

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 PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD'S DECISION ON INSTITUTION	6
A. Claim Construction.....	6
B. Instituted Grounds.....	7
III. PATENT OWNER'S EXPERT DECLARATIONS	10
A. Dr. Tjalf Ziemssen.....	10
B. Dr. Edward Fox	11
C. Dr. Robert Gristwood.....	11
D. Dr. Henry Grabowski	12
IV. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND.....	13
A. Multiple Sclerosis.....	13
B. The Active Molecule In GA Is Unknown.....	14
C. What Was Known About The Mechanism of Action of GA Taught Away From Less Frequent Administration	15
D. No PK/PD Correlation Exists For GA	16
V. CLAIMS 1-20 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER PINCHASI AND THE SBOA OR FLECHTER.....	16
A. The Prior Art Would Have Discouraged a POSA From Using A 40 mg Dose of GA On Any Schedule	17
1. After the FORTE trial, a POSA would not have used a 40 mg dose of GA to treat MS.	17
2. The prior art taught that a 40 mg dose would be associated with increased side effects which would have discouraged a POSA from using a 40 mg dose.....	20
B. The Prior Art Would Have Discouraged a POSA From Using A Three Times Weekly Dosing Regimen	22
1. The POSA's understanding of the mechanism of action of GA taught away from three times weekly dosing.....	22

2.	Flechter actually teaches away from less frequent dosing.....	29
3.	No other prior art would have motivated three times weekly dosing.	31
C.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Pinchasi With The SBOA To Make The Claimed Invention.....	32
D.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Pinchasi With Flechter To Make The Claimed Invention	35
E.	A POSA Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation That A 40mg Three Times Weekly Regimen Would Work for Its Intended Purpose	36
1.	The monkey data PK are entirely irrelevant to the activity of GA.	39
2.	The monkey data do not support the conclusion that GA has an 80 hour half-life in human patients.	41
3.	Modifying the alternate day dosing schedule to three times weekly is not “routine optimization”.....	46
VI.	THE DEPENDENT CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE	51
A.	Mylan Has Failed To Meet Its Burden of Proving That The Limitations of Dependent Claims 6 and 14-18 Are “Inherent” In Pinchasi.....	51
B.	Mylan Has Failed To Meet Its Burden of Proving That The Limitations of Dependent Claim 7 Are Disclosed By The Prior Art.....	52
VII.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA SUPPORT THE NONOBVIOUSNESS OF THE '413 PATENT CLAIMS.....	53
A.	The Unexpected Efficacy Of The Claimed Dosing Regimen Supports A Finding That The Claims Are Not Obvious.....	53
B.	The Unexpected Tolerability Of The Claimed Dosing Regimen Supports A Finding That The Claims Are Not Obvious.....	55
C.	Commercial Success Supports A Finding That The Claims Are Not Obvious	57
D.	The Claimed Invention Met A Long-Felt But Unmet Need	59
VIII.	CONCLUSION	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955)	48,49
<i>In re Antonie</i> , 559 F.2d 618 (C.C.P.A. 1977)	46
<i>In re Boesch</i> , 617 F.2d 272 (Fed. Cir. 1980)	48
<i>DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	48
<i>Eurand, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38
<i>Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil</i> , 774 F.2d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	34
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	38
<i>Merck & Co., Inc. v. Biocraft Labs., Inc.</i> , 874 F.2d 804 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	48, 49
<i>In re O'Farrell</i> , 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	46
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	48
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	48
<i>Sandoz, Inc. v. EKR Therapeutics, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00005, Paper 20 (P.T.A.B. 2015).....	52

Other Authorities

M.P.E.P. § 716.04(I)59

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.