

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,
Petitioner

v.

CIPLA LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,168,620
Issue Date: May 1, 2012
Title: COMBINATION OF AZELASTINE AND STEROIDS

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2017-00807

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO
PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE**

I. Reliance On The Malhotra Declaration For Its Truth Should Be Precluded

Petitioner's motion made clear that it does not seek to entirely exclude the Malhotra Declaration, but rather only to preclude Patent Owner and its experts from relying on it—as they have—for hearsay purposes. *See* Mot, 7-8. Patent Owner's attempts to recharacterize those uses now cannot avoid the hearsay rule.

A. The Malhotra Declaration Is Hearsay As Used By Patent Owner And Its Experts

Referring to the Malhotra Declaration as part of what the Examiner was told during prosecution may have some nonhearsay relevance to this proceeding, and therefore is not a hearsay use of the document. What is hearsay, however, is Patent Owner's repeated attempts to refer to the Malhotra Declaration for its truth—*i.e.*, that Dr. Malhotra actually did test Cramer's Example III and actually did encounter problems with it. *See* POR, 9 (“However, attempts to recreate, and testing of, Cramer Example III revealed that the formulation exhibited: (1) unacceptable osmolality, which would have caused irritation to patients.... These problems rendered Cramer Example III unsuitable for use” (citing EX1002, 284-87)). These representations are necessarily premised on Dr. Malhotra's out-of-court statements being true.

While the declaration, as a part of the prosecution history, need not be excluded from the record altogether, Patent Owner misstates its relevance in this context when arguing that it was part of the Examiner's reasoning for allowing the

claims. Opp., 3-4 (“...and accepted by the Examiner”). There is zero evidence in the prosecution history that the Examiner relied in any way on the declaration. *See* EX1002, 137-47 (Not. of Allowance). Instead, the Examiner relied on three other declarations relating to other secondary considerations, but, significantly, the Examiner did **not** rely the Malhotra Declaration. *Id.*

Patent Owner also ignores its own arguments in the POR, where the results of Dr. Malhotra’s alleged efforts were stated as *truthful* definitive evidence concerning reasonable expectations of success. *See* POR, 28 (“[A] POSA following the prior art guidance of Cramer and Segal would not have arrived at a formulation that was ‘suitable for nasal administration.’ Multiple formulators, acting as a POSA in 2002, all failed....”). While the Malhotra Declaration is not directly cited, the mention of “Multiple formulators, acting as a POSA in 2002” certainly suggests reliance on the Malhotra Declaration, especially since Dr. Govindarajan’s report decidedly does not support this allegation. *See* CIP2030, ¶¶11-15; EX1145, ¶¶34-40.

This same section of the POR later makes the disjunctive statement that “Example III of Cramer ... was not shown to be ‘suitable for nasal administration’ both *during original prosecution* and again in litigation” (POR, 33 (citing EX1002, 286) (emphasis added)), which cannot be read as anything other than relying on the contents of the Malhotra Declaration for its substantive truth.

Additionally, the comparison testing of Drs. Govindarajan and Herpin that Patent Owner asserts found the **same results** as Dr. Malhotra also require the Malhotra Declaration to be truthful.^{1,2} While it may be a nonhearsay purpose for Dr. Herpin to say that he attempted to reproduce the experiment that Dr. Malhotra said she carried out, such reliance crosses over into an impermissible hearsay use where Patent Owner tries to claim that other experts “confirmed” Dr. Malhotra’s results, as here (*see, e.g.*, CIP2176, ¶38 (citing EX1002, 286-87)). Such alleged “confirmation” is only relevant if the results in the Malhotra Declaration are taken as true, which is what makes Patent Owner’s reliance a prohibited hearsay use.

As for Patent Owner’s experts, their declarations mimic the content of the POR, and similarly rely on the Malhotra Declaration for its truth. *See* CIP2147,

¹ Patent Owner’s assertion that Dr. Govindarajan arrived at the same results as Dr. Malhotra is completely incorrect. *See* CIP2030, ¶¶11-15; EX1145, ¶¶34-40 (discussing physical stability recreations). Nevertheless, for purposes of the hearsay analysis, what is relevant is Patent Owner’s considerations and how those are advanced for a hearsay purpose, as the Malhotra Declaration is here.

² Patent Owner’s claim that “Dr. Govindarajan sought to recreate the experiment described in the Malhotra Declaration” (Opp., 4.) is also wrong, as Dr. Govindarajan sought to and did reproduce Cramer’s Example 3, not Dr. Malhotra’s experiments. *See* CIP2030, ¶¶7-10.

¶27 (Carr); CIP2176, ¶¶ 23, 31, 36, 38, 40-43 (Smyth (public)). Their attempt to use the Malhotra Declaration to allegedly show a lack of expectation of success (*see, e.g.*, CIP2176, ¶36) can only be relying on the declaration for its truth.

B. Hearsay Uses Of The Malhotra Declaration Can And Should Be Precluded

Patent Owner claims that *REG Synthetic Fuels, LLC v. Neste Oil Oyj*, 841 F.3d 954 (Fed. Cir. 2016), is dispositive, and compels denial of Petitioner’s motion to exclude. *Opp.*, 6. Patent Owner is wrong. The relevance of *REG Synthetic Fuels*, and the reason Petitioner cited this case in its motion, was to show that evidence can be “admitted” into the proceeding for one purpose (*i.e.*, a nonhearsay use), even while other uses (*i.e.*, hearsay) remain prohibited. 841 F.3d at 963-65. Thus, it is not that the Malhotra Declaration should be stricken from the proceeding altogether, but rather that the parties’ and the Board’s reliance on it should be restricted to nonhearsay purposes.

C. Patent Owner And Its Experts’ Reliance Does Not Fit Within A Hearsay Exception

The exceptions to the hearsay rule Patent Owner identifies are not applicable to their and their expert’s reliance on the Malhotra Declaration. Specifically, FRE 803(15) states that “unless later dealings with the property are inconsistent with the truth of the statement or the purport of the document,” which directly implicates that fact that Dr. Govindarajan’s testing efforts directly contract those of Dr.

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.