

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC

Petitioner

v.

CIPLA LIMITED

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00807

U.S. Patent No. 8,168,620

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 5

 A. The '620 patent and its commercial embodiments5

 B. Background of related litigation.....6

 C. Person of ordinary skill in the art6

III. PETITIONER FAILS TO CONSIDER THE “SUITABLE FOR NASAL ADMINISTRATION” AND “NASAL SPRAY” CLAIM LIMITATIONS..... 7

IV. PETITIONER’S MOTIVATION-TO-COMBINE ARGUMENTS REFLECT PURE HINDSIGHT..... 10

 A. The prior clinical use of antihistamines and steroids would not have been a motivation to pursue a combination formulation.11

 B. A POSA would have understood that azelastine and fluticasone had redundant mechanisms of action *in vivo*, further negating any motivation to combine into a single formulation.18

 C. There is no factual support for Petitioner’s assertion that combining azelastine and fluticasone would increase treatment compliance.20

 D. Petitioner’s “anti-inflammatory properties” justification for selecting azelastine is based on improper hindsight.23

V. A POSA WOULD NOT HAVE HAD A REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESSFULLY COMBINING AZELASTINE AND FLUTICASONE INTO A SINGLE DOSAGE FORM THAT WAS “SUITABLE FOR NASAL ADMINISTRATION.” 27

A.	A POSA would have been dissuaded by fluticasone's propensity to aggregate when co-formulated with other drugs in liquid formulations.	29
B.	Azelastine was known to be incompatible with MCC and CMC, the thickening agents used in Flonase®	30
C.	Cramer and Segal underscore the lack of reasonable expectation of success.	32
D.	Petitioner's remaining assertions of reasonable expectation of success equally fail.	36
VI.	CLAIMS 42-44 WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF SEGAL, HETTCHE, PHILLIPPS, AND THE FLONASE® LABEL.....	38
A.	MCC and CMC were incompatible with cationic drugs and electrolytes like azelastine salts.....	40
B.	There was no design need or market pressure to use the claimed three preservative combination.....	41
C.	It would not have been obvious to try the claimed glycerine as an isotonicity agent.	44
VII.	UNEXPECTED RESULTS CONFIRM NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.	46
VIII.	OTHER OBJECTIVE INDICIA COMPEL NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.	53
A.	Commercial embodiments of the claimed invention Dymista® and Duonase have a nexus to the challenged claims.....	55
B.	Dymista® meets long-felt but unmet medical needs for more effective, faster, and safer treatment of AR.	56
C.	Dymista® faced industry skepticism from both Meda and FDA.	57

D. Dymista[®] has enjoyed industry praise as the new “gold standard” for treatment of AR.....59

E. Failure by Cramer, Segal, and Meda to develop a combination nasal spray confirms nonobviousness.....60

F. Meda’s royalty-bearing license to the ’620 patent supports patentability.....62

G. Dymista[®] and Duonase were subject to widespread copying.....63

H. Dymista[®] and Duonase are commercially successful.....63

I. No alleged “blocking patents” undercut Cipla’s commercial success and long-felt need evidence.....65

IX. CONCLUSION..... 67

I. INTRODUCTION

The challenged claims cover a combination nasal spray formulation with two active ingredients: azelastine hydrochloride (“azelastine”) and fluticasone propionate (“fluticasone”). Cipla’s successful combination formulation of these two ingredients was a breakthrough: the world’s first combination of an intranasal antihistamine (azelastine) with an intranasal corticosteroid (fluticasone). Indeed, Cipla’s invention was the first time *any* of the myriad available allergic rhinitis (“AR”) treatments were ever combined into a nasal spray formulation, by *anyone*, *anywhere*. As a result, Dymista[®], the U.S. commercial embodiment of Cipla’s invention remains, more than fifteen years later, the only fixed-dose nasal spray combination approved by the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) for the treatment of AR. Faced with the groundbreaking nature of Cipla’s invention, Petitioner resorts to hindsight, relying either on art that was already considered—and overcome—during prosecution to build its case, or art that contradicts Petitioner’s obviousness theories.

Petitioner has failed to prove that Hettche, Phillipps, and Segal render claims 1, 4-6, 24-26, and 29 obviousness. First, Petitioner’s evidence falls far short of demonstrating that a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”) would have been motivated by the prior art to select azelastine, or to combine azelastine and fluticasone into a combination formulation. Instead, Petitioner and its clinical

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.