UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADAMA MAKHTESHIM LTD., Petitioner,

V.

FINCHIMICA S.P.A., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00577 Patent 8,304,559 B2

Held: February 14, 2017

BEFORE: RICHARD E. SCHAFER, SALLY GARDNER LANE, and DEBORAH KATZ, Administrative Patent Judges.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, February 14, 2017, commencing at 10:02 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.



APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

GARY J. GERSHIK, ESQUIRE ERIC EISENBERG, ESQUIRE Cooper & Dunham LLP 30 Rockefeller Plaza, 20th Floor New York, New York 10112

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

E. ANTHONY FIGG, ESQUIRE SETH E. COCKRUM, Ph.D. Rothwell Figg 607 14th Street, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20005



1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	JUDGE LANE: Okay. Good morning again. Can I
4	find out who we have here for Petitioner?
5	MR. GERSHIK: Your Honor, Gary Gershik for
6	Petitioner.
7	JUDGE LANE: And who do you have with you?
8	MR. GERSHIK: Eric Eisenberg, an associate. We're
9	both from the firm of Cooper & Dunham.
10	JUDGE LANE: Okay. Thank you. And for Patent
11	Owner?
12	MR. FIGG: Good morning, Your Honor. Tony Figg
13	for the Patent Owner. With me is Seth Cockrum. We're both for
14	Finchimica.
15	JUDGE LANE: Okay. Good morning.
16	So I believe in the order we said that each side would
17	have 20 minutes I'm sorry, 30 minutes and each side may
18	reserve time for rebuttal. So we'll start with Petitioner and do you
19	have any demonstratives?
20	MR. GERSHIK: Yes, we do. Can we hand you some?
21	They're also going to be on the screen.
22	JUDGE LANE: Okay. And I know that you filed
23	them



1	MR. GERSHIK: And we filed them as well, but we can
2	hand you hard copies.
3	JUDGE LANE: Great. Thank you.
4	Would you like to reserve some time for rebuttal?
5	MR. GERSHIK: Yes, Your Honor. I'd like to reserve
6	10 minutes, if I could, and speak for 20 minutes. I'll try to go
7	through this quickly.
8	JUDGE LANE: All right. So 20 minutes. Okay.
9	MR. GERSHIK: Good morning. We're here on behalf
10	of the Petitioner. The patent in question is the Finchimica '559
11	patent and I'll reply to is Claim 1 of the '559 patent together
12	with a simplified version of that claim.
13	Essentially the claim is to a method for the preparation
14	of fipronil through oxidation of the sulfide precursor of fipronil.
15	Fipronil is the sulfoxide, the oxidized version of that sulfide
16	precursor in the presence of DCA, dichloroacetic acid, and an
17	oxidizing agent, which is opened-ended as been construed by the
18	Decision Instituting Trial.
19	And there is a negative limitation in the Claim 1
20	wherein the oxidation is conducted in the absence of
21	trichloroacetic acid or TCA and/or and we'll be talking about
22	that term at some point and/or TCPA, trichloroperacetic acid,
23	which is the peroxide form, the oxidized form, if you will, of
24	$TC\Delta$



1	On to slide 3, slide 3 a claim element chart aligning the
2	claim elements with the references that we cited. Our primary
3	reference and I emphasize it's important here, the order of
4	references is important. Our primary reference is the European
5	patent, what we refer to as EP '117. That is our primary
6	reference.
7	In particular, although we cite the entire disclosure, in
8	particular we focused on Example 1. And if we align the
9	elements of Example 1 of the EP '117, we see that it is a method
10	that prepares fipronil. It does so through the oxidation of the
11	sulfide precursor of fipronil. It does so in the presence of a
12	compound called dichloromethane or DCM.
13	The oxidizing agent in that example is mCPBA,
14	meta-chloroperbenzoic acid, and it is conducted in the absence of
15	TCA and in the absence of TCPA. There's no mention of those
16	two elements. And so if you align these elements of Example 1
17	with the claim elements of Claim 1 and, by the way, Claim 1 is
18	the only claim at issue that Patent Owner has not argued for the
19	dependent claims in their Response.
20	If you align it, you'll see the only distinction between
21	Example 1 of the '117 and the Claim 1 is that Example 1 uses
22	DCM, whereas Claim 1 of the '559 requires DCA.
23	We've then cited another reference, the '440, WO '440
24	reference also known as the Gharda reference, and we've cited it
25	as a secondary reference to show the interchangeability of DCM



DOCKET

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.

