

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
tribar@sughrue.com
ciyer@sughrue.com

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

NISSAN CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD.
Patent Owner

IPR 2015-01648
Patent No. 5,856,336

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CASES	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(a)(1)).....	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 contain 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 KESSELER IN VIEW OF PICARD	25
A.	A POSA would have selected Kessler’s compound IIac as a lead compound	25
B.	A POSA would have found it obvious to have made the fused-ring analog of compound IIac	28
C.	A POSA would have found it obvious to have selected the ½ calcium salt.....	33
D.	The methods of claim 2 would have been obvious	34
VII.	PATENT OWNER CANNOT RELY UPON THE DECLARATION EVIDENCE SUBMITTED DURING PROSECUTION	35
A.	The results shown in the Declarations were not unexpected.....	36
B.	The results shown in the Declarations do not compare the compound of formula A of claims 1 and 2 of the ’336 Patent with the closest compounds of the prior art	36
VIII.	PATENT OWNER DISCLAIMED THE COMPOUND OF CLAIMS 1 AND 2 OF THE ’336 PATENT	39

A.	Introduction	39
B.	Disclaimer of a claim	45
C.	Patent Owner disclaimed the compound of claim 1 of the '336 Patent during prosecution of its grandparent application	46
D.	The subject matter that Patent Owner lost in the interferences	51
E.	Canceled claim 10 was merely an obvious analog of the claims that Patent Owner lost in the interferences	53
F.	Claim 1 of the '336 Patent is obvious over the claims Patent Owner lost in the interferences	55
G.	Claim 1 of the '336 Patent should “suffer the same consequences that would have befallen” if it were included in the interferences	55
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	56
IX.	PATENT OWNER’S BURDEN IN THE PROPOSED IPR	57
X.	CONCLUSION.....	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	11, 12, 13
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	21, 22
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	2, 40, 51
<i>In re Deckler</i> , 977 F.2d 1449 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	44, 56
<i>In re Fout</i> , 675 F.2d 297	34
<i>In re Nomiya</i> , 509 F.2d 566 (CCPA 1975).....	34
<i>In re Ogiue</i> , 517 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1975).....	46, 50, 56
<i>In re Ruschig</i> , 379 F.2d 990 (CCPA 1967).....	11, 12
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	11
<i>Motionpoint Corp., Petitioner</i> , CBM2014-00066, 2014 WL 3704044 (July 23, 2014).....	12
<i>Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS</i> , 723 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	11, 12
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co., Ltd. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	22, 23
<i>Takeda Chem. Indus. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.</i> , 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	22

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 112.....	11
----------------------	----

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.