

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_

Filed on behalf of Sawai

By: Kenneth J. Burchfiel  
Travis B. Ribar  
Chidambaram S. Iyer  
Sughrue Mion, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
Telephone: 202-293-7060  
Facsimile: 202-293-7860  
email: [kburchfiel@sughrue.com](mailto:kburchfiel@sughrue.com)  
[tribar@sughrue.com](mailto:tribar@sughrue.com)  
[ciyer@sughrue.com](mailto:ciyer@sughrue.com)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAWAI USA, INC., AND SAWAI PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.  
Petitioners

v.

NISSAN CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD.  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2015-01647  
Patent No. 5,856,336

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,856,336**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	IV
EXHIBITS CITED .....	VI
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR AN <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW PETITION .....	5
A. Grounds for Standing .....	5
B. Payment of Fee for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	5
C. Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)) .....	5
1. Each Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1)) .....	5
2. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2)) .....	5
3. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(3)).....	6
4. Service Information (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(4)).....	7
5. Power of Attorney (37 C.F.R. §42.10(b)).....	7
D. Statement of precise relief requested .....	7
E. Identification of Prior Art and Challenged Claims .....	7
F. Supporting Evidence Relied Upon.....	7
III. THE '336 PATENT .....	8
A. Field of the '336 Patent .....	8
B. Claims 1 and 2 of the '336 Patent .....	9
C. The Broadest Reasonable Construction of Claim Terms.....	9
IV. THE EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF CLAIMS 1 AND 2 OF THE '336 PATENT IS, AT THE EARLIEST, AUGUST 3, 1988 .....	10

A.	Single species claims require full written description support in order to be entitled to benefit of priority.....	11
B.	The failure of JP '224 and JP '585 to name a calcium salt is fatal to any benefit claim .....	12
C.	JP '224 does not provide written description support for a ½ calcium salt.....	13
D.	JP '585 does not contain written description support for a ½ calcium salt.....	14
V.	MEVALONOLACTONES IN THE TREATMENT OF HYPERCHOLESTEROLEMIA .....	15
VI.	GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1 AND 2 OF THE '336 PATENT ARE OBVIOUS OVER PICARD IN VIEW OF KESSELER.....	25
A.	Picard discloses derivatives of compactin useful in inhibiting HMG-CoA reductase .....	25
1.	A POSA would have selected Picard's Example 3 compound as a lead compound.....	26
2.	Patent Owner admitted that the ½ calcium salt of Picard's Example 3 compound is prior art.....	29
3.	A POSA would have found it obvious to change the R <sub>2</sub> isopropyl group to a cyclopropyl group.....	29
B.	Kessler provides data showing the superior activity of analogous cyclopropyl-substituted compounds .....	31
1.	A POSA would have found it obvious to substitute a ½ calcium salt for the sodium salt.....	36
2.	The methods of claim 2 would have been obvious.....	38
C.	Patent Owner cannot rely on <i>ex parte</i> Declaration evidence submitted during prosecution.....	39
D.	The results shown in the Declarations were not unexpected.....	39

E.	The results shown in the Declarations do not compare the claimed compound with the closest compounds of the prior art .....	40
VII.	PATENT OWNER DISCLAIMED THE COMPOUND OF CLAIMS 1 AND 2 OF THE '336 PATENT .....	41
A.	Introduction .....	41
B.	Disclaimer of a claim .....	48
C.	Patent Owner disclaimed the compound of claim 1 of the '336 Patent during prosecution of its grandparent application .....	49
D.	The subject matter that Patent Owner lost in the interferences .....	53
E.	Canceled claim 10 was merely an obvious analog of the claims that Patent Owner lost in the interferences .....	55
F.	Claim 1 of the '336 Patent is obvious over the claims Patent Owner lost in the interferences .....	57
G.	Claim 1 of the '336 Patent should “suffer the same consequences that would have befallen” if it were included in the interferences .....	58
H.	Evidence submitted during prosecution of the '336 Patent does not compare the compound of formula A of claims 1 and 2 of the '336 Patent with the compounds lost in the interferences .....	58
VIII.	PATENT OWNER’S BURDEN IN THE PROPOSED IPR .....	60
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	60

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	11, 12
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	21, 22
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	2, 42, 53
<i>In re Deckler</i> , 977 F.2d 1449, 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	46, 58
<i>In re Fout</i> , 675 F.2d 297 .....	37
<i>In re Nomiya</i> , 509 F.2d 566, 570-71 (CCPA 1975).....	37
<i>In re Ogiue</i> , 517 F.2d 1382, 1390 (CCPA 1975).....	48, 52
<i>In re Ruschig</i> , 379 F.2d 990, 995 (CCPA 1967) .....	11, 12
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines</i> , 107 F.3d 1565, 1571–72 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	11
<i>Motionpoint Corp., Petitioner</i> , CBM2014-00066, 2014 WL 3704044, at *14 (July 23, 2014).....	12
<i>Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS</i> , 723 F.3d 1336, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	11, 12
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co., Ltd. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280, 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	21, 23
<i>Takeda Chem. Indus. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.</i> , 492 F.3d 1350, 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	22

### STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....	25
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) .....	25
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	7, 8

# 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.