

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ETON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

EXELA PHARMA SCIENCES, LLC,

Patent Owner

U.S. PATENT NO. 10,478,453

PGR2020-00064

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. BASIS FOR REHEARING | 1 |
| A. The Petition Demonstrates The POSITA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Achieving The Claimed Aluminum Levels | 1 |
| B. The Petition Meets The Particularity Requirement..... | 8 |
| III. CONCLUSION..... | 14 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Blue Coat Systems, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.,
IPR2016-01444, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 18, 2017) 1

Google Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.,
Case IPR2017-00447, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. June 8, 2017), *aff'd*, 948
F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2020) 10

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c)..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) 1

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), Petitioner requests rehearing of the Board’s decision denying post grant review entered November 18, 2020 (Paper 12, hereinafter “Decision”).

II. BASIS FOR REHEARING

A request for rehearing “must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each such matter was previously addressed in a motion, opposition, or reply.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The Board will review the decision for an abuse of discretion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). An abuse of discretion results from an erroneous interpretation of law, a factual finding that is not supported by substantial evidence, or if the decision represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing the relevant evidence. *Blue Coat Systems, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.*, IPR2016-01444, Paper 11 at 2 (P.T.A.B. July 18, 2017).

A. **The Petition Demonstrates The POSITA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Achieving The Claimed Aluminum Levels**

The claimed aluminum levels were not new. As the Petition¹ demonstrates, numerous batches of the Sandoz product manufactured by Allergy Labs prior to the

¹ The term “Petition” also includes the Rabinow Declaration, Johnson Declaration and the prior art cited therein.

alleged invention contained aluminum within the claimed ranges shortly after manufacture (*i.e.*, at product release) without Allergy even taking affirmative steps to control aluminum levels; namely, 17 ppb, 61 ppb, 37 ppb, 18 ppb, 50 ppb, 54 ppb, 46 ppb, 47 ppb, 48 ppb, and 43 ppb. (Pet., p. 41; Ex. 1022, Ex. B (pp. 103-112), and Ex. C (pp. 113-123).)² Post-release, aluminum was known to leach into the Sandoz product from the glass vials in which the Sandoz product was stored, and could rise to several hundred ppb by the product’s two-year expiration date (Ex. 1022, ¶ 15)³, which was at the lower end of the “[c]ontains no more than 5,000 [ppb] of aluminum” disclosed on the Sandoz Label. The POSITA motivated to reduce aluminum would have reasonably expected that an optimized Sandoz Label product would achieve and maintain low aluminum levels (as claimed) for long periods of time by simply removing the known sources of aluminum contamination.

As the Petition explains, the POSITA would have known that the potential sources of aluminum contamination in the Sandoz Label product included (1) the drug product starting ingredients, (2) the manufacturing process, and/or (3)

² The Sandoz product attributes are included within the knowledge of the POSITA. (Paper 9, Pet. Reply, p. 2, n.4; Pet., p. 41.)

³ The Decision “accepts the disclosures for the matter asserted in the Johnson declaration (Ex. 1022).” (Paper 12, p. 21, n.11.)

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.