

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SLAYBACK PHARMA LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

EYE THERAPIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-00142
U.S. Patent No. 8,293,742

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	4
	A. Legal Framework	5
	B. Factor 1: A stay has not been, and is unlikely to be, entered.....	5
	C. Factor 2: Trial in the related litigation is likely to occur shortly after the deadline for the final written decision	6
	D. Factor 3: The parties and the court will invest significant resources in the related litigation	7
	E. Factor 4: The petition relies on substantially the same art and arguments likely to be presented in the parallel proceeding.....	8
	F. Factor 5: The Petitioner is a defendant in the related litigation	10
	G. Factor 6: All other circumstances further support denial.....	10
III.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	13
	A. Legal Framework	13
	B. The petition relies on the same or substantially the same art or arguments overcome during prosecution	14
	1. The '442 Patent (EX-1007) was applied and distinguished during prosecution	15
	2. Alphagan [®] Label 1998 (EX-1008) contains substantially the same disclosure as Cantor 2006 (EX-2007), which the Examiner Considered.....	17
	3. Federal Register 1988 (EX-1009) contains substantially the same disclosure as the '079 patent (EX-2008), which the Examiner Considered.....	18
	4. Norden 2002 (EX-1006) contains substantially the same disclosure as the combination of the '442 patent (EX-	

	1007) and Lee (EX-2009), applied as such and distinguished during prosecution	20
5.	The '553 patent contains substantially the same disclosure as the '442 patent (EX-1007), Lee (EX-2009) Cantor 2006 (EX-2007), and the '416 patent (EX-2010), which the Examiner Considered.....	23
6.	Walters 1991 (EX-1005) contains substantially the same disclosure as the '442 patent (EX-1007), which was applied and distinguished during prosecution	26
C.	The Petitioner has not demonstrated that the Office erred in a manner material to the patentability of challenged claims.	27
IV.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because the Petitioner Has Failed to Establish That Any of the Claims Are Unpatentable	28
A.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	28
B.	Claim Construction	29
1.	“about 0.025%”	29
a.	A concentration of “about 0.025%” does not include 0.03%	29
b.	The Petitioner’s reasons for asserting that “about 0.025%” includes 0.03% are unavailing.....	32
2.	“ocular condition”	35
C.	The petition should be denied for failing to establish a reasonable likelihood that any of the challenged claims is unpatentable	36
1.	Ground 1: The '553 patent (EX-1004) does not inherently anticipate the methods for reducing eye redness recited in claims 1 and 2	36
2.	Ground 2: Walters 1991 (EX-1005) does not inherently disclose a method for reducing eye redness as recited in claims 1 and 2	40

3.	Ground 3: The Petitioner has failed to establish that claims 1-6 are obvious.....	42
a.	Legal Standard	42
b.	The Petitioner’s arguments are driven by improper hindsight	44
i.	The Petitioner’s exclusive focus on brimonidine is driven by hindsight	45
ii.	The Petitioner relies on the Alphagan® product, but ignores the later-developed Alphagan® P product.....	49
V.	Conclusion	51

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3M Co., Inc. v. Andover Healthcare, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00630, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014).....	38, 41
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper No. 6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper No. 15 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	13, 14
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	37
<i>Biocon Pharma Ltd. v. Novartis Pharms. Corp.</i> , IPR2020-01263, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2021).....	18, 20, 26
<i>Biodelivery Sci. Int’l, Inc. v. Monosol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00794, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 5, 2014).....	38, 41
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	42
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	50
<i>Endo Pharm. Sols., Inc. v. Custopharm Inc.</i> , 894 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	37
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper No. 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....	12

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.