

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.,
Petitioner,

v.

Nissan Chemical Industries, Ltd.,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 5,856,336

Issue Date: January 5, 1999

Title: Quinoline Type Mevalonolactones

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2015-01069

**NISSAN CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES, LTD.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MYLAN FAILED TO IDENTIFY A REAL PARTY-IN-INTEREST	5
A. Facts	5
B. Applicable Legal Principles	7
C. Argument	9
1. Mylan N.V. is a real party-in-interest.....	9
2. Correction of the real party-in-interest would be futile	11
III. THE PETITION FAILS ON THE MERITS.....	12
A. Relevant Aspects of the Prosecution History and Interference Proceedings.....	12
B. Summary of the ‘336 Patent	14
C. Claim Construction	15
D. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	16
E. Legal Standard for Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	17
F. Vertical Redundancy	18
G. Legal Principles Regarding Chemical Obviousness	19
H. Mylan Has Failed to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood That the Challenged Claims are Invalid.....	21
1. Ground 1: Obviousness.....	21
a. Ground 1 ¹ , Claim 1 (Mylan’s 10-Reference Obviousness Argument).....	21
i. The Petition Both Misrepresents and Oversimplifies the State of the Art in Statin Research as of August 20, 1987	22

ii.	Mylan’s 6-Step Theory Is Based on Impermissible Hindsight.....	25
b.	Ground 1 ² , Claims 1 and 2 (Mylan’s 14-Reference Obviousness Argument).....	47
c.	Ground 1 ¹⁺² , Claim 2	51
d.	The Gortler Declaration Is Not Sufficiently Described in the Petition to Be Considered	52
e.	Secondary Considerations Already of Record and Known by Mylan Demonstrate Non-Obviousness	53
2.	Ground 2: Anticipation	55
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE

Cases

<i>Actavis Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01126, Paper No. 22 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2015)	57
<i>Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n.</i> , 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	29
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 818 F. Supp. 2d 974 (E.D. Tex. 2011).....	22
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Appistry, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00480, Paper No. 18 (PTAB Jul. 13, 2015).....	7
<i>Apotex Inc. v. Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00419, Paper No. 14 (PTAB Jun. 25, 2015).....	18, 20
<i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-00115, Paper No. 94 (PTAB Apr. 20, 2015).....	27
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , IPR 2013-00276, Paper No. 43 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2014)	52
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	27
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Paper No. 88 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2015).....	8, 12
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	56
<i>Bayer AG v. Carlsbad Tech. Inc.</i> , No. 01CV0867-B, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27830 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2002).....	35, 44
<i>BioDelivery Sciences Int’l v. RB Pharm. Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00325, Paper No. 43 (PTAB June 30, 2015).....	38

	PAGE
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	32, 34, 35, 38
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. The Proctor & Gamble Company</i> , IPR2013-00510, Paper No. 9 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2014)	52
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs, Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	20
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	20, 51
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	53
<i>Eisai Co. Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs. Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	42
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 02-0512, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14724 (S.D. Ind. Jul. 29, 2004)	21
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	20, 57
<i>Endo Pharm. Inc. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , No. 11-cv-00717, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10037 (D. Del. Jan. 28, 2014)	57
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	14, 43
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	19
<i>Impax Labs., Inc. v. Aventis Pharm. Inc.</i> , 468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	18, 57
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	19
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	21

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.