

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
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 POST-TRIAL BRIEF
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. EXAMPLE 3 OF EP '406 INHERENTLY ANTICIPATES CLAIMS 1 AND 22-25 OF THE '993 PATENT.....8

A. The Law of Inherent Anticipation.....8

B. Amneal and Apotex Presented Plaintiff Nissan’s Own Clear and Convincing Evidence of Inherent Anticipation, and Confirmed of its Scientific Accuracy.9

1. Nissan’s Own Scientific Data and Conclusions Disclosed to the European Patent Office and Contained in Internal Lab Reports.10

2. Defendants’ Experts Confirmed the Scientific Accuracy of Nissan’s Work and Scientific Truthfulness of Nissan’s Submission to the European Patent Office.....14

C. Dr. Byrn’s Theory Does Not Refute Nissan’s Own Confirmed Clear and Convincing Evidence of Anticipation.14

1. Dr. Byrn’s Theory is Trial-by-Ambush in Violation of Rule 26 and this Court’s Case Management Order.15

2. Dr. Byrn Bases his Theory on Evidence That the Court Expressly Excluded, on Counsel’s Mischaracterization of Trial Testimony, and on an Anonymous, Unpublished and Unverified Report of an Alleged Experiment.16

3. Dr. Byrn’s Opinion Testimony Fails With Respect to Virtually Every Reliability Factor Articulated by the Supreme Court in Daubert and Kumho Tire.....21

4. Additional Evidence of the Unreliability of Dr. Byrn’s Drying Conditions Theory.24

5. Dr. Byrn’s Evidence Regarding Forms “M” and “P” Is Unreliable and Not Probative.25

D. There Is No Heightened Burden to Show Invalidity, and No Deference Due to the Examiner Because the Examiner Failed to Correctly Recognize the Closest Prior Art.....26

E. EP '406 Also Inherently Anticipates Claim 22.27

F. Conclusion as to Anticipation28

III.	THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '993 PATENT ARE INVALID AS OBVIOUS ...	28
A.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success of Obtaining Form A of Pitavastatin Calcium from a Routine Polymorph Screen of Example 3 of EP '406.	29
B.	Near Simultaneous Invention of Form A of Pitavastatin Calcium Further Supports the Obviousness of Claims 1 and 23-25 of the '993 patent.	33
C.	Plaintiffs' Alleged Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness Do Not Rebut Defendants' Strong Prima Facie Showing of Obviousness	33
1.	There is No Nexus Between Plaintiffs' Alleged Secondary Considerations and The Asserted Claims of the '993 Patent	33
2.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate the Commercial Success of Livalo.	34
3.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate Any Long-Felt But Unmet Need for Livalo.	36
4.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate Any Unexpected Results.....	37
5.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate Licensing of Livalo as a Secondary Consideration Supporting Non-Obviousness.	37
6.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate Any Industry Praise for Livalo.	38
7.	Plaintiffs' Reliance on Copying is Irrelevant.....	38
D.	Claim 22 of the '993 Patent Is Obvious in Light of EP '406 and the Prior Art.	38
E.	Conclusion as to Obviousness	40

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re '639 Patent Litig.</i> , 154 F. Supp. 2d 157 (D. Mass. 2001)	13
<i>AEP Energy Servs. Gas Holding Co. v. Bank of Am., N.A.</i> , 626 F.3d 699 (2d Cir. 2010)	24
<i>Am. Stock Exchange, LLC v. Mopex, Inc.</i> , 215 F.R.D. 87 (S.D.N.Y. 2002)	15
<i>Anderson News, L.L.C. v. American Media, Inc.</i> , No. 09 Civ. 2227 (PAC), 2015 WL 5003528 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2015) (Crotty, J.)	22
<i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	38
<i>Astra Aktiebolag v. Andrx Pharm., Inc.</i> , 222 F. Supp. 2d 423 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).....	12
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Andrx Labs., LLC</i> , Nos. 15-1057, 14-8030, 2017 WL 111928 (D.N.J. Jan. 11, 2017).....	31
<i>Ayyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	34
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	38
<i>Borsack v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , No. 04 Civ. 3255 (PAC), 2007 WL 2142070 (S.D.N.Y. July 26, 2007) (Crotty, J.)	21
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	37
<i>Brown v. 3M</i> , 265 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	8
<i>Caterpillar Tractor Co. v. Berco, S.p.A.</i> , 714 F.2d 1110 (Fed.Cir. 1983).....	12
<i>In re Cavanagh</i> , 436 F.2d 491 (C.C.P.A. 1971).....	36

<i>Cucuras v. Sec’y of Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.</i> , 993 F.2d 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	24
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	33
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	21, 22, 23
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	33
<i>Eli Lilly & Co., Inc. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	9
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	8
<i>Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Ltd.</i> , 65 F. Supp. 3d 379 (D. Del. 2014).....	22
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	37
<i>General Elec. Co. v. Joiner</i> , 522 U.S. 136 (1997).....	22, 32
<i>Geo M Martin v. Alliance Mach.</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	38
<i>In re Gersbon</i> , 372 F.2d 535 (C.C.P.A. 1967).....	36
<i>In re GPAC, Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	35
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	34, 35
<i>J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co.</i> , 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	35
<i>Joseph S. v. Hogan</i> , No. 06 Civ. 1042, 2011 WL 2848330 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2011)	21
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	29, 39

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.