

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 IPR2022-01105  
Patent No. 9,925,231

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,925,231**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | Introduction.....  | 1  |
| II.  | Rule 42.8 Notices.....   | 3  |
|      | A. Real Parties-in-Interest.....   | 3  |
|      | B. Related Matters.....  | 4  |
|      | C. Counsel and Service Information.....  | 4  |
| III. | Certifications.....  | 5  |
| IV.  | Overview of Challenges; Precise Relief Requested.....  | 5  |
| V.   | The '231 Patent.....   | 7  |
|      | A. Prosecution History.....  | 9  |
|      | B. Priority Date.....  | 10 |
|      | C. Level of Ordinary Skill.....  | 11 |
|      | D. Claim Construction.....   | 13 |
| VI.  | Prior Art Summary.....   | 13 |
|      | A. Technical Background.....   | 13 |
|      | B. Asserted References.....  | 17 |
|      | 1. Shailubhai.....   | 17 |
|      | 2. Remington.....  | 18 |
|      | 3. Mihranyan.....  | 19 |
|      | 4. Aulton.....   | 19 |
|      | 5. The 2009 Abstract.....  | 19 |
|      | 6. Doelker.....  | 20 |
|      | 7. Zimmer.....   | 20 |
| VII. | Ground 1: Claims 1-2 and 4-12 Were Obvious Over Shailubhai,<br>Remington, and Mihranyan..... | 21 |
|      | A. Claim 1.....  | 21 |
|      | 1. Element 1.[a].....  | 21 |
|      | 2. Element 1.[b].....  | 24 |

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| 3.    | Element 1.[c].....  | 26 |
| 4.    | Element 1.[d].....  | 27 |
| 5.    | Reason to Combine and Reasonable Expectation of<br>Success .....                          | 30 |
| 6.    | Conclusion .....  | 33 |
| B.    | Dependent Claims 2 and 5 .....  | 33 |
| 1.    | Claim 2.....  | 33 |
| 2.    | Claim 5.....  | 34 |
| C.    | Dependent Claims 4 and 6-7 .....  | 35 |
| 1.    | Claims 4 and 6.....   | 35 |
| 2.    | Claim 7.....  | 36 |
| D.    | Dependent Claims 8-9.....   | 38 |
| E.    | Dependent Claims 10-12.....   | 39 |
| 1.    | Claims 10-11 .....  | 39 |
| 2.    | Claim 12.....   | 41 |
| VIII. | Ground 2: Claim 3 Was Obvious Over Shailubhai, Remington,<br>Mihiranyan, and AULTON ..... | 42 |
| IX.   | Ground 3: Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 8-12 Were Obvious Over 2009<br>Abstract and Doelker .....  | 43 |
| A.    | Claim 1 .....   | 44 |
| 1.    | Element 1.[a].....  | 44 |
| 2.    | Element 1.[b].....  | 46 |
| 3.    | Element 1.[c].....  | 47 |
| 4.    | Element 1.[d].....  | 48 |
| 5.    | Reason to Combine and Reasonable Expectation of<br>Success .....                          | 51 |
| 6.    | Conclusion .....  | 54 |
| B.    | Dependent Claims 2 and 5 .....  | 54 |
| 1.    | Claim 2.....  | 54 |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 2.    | Claim 5 .....  | 55 |
| C.    | Dependent Claims 4 and 6 .....   | 56 |
| D.    | Dependent Claims 8-9 .....   | 56 |
| E.    | Dependent Claims 10-12 .....   | 58 |
| 1.    | Claims 10-11 .....   | 58 |
| 2.    | Claim 12 .....   | 59 |
| X.    | Ground 4: Claim 3 Was Obvious Over the 2009 Abstract, Doelker,<br>and Aulton ..... | 60 |
| XI.   | Ground 5: Claim 7 Was Obvious Over the 2009 Abstract, Doelker,<br>and Zimmer ..... | 61 |
| XII.  | No Secondary Considerations .....  | 62 |
| XIII. | Discretionary Denial is Unwarranted .....  | 67 |
| XIV.  | Conclusion .....   | 70 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Adapt Pharma Ops. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 25 F.4th 1354 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 10, 2022) .....     | 66             |
| <i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....                       | 28, 49         |
| <i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB 2017) ..... | 68             |
| <i>ClearValue Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....             | passim         |
| <i>Hospira, Inc. v. Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC</i> , 946 F.3d 1322, 1329-30 (Fed. Cir. 2020) .....        | 27, 49         |
| <i>In re Harris</i> , 409 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....   | 66             |
| <i>In re Lohr</i> , 317 F.2d 388 (CCPA 1963).....  | 66             |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....                                      | 21, 33, 43, 54 |
| <i>Scientific Design Co., Inc. v. Shell Oil Co.</i> , IPR2022-00159, Paper 7 (PTAB Apr. 4, 2022) ..... | 68             |
| <i>Telemac Cellular Corp. v. Topp Telecom, Inc.</i> , 247 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....             | 28, 49         |
| <i>Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters., Inc.</i> , 632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....                      | 65             |
| <i>Trend Micro Inc. v. Cupp Computing AS</i> , IPR2021-01236, Paper 16 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2022) .....      | 68             |

# 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.