

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALTAIRE PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PARAGON BIOTECK, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2015-00011
Patent 8,859,623 B1

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, ZHENYU YANG, and
CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

YANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of Post-Grant Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.208

INTRODUCTION

Altaire Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for a post-grant review of claims 1–13 of U.S. Patent No. 8,859,623 B1 (“the ’623 patent,” Ex. 1001). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Paragon Biotech, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 7 (“Prelim. Resp.”). Thereafter, at our request (Paper 8), Petitioner filed a Reply, addressing the issue of whether the Petition properly identifies all real parties in interest (Paper 11). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 324, which provides that post-grant review shall not be instituted unless it is determined that “the information presented in the petition filed under section 321, if such information is not rebutted, would demonstrate that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the challenged claims in the petition is unpatentable.” 35 U.S.C. § 324(a).

For the reasons provided below, we determine that Petitioner has demonstrated that it is more likely than not that at least one claim of the ’623 patent is unpatentable. Because Petitioner has satisfied the threshold requirement set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 324(a), we institute a post-grant review of claims 1–13 of the ’623 patent.

Related Proceedings

Patent Owner identifies two district-court cases involving the parties. Paper 5, 1. Those cases, however, appear to involve issues unrelated to the ’623 patent. Prelim. Resp. 6 n.7.

The '623 Patent

The '623 patent “is directed to methods and compositions of stabilizing phenylephrine formations.” Ex. 1001, Abstract. “Phenylephrine is a selective α 1-adrenergic receptor agonist used primarily as a decongestant, as an agent to dilate the pupil, and to increase blood pressure.” *Id.* at 1:6–8. Specifically, the '623 patent provides “a composition comprising at least 95% R-phenylephrine hydrochloride and an aqueous buffer, wherein the composition substantially maintains an initial chiral purity of R-phenylephrine hydrochloride for at least 6 months stored between –10 to 10 degree Celsius.” *Id.* at 1:16–21. It also discloses “methods of dilating the pupil comprising administering a composition comprising R-phenylephrine hydrochloride topically to a mammal, wherein the composition substantially maintains the initial chiral purity of R-phenylephrine hydrochloride for at least 6 months.” *Id.* at 1:38–42.

At the time of the '623 patent invention, it was known that R-phenylephrine, but not S-phenylephrine, was useful to dilate the pupil. *Id.* at 6:21–30. Thus, “it is important that an eye drop containing Phenylephrine Hydrochloride used for dilation of the pupil contains predominantly the R-isomer in order to maintain maximum efficacy of the ophthalmic solution.” *Id.* at 6:30–33.

According to the '623 patent, generally, commercially available phenylephrine hydrochloride ophthalmic solutions were stored at 20 to 25 degree Celsius, with the container tightly closed. *Id.* at 2:60–65. A solution under such condition, however, often turns brown over time and cannot be

used. *Id.* at 2:66–3:3. The '623 patent states that it “provides the improvement to overcome such instability problem.” *Id.* at 3:4–5.

Illustrative Claim

Claims 1 is the sole independent claim. It reads:

1. A method of using an ophthalmic composition for pupil dilation, the composition comprising R-phenylephrine hydrochloride having an initial chiral purity of at least 95% and an aqueous buffer, wherein the chiral purity of R-phenylephrine hydrochloride is at least 95% of the initial chiral purity after 6 months, the method comprising:

administering the composition into an eye of an individual in need thereof, wherein the composition is stored between –10 to 10 degree Celsius prior to administration, and wherein the composition comprises R-phenylephrine hydrochloride having a chiral purity of at least 95% when administered after storage.

Asserted Ground of Unpatentability

Petitioner asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

1. claims 1–13 as anticipated by, or in the alternative, rendered obvious over, Altaire’s Product (“the Altaire’s Product ground”);
2. claims 1–13 as anticipated by, or in the alternative, rendered obvious over, Altaire’s Package Insert,¹ “or alternatively, in view of common knowledge in the art or, alternatively or in addition, in view of U.S.

¹ Sterile Phenylephrine Hydrochloride Ophthalmic Solution, USP (Revised August 2010) (Ex. 1018).

Patent No. 3,966,749² and in further view of Syn-Tech’s Commercially Available product (“the Altaire’s Package Insert ground”);

3. claims 1–13 as “obvious in view of Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art (‘AAPA’), Altaire’s Commercial Product, and/or the common knowledge in the art or, alternatively or in addition, in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,966,749” (“the AAPA ground”); and

4. claims 1–13 as unpatentable “under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the joint inventors regard as the invention” (“the indefiniteness ground”).

In support of its patentability challenge, Petitioner relies on the Declaration of Assad Sawaya. Ex. 1003.

ANALYSIS

Eligibility for Post-Grant Review

The ’623 patent issued on October 14, 2014, from an application filed on November 14, 2013. Ex. 1001, (22). It does not claim the benefit of any earlier filing date. Because it issued from an application that contains a claim with an effective filing date after March 16, 2013, the ’623 patent is available for post-grant review. *See Leahy-Smith America Invents Act* (Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011), §§ 3(n)(1), 6(f)(2)(A).

The Petition was filed on May 11, 2015 (Pet. 69), within 9 months of the grant of the ’623 patent. *See 35 U.S.C. § 321(c)*. Petitioner further

² U.S. Patent No. 3,966,749, issued on June 29, 1976 (Ex. 1011).

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.