

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Kowa Company, Ltd.,  
Kowa Pharmaceuticals America, Inc., and  
Nissan Chemical Industries, Ltd.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 14-CV-2758 (PAC)

Kowa Company, Ltd.,  
Kowa Pharmaceuticals America, Inc., and  
Nissan Chemical Industries, Ltd.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Apotex, Inc. and Apotex Corp.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 14-CV-7934 (PAC)

DEFENDANTS AMNEAL'S AND APOTEX'S  
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW  
REGARDING ANTICIPATION AND OBVIOUSNESS OF THE ASSERTED  
"FORM A CLAIMS" OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,557,993

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING ANTICIPATION OF THE “FORM A” CLAIMS OF THE ’993 PATENT .....2

A. Background .....2

    1. The ’993 Patent .....2

    2. Asserted “Form A Claims” of the ’993 Patent.....2

    3. The Specification of the ’993 Patent.....4

    4. The Prosecution History of the ’993 Patent.....6

B. Nissan Itself Proved that Example 3 of EP ’406 Anticipates Claims 1 and 22-25 of the ’993 Patent. ....7

    1. EP ’406 Discloses a Process for Making a Crystalline Form of Pitavastatin Calcium.....8

    2. Plaintiff Nissan’s Testing, Conclusion, and Unambiguous Representation that Example 3 of EP ’406 Inherently Anticipates Claims Identical to the Form A Claims of the ’993 Patent. ....8

    3. The EPO Accepted Nissan’s Showing that Example 3 Anticipates the Claims 1, 2 and 37 of the ’232 Application.....12

    4. After Acquiring the ’232 Application, Nissan Argued that EP ’406 Could Not Anticipate Example 3—Precisely the Opposite of What Nissan Had Previously Insisted and Demonstrated.....13

    5. The EPO Rejected Nissan’s Flip-Flop, and Reiterated that Example 3 Anticipates the Original Claims. ....14

    6. Nissan Gave Up on Disavowing Its Scientific Proof, But Misled the EPO in the Process. ....15

C. Defendants’ Experts Confirmed that Example 3 of EP ’406 Anticipates the Form A Claims of the ’993 Patent. ....16

    1. Dr. Sessler Confirmed that Nissan Faithfully Followed Example 3. ....16

    2. Dr. Roberts Confirmed that Nissan Obtained Form A from its Replications of Example 3. ....17

..

D.	Plaintiffs Have Not Established Any Failure by Defendants to Prove Anticipation of Claims 1 and 22–25 by Clear and Convincing Evidence.....	18
1.	Dr. Byrn’s Untimely Theory Is Unsupported by the Record.....	19
2.	Dr. Byrn’s Theory Contradicts Plaintiffs’ FDA Communications and Dr. Byrn’s Own Patents.....	26
3.	The Court Does Not Accept Dr. Byrn’s Theory Based on Unpublished, Unverified, and Unreviewed Indian Patent Applications.....	27
III.	PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW REGARDING ANTICIPATION OF THE ASSERTED “FORM A CLAIMS” OF THE ’993 PATENT. ....	28
A.	Legal Standards.....	28
1.	The Law of Anticipation.....	28
2.	The Admissibility, Reliability and Credibility of Expert Evidence.....	29
B.	Example 3 of EP ’406 Inherently Anticipates Claims 1 and 22-25 of the ’993 Patent. ....	30
1.	Nissan’s Own Scientific Conclusions and Representations to the European Patent Office: Unrebutted and Scientifically Confirmed.....	31
2.	Nissan’s Trial Evidence Does Not Refute Nissan’s Own Clear and Convincing Evidence of Anticipation. ....	34
3.	There Is No Heightened Burden to Show Invalidity.....	40
4.	EP ’406 Also Inherently Anticipates Claim 22.....	41
IV.	PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING OBVIOUSNESS OF THE “FORM A” CLAIMS OF THE ’993 PATENT.....	43
A.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art of the ’993 Patent.....	43
B.	Pitavastatin Calcium and Other Crystalline Statins Known in the Art .....	43
C.	Motivation to Perform Routine Polymorph Screens on Prior Art Crystalline Pitavastatin Calcium.....	44
D.	The Person of Ordinary Skill’s Reasonable Expectation that a Routine Polymorph Screen Would Produce the Polymorphs of Pitavastatin Calcium, Including Form A.....	49
E.	Form A of Pitavastatin Calcium Was Sufficiently Obvious as to Have Been Invented Nearly Simultaneously with the ’993 Patentee’s Conception of the Form.....	50

F.	It Was Well Known in the Art that a “Pharmaceutical Composition” Including “Pharmaceutically Acceptable Carriers” Was Necessary to Administer an “Effective Amount” of Prior Art Crystalline Pitavastatin Calcium. ....	51
G.	Plaintiffs’ Alleged Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness. ....	52
1.	No Nexus Exists Between Any Alleged Secondary Consideration and the Patents-in-Suit. ....	52
2.	Livalo is Not a Commercial Success. ....	53
3.	There was No Long-Felt, But Unmet Need for Livalo. ....	55
4.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate Any Unexpected Results.....	60
5.	Plaintiffs’ Licensing Evidence Does Not Support Non-Obviousness. ....	62
V.	PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW REGARDING OBVIOUSNESS OF THE “FORM A CLAIMS” OF THE ’993 PATENT. ....	63
A.	Legal Standards.....	63
B.	Claims 1 and 23-25 of the ’993 Patent Are Obvious in Light of EP ’406 and the Prior Art.....	66
1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	66
2.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art .....	66
3.	Differences Between the Prior Art and Claims at Issue .....	66
4.	Motivation to Combine the Teachings of Prior Art to Achieve the Claimed Invention, and Whether a Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have a Reasonable Expectation of Success in So Doing.....	67
5.	Alleged Secondary Considerations.....	69
C.	Claim 22 of the ’993 Patent Is Obvious in Light of EP ’406 and the Prior Art. ....	75

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re '639 Patent Litig.</i> , 154 F. Supp. 2d 157 (D. Mass. 2001), <i>aff'd sub nom. Smithkline Beecham Corp. v. Copley Pharm., Inc.</i> , 45 F. App'x 915 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	32, 33
<i>ABT Sys. and Univ. Central Fla. v. Emerson Elec.</i> , 797 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	73, 74
<i>AEP Energy Servs. Gas Holding Co. v. Bank of Am., N.A.</i> , 626 F.3d 699 (2d Cir. 2010).....	36
<i>Amorgianos v. Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp.</i> , 303 F.3d 256 (2d Cir. 2002).....	30, 65
<i>Anderson News, LLC v. Am. Media, Inc.</i> , No. 09 Civ. 2227 (PAC), 2015 WL 5003528 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2015) (Crotty, J.) .....	30, 65
<i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	63
<i>Astra Aktiebolag v. Andr� Pharm., Inc.</i> , 222 F. Supp. 2d 423 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).....	32
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Andr� Labs., LLC</i> , Nos. 14-08030, 15-1057, 2017 WL 111928 (D.N.J. Jan. 11, 2017).....	67
<i>Ayst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	64, 69
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	72
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	75
<i>Borsack v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , No. 04 Civ. 3255 (PAC), 2007 WL 2142070 (S.D.N.Y. July 26, 2007) (Crotty, J.) .....	30, 65
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	72, 73
<i>Brooks v. Outboard Marine Corp.</i> , 234 F.3d 89 (2d Cir. 2000).....	34

# 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.