

Paper No. ____
Date Filed: July 20, 2015

Filed on behalf of Janssen Sciences Ireland UC

By: Dianne B. Elderkin
Barbara L. Mullin
Ruben Munoz
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER
& FELD LLP
Two Commerce Square
2001 Market Street, Suite 4100
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: (215) 965-1200
Fax: (215) 965-1210
JANS-LUPIN@akingump.com

Irena Royzman
PATTERSON BELKMAP WEBB
& TYLER LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Tel.: (212) 336-2081
Fax: (212) 336-2222
LupinIPR@pbwt.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LUPIN LIMITED
Petitioner

v.

JANSSEN SCIENCES IRELAND UC
Patent Owner

CASE No. IPR2015-01030
U.S. Patent No. 8,518,987 B2

JANSSEN'S PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE PETITION FAILS TO IDENTIFY ALL REAL PARTIES-IN-INTEREST	3
A. The Real Party-in-Interest Standard	3
B. Lupin Inc. and Lupin Atlantis are Real Parties-In-Interest	4
C. The Petition Should be Dismissed.....	7
III. BACKGROUND: THE ‘987 PATENT	7
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
A. Determining the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation	9
B. “Hydrate” (Claims 1-19)	10
<u>1.</u> The Ordinary Meaning of “Hydrate”	11
<u>2.</u> The Specification.....	12
3. Other Claims.....	14
4. The Prosecution History.....	15
5. Lupin’s Position is at Odds with the Intrinsic Record	15
C. The “Ratio” Limitations (Claims 1, 3-5, 9-18)	17
D. The Graphic Depiction in Claims 2 and 6.....	18
E. The “Carrier” Limitations (Claims 3-8, 14-19).....	19
V. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED	20
A. Lupin Mischaracterizes the Legal Test for Inherent Anticipation	22
B. Ghosh 1998.....	23
1. Lupin Failed To Prove Any Inherent Properties Of The Ghosh 1998 Darunavir Because Its Expert Deviated From The Ghosh 1998 Method.....	23
2. The Ghosh 1998 Method Does Not Inevitably Yield a Crystalline Hydrate of Darunavir Under The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of “Hydrate”	26

3. Lupin's Testing Does Not Show That Ghosh 1998 Inherently Discloses A "Hydrate" of Darunavir Under Either Side's Construction	26
4. Lupin's Testing Does Not Show That Ghosh 1998 Inherently Discloses the Claimed Ratios Under Either Side's Construction	28
5. Lupin's Arguments About the Prosecution History	32
6. The Van Gyseghem Paper	33
7. Ghosh 1998 Does Not Anticipate the 'Pharmaceutically Acceptable Carrier' or 'Solid Carrier' Limitations	35
C. The '775 Patent	36
1. Under Either Side's Construction, the '775 Patent Does Not Inherently Anticipate the Claimed Hydrates	37
2. Under Either Side's Construction, the '775 Patent Does Not Inherently Anticipate the Claimed Ratios	39
VI. THE CLAIMED INVENTION WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS TO A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	40
A. The Prior Art on Which Lupin Relies	41
1. Byrn	43
2. Desiraju	44
B. No Reason to Choose Darunavir for Formulation	45
C. There Is No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Making a Solvate of Darunavir	49
D. There Was No Reason to Create a Hydrate of Darunavir, and No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Doing So	51
1. The Desiraju Paper Does Not Provide A Reasonable Expectation of Success in Making a Hydrate of Darunavir	53
2. Byrn Does Not Provide a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Making a Hydrate Of Darunavir	54
3. Lupin's Reliance on Van Gyseghem Is Misplaced	55
4. The Prosecution History Does Not Support Lupin's Obviousness Theory	55

E. No Reasonable Expectation of a Hydrate of Darunavir with the Claimed Ratios of Darunavir-to-Water.....	57
F. No Reasonable Expectation that a Hydrate Would Be Useful as a Pharmaceutical Composition.....	58
G. Lupin's Unsuccessful Obviousness Challenge to a Related Patent	59
VII. CONCLUSION	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Am. Calcar, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , 651 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	22
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Paper 88 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2015)	6
<i>Crown Operations Int'l, Ltd. v. Solutia, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	30, 40
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs. Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	45, 47, 48
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	47
<i>Endo Pharms. Inc. v. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00655, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 29, 2014).....	25
<i>Ex Parte Peltz</i> , Appeal 2012-011729, 2015 Pat. App. LEXIS 513 (PTAB Jan. 13, 2015).....	35
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	23, 35
<i>Galderma S.A. v. Allergan Industrie, SAS</i> , IPR2014-01422, Paper 14 (PTAB March 5, 2015)	3, 4, 5, 7
<i>Hoop v. Hoop</i> , 279 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	56
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Science Tech. Center</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10, 14
<i>In re Armodafinil Patent Litig.</i> , 939 F. Supp. 2d 456 (D. Del. 2013).....	60
<i>In re Cyclobenzepriene Hydrochloride Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	56

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.