

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

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

Issue Date: January 5, 1999

Title: Quinoline Type Mevalonolactones

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2015-01647

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SAWAI’S OBVIOUSNESS ARGUMENTS FAIL	6
A. RELEVANT ASPECTS OF THE PROSECUTION HISTORY AND INTERFERENCE PROCEEDINGS	6
B. SUMMARY OF THE ‘336 PATENT	10
C. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
D. LEGAL STANDARD FOR INSTITUTION OF <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	11
E. LEGAL PRINCIPLES REGARDING CHEMICAL OBVIOUSNESS	12
F. SAWAI HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT CLAIM 1 OF THE ‘336 PATENT WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER PICARD IN VIEW OF KESSELER.	14
1. Sawai fails to supply a coherent reason for why the compound disclosed as Example 3 in Picard would have been an obvious choice of a “lead compound” for an HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor	14
(a) Picard itself discloses compounds with better HMG-CoA reductase inhibitory activity than Example 3	16
(b) Other prior art taught away from selecting Picard Example 3 as a “lead compound.”	23
i. Sawai’s own selected art (Kessler) taught away from Picard Example 3	23
ii. The prior art identified in a related IPR petition taught away from Picard Example 3.	26

iii.	Numerous other pieces of prior art taught away from Picard Example 3	27
2.	Even if Picard Example 3 were a proper selection of a “lead compound” for an HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor, it would not have been obvious to modify the substituent at the 2-position of Picard Example 3 from isopropyl to cyclopropyl.....	31
(a)	Picard taught away from replacing the 2-isopropyl moiety with a 2-cyclopropyl moiety	32
(b)	Sawai provides no reason for a POSA to have equated results from the pyridine and pyrimidine cores of Kessler to the quinoline cores of Picard.	34
(c)	Sawai’s reliance on selected excerpts from the NCI Interference proceedings is a red herring.....	38
3.	Sawai fails to identify any reason to change the final form of the quinoline compound to a calcium salt.	41
4.	Secondary considerations of record demonstrate non-obviousness.	43
G.	SAWAI HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT CLAIM 2 OF THE ‘336 PATENT WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER PICARD IN VIEW OF KESSELER.	46
III.	SAWAI’S PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED AS DUPLICATIVE UNDER 35 U.S.C. §325(d).....	46
IV.	SAWAI’S “INTERFERENCE ESTOPPEL” ARGUMENTS ARE NOT PROPERLY POSED IN AN IPR PROCEEDING, AND LACK MERIT ...	48
V.	CONCLUSION.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE

Cases

<i>Altana Pharma AG v. KUDco</i> , 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 146152 (D.N.J. July 15, 2010)	30
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	35
<i>Bayer AG v. Carlsbad Tech., Inc.</i> , No. 01-CV-0867-B, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27830 (S. D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2002)	36
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs, Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010) cert. denied, 131 S. Ct. 1678 (2011)	13, 21, 25, 27, 29
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	14
<i>Eisai Co. Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs. Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	21, 33
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm. Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	13, 22
<i>Endo Pharm. Inc. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , Civ. No. 11-CV-00717, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10037 (D. Del. Jan. 28, 2014)	19, 30
<i>Ex Parte Cullis</i> , 11 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1876 (BPAI 1989)	5, 48
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 265 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	5, 49, 50
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	9, 40

<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	12
<i>In re Deckler</i> , 977 F.2d 1449 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	50
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	12
<i>In re Kroekel</i> , 803 F.2d 705 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	50
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	23
<i>In re Ogiue</i> , 517 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1975)	48
<i>In re Risse</i> , 378 F.2d 948 (CCPA 1967)	48
<i>In re Rosuvastatin Calcium Patent Litig.</i> 703 F.3d 511 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	3, 37, 40
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	15, 21, 27
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States</i> , 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	12
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012), <i>cert. denied</i> , 133 S. Ct. 940 (2013).....	passim
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 71 F. Supp. 3d 458 (D. Del. 2014).....	30
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Teva Pharm. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 555 Fed. App’x 961 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16, 28
<i>Shire LLC v. Amneal Pharm.</i> , 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 16908, (Fed. Cir. Sept. 24, 2015).....	23

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.