

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01340  
Patent RE44,186

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Saxagliptin and the Applicable Dates of Invention..... 4

III. Scope and Content of the Art ..... 5

    A. Type-2 diabetes and DPP-4 inhibitors ..... 5

    B. Structural requirements for a safe and effective DPP-4 inhibitor  
    were largely unknown ..... 6

    C. Ashworth-I’s compounds raised stability concerns ..... 7

    D. The art sought ways to solve the problem of intramolecular  
    cyclization and left the Ashworth-I compounds behind ..... 11

    E. The most promising DPP-4 inhibitors were in the clinic..... 14

        1. Novartis’s first clinical trial candidate NVP-DPP728 ..... 14

        2. Merck’s first clinical trial candidate P32/98..... 15

IV. The Invention of Saxagliptin ..... 17

    A. Saxagliptin’s discovery ..... 17

    B. The RE’186 patent..... 19

        1. Saxagliptin-specific claims ..... 19

        2. Other challenged claims..... 19

V. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art ..... 21

VI. The Differences Between Saxagliptin and the Prior Art Render The  
Saxagliptin-Specific Claims In Ground 1 Non-Obvious..... 21

    A. A POSA would not have chosen Compound 25 as a lead ..... 22

        1. NVP-DPP728 and P32/98 were more plausible leads ..... 23

2.	Compound 25 would not have been selected over Ashworth-II's compounds .....	26
B.	Even accepting Compound 25 as a lead, each of the additional proposed modifications would have been non-obvious .....	29
1.	There was no reason to add cyclopropyl to Compound 25 in the <i>cis</i> -4,5 configuration .....	30
2.	There was no reason to substitute an adamantyl group for the cyclohexyl of Compound 25 .....	41
3.	There was no reason to hydroxylate an adamantyl-substituted Compound 25 .....	49
C.	Petitioner's failure to consider <i>all</i> of the proposed modifications together is legal error.....	54
D.	Objective evidence of non-obviousness demonstrates the patentability of saxagliptin .....	57
1.	Development of a successful DPP-4 inhibitor was difficult and unpredictable .....	58
2.	Saxagliptin's properties were unpredictable and unexpected .....	60
3.	Saxagliptin met a long felt need .....	65
4.	Saxagliptin is a commercial success .....	66
E.	Conclusion regarding saxagliptin.....	67
VII.	The Cyclopropyl Fused Pyrrolidine Compounds of the Other Challenged Claims in Ground 1 Were Non-Obvious.....	68
VIII.	Claims Directed To Pharmaceutical Combinations Were Non-Obvious.....	69
IX.	Conclusion .....	69

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.*,  
796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....43

*Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*,  
598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....66

*In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule  
Patent Litig.*,  
2010 WL 3766530 (D. Del. Sept. 21, 2010).....59

*Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.*,  
619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....22, 27

*Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.*,  
471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....30, 56

*In re Fine*,  
837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....69

*Graham v. John Deere Co.*,  
383 U.S. 1 (1996).....22

*Innopharma Licensing, Inc. v. Senju Pharm. Co., Ltd.*,  
IPR2015-00902 .....67

*Knoll Pharms. Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.*,  
367 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....59

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....38, 56

*Leo Pharm. Prods. Ltd. v. Rea*,  
726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....49

*Life Tech., Inc. v. Clontech Labs., Inc.*,  
224 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....37

<i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	58
<i>Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00888 .....	56, 57
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	22, 25, 33
<i>Pfizer Inc., v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 71 F. Supp. 3d 458, 473 (D. Del. 2014), <i>aff'd</i> 628 Fed. Appx. 764 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	57
<i>Procter &amp; Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	65
<i>Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.</i> , 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	28, 30, 68
<i>Torrent Pharm. Ltd. v. Merck Frosst Canada &amp; Co.</i> , IPR2014-00559 (2014) .....	56
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.</i> , 617 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	58
<i>Yamanouchi Pharm. Co. v. Danbury Pharmacal, Inc.</i> , 21 F. Supp. 2d 366 (S.D.N.Y. 1998), <i>aff'd sub nom. Yamanouchi Pharm. Co. v. Danbury Pharmacal, Inc.</i> , 231 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	60
<i>Yamanouchi Pharm. Co. v. Danbury Pharmacal, Inc.</i> , 231 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	56
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	24, 56
35 U.S.C. § 316(e) .....	22

# 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.