehearing of the decision (Paper 15, Dec.) denying institution. The decision misapprehends both law and fact, imposing a limitless obligation on Mylan to prove a negative when *no* contrary contention is even alleged, much less shown, and where all evidence of record, including the evidence of Patent Owner (Bausch), shows Mylan is correct on the very point—peptide moisture sensitivity—the decision considered lacking. Where, as here, Mylan’s showing is exactly the same as the Office’s earlier uncontroverted holding on the same point, only powerful evidence of a previous error could justify an inconsistent Board decision. The decision provides no reason for the agency’s shifting position, and Mylan had no warning of this shift.

The decision also arbitrarily imposes an unlawfully heightened burden on Mylan—far beyond of the likelihood standard required for institution—without providing Mylan an opportunity to reply. Mylan asked to brief Bausch’s unreasonably high standard, yet the Board denied this request without a hearing. The Federal Circuit en banc rejected this heightened requirement, and the Supreme Court has similarly rejected any specific-motivation requirement. To the extent Bausch raised any colorable issue at all, it justifies a trial rather than dismissal. The Board should withdraw its decision in Paper 15 and institute review. This request is timely. 37 C.F.R. §42.71(d)(2).

## II. INCORRECT OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS

### A. Background

Mylan filed a petition (Paper 2, Pet.) supported in relevant part by an expert declaration from Dr. Graham Buckton (EX1002). The petition points to Dr. Buckton’s testimony, a background survey article (EX1016, Lai), and an art handbook (EX1006, Remington) as support for the mundane, uncontroverted technical fact that peptides (like the claimed peptide) are moisture sensitive. Pet., 17, 25, 37, 47, 66-67; EX1002, ¶¶104, 140, 144; EX1016, 489 (Introduction: many protein and peptide drugs “are formulated as lyophilized or freeze-dried products to prolong their shelf life” because of their “susceptibility to chemical degradation in solution,” but “residual moisture” can still impact their chemical stability). Indeed, Dr. Buckton noted that the Office, citing Lai generally, had already made the same finding regarding peptides, leaving no reason to believe the issue was seriously in question. EX1002, ¶62, citing EX1022 (prosecution history), 4136-48.

In response, Bausch miscited a nonprecedential decision as authority for a legally-erroneous heightened-obviousness standard. Paper 8 (POPR), 50 (“But Mylan has failed to identify any teaching or suggestion in the prior art that plecanatide is moisture sensitive.”), citing *Novartis Pharm. Corp. v. Watson Labs., Inc.*, 611 F. App’x 988, 995-96 (Fed. Cir. 2015) . As will be explained below, controlling precedent establishes a general teaching is sufficient. Bausch conceded

# 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.