

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

Petitioner

v.

YEDA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CO. LTD.

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-00644

Patent No. 8,399,413

YEDA'S PRELIMINARY PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. THE '413 PATENT | 6 |
| III. BACKGROUND FACTS..... | 9 |
| A. Multiple Sclerosis..... | 9 |
| B. COPAXONE® - Glatiramer Acetate | 11 |
| 1. The Active Molecule In GA Is Unknown | 11 |
| 2. GA's Mechanism Of Action Is Unknown | 13 |
| 3. No PK/PD Correlation Exists For GA..... | 15 |
| IV. THE PRIOR ART | 17 |
| V. MYLAN'S PROFFERED GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY | 23 |
| VI. MYLAN'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF "COMPRISING" IS UNREASONABLE AND SHOULD BE REJECTED | 24 |
| A. Yeda Expressly Disclaimed Coverage of Alternate Day Administration During Prosecution | 24 |
| B. Mylan's Proposed Claim Construction Conflicts With The Intrinsic Record..... | 27 |
| C. "Comprising" Should Not be Interpreted to Render the "Regimen" Method Step Open-Ended. | 28 |
| VII. MYLAN'S IPR PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED..... | 31 |
| A. Ground 1 Fails: Pinchasi Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-6 And 8-20 | 32 |
| B. Grounds 2, 3, And 4 Fail: The Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Pinchasi Alone Or Pinchasi In View Of The SBOA Or Flechter | 34 |
| 1. Mylan's Definition Of The Person Of Ordinary Skill Should Be Rejected | 34 |
| 2. A POSA Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Using A 40 mg Three Times Per Week Regimen Because The Active Molecule And Mechanism Of Action Were Unknown, And There Was No PK/PD Correlation..... | 35 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 3. | A Skilled Artisan Would Not Have Been Motivated To Dose GA Three Times Weekly | 38 |
| 4. | It Would Not Have Been Obvious To Use A 40 mg Dose | 45 |
| 5. | The Person of Skill Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Pinchasi with the SBOA And/Or Flechter..... | 46 |
| 6. | Mylan Has Failed To Prove That The SBOA Document Is Available As Prior Art | 48 |
| VIII. | IF IPR IS INSTITUTED, IT SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED FOR ALL CLAIMS | 50 |
| A. | The Board Should Not Institute Review Of Dependent Claims 6-7 And 14-18 Where Mylan's Only Argument Is An Insufficiently Supported Assertion That The Claim Limitations Are "Inherent" In The Prior Art | 51 |
| B. | The Board Should Not Institute Review Of Claim 7 | 53 |
| IX. | UNEXPECTED RESULTS AND OBJECTIVE INDICIA SUPPORT THE PATENTABILITY OF THE '413 PATENT CLAIMS | 54 |
| A. | Unexpected Results Support The Patentability Of The '413 Patent's Claims..... | 54 |
| B. | Commercial Success Supports The Patentability Of The '413 Patent's Claims..... | 55 |
| C. | The Claimed Invention Met A Long Felt But Unmet Need | 56 |
| X. | CONCLUSION..... | 58 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Cedarapids, Inc. v. Nordberg, Inc.</i> , No. 95-1529, 1997 WL 452801 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 11, 1997) | 35 |
| <i>Dippin' Dots, Inc. v. Mosey</i> , 476 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 28 |
| <i>Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co.</i> , 192 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 1999) | 27 |
| <i>ERBE Elektromedizin GmbH v. Canady Tech. LLC</i> , 629 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2010) | 26 |
| <i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 32 |
| <i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992) | 40 |
| <i>Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc.</i> , 405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005) | 30, 31 |
| <i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 37, 38 |
| <i>Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil</i> , 774 F.2d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1985) | 46, 47 |
| <i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 37 |
| <i>Mass. Inst. of Tech. v. Harman Int'l Indus.</i> , 584 F. Supp. 2d 297 (D. Mass. 2008) | 48 |
| <i>In re McLaughlin</i> , 443 F.2d 1392 (C.C.P.A. 1971) | 56 |
| <i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999) | 33 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Spectrum Int'l, Inc. v. Sterilite Corp.</i> , 164 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 1998) | 29 |
| <i>SRI Int'l Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys., Inc. et al.</i> , 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008) | 49, 50 |
| <i>Std. Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) | 27 |
| <i>Syntex (U.S.A.) LLC v. Apotex Inc.</i> , No. C 01-02214 MJJ, 2006 WL 1530101 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2006)..... | 56 |
| <i>U.S. v. Telectronics, Inc.</i> , 857 F.2d 778 (Fed. Cir. 1988) | 35 |
| <i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 36 |
| <i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 32 |
| <i>W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) | 40 |
| <i>Warner Chilcott Co., LLC v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 594 Fed. Appx. 630 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 18, 2014)..... | 37, 38 |
| <i>Zhejiang Med. Co. v. Kaneka Corp.</i> , No. H-11-1052, 2012 WL 4795623 (S.D. Tex. Aug. 23, 2012)..... | 29 |
| Statutes | |
| 35 U.S.C. §102 | <i>passim</i> |
| 35 U.S.C. §312(a)(3)..... | 50 |
| Other Authorities | |
| M.P.E.P. §2141.03(I) | 35 |

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.