

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. IPR2015-01648

**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	12
E. LEGAL PRINCIPLES REGARDING CHEMICAL OBVIOUSNESS	12
F. SAWAI HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER KESSELER IN VIEW OF PICARD	14
1. Sawai fails to supply a coherent reason for why a POSA would have selected Compound IIac of Kessler as a “lead compound” for an HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor	15
(a) Kessler discloses hundreds of compounds with “interesting possibilities” for further research	16
(b) Sawai supplies no reason, other than hindsight, for selection of Compound IIac in Kessler as a lead compound	18
2. Even if Kessler Compound IIac were a proper selection of a lead compound for an HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor, it	

would not have been obvious to make a “ring-fused analog” of that compound.....	24
(a) Kessler Compound IIac is not “structurally similar” to the compound depicted in Claim 1 of the ‘336 Patent.....	25
(b) Sawai fails to identify a reason to modify the core of Kessler Compound IIac from pyridine to quinoline	28
3. Sawai fails to identify any reason to change the final form of the quinoline compound to a calcium salt.....	32
4. Secondary considerations of record demonstrate non- obviousness	34
G. SAWAI HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT CLAIM 2 OF THE ‘336 PATENT WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER KESSELER IN VIEW OF PICARD	37
III. SAWAI’S PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED AS DUPLICATIVE UNDER 35 U.S.C. §325(d).....	38
IV. SAWAI’S “INTERFERENCE ESTOPPEL” ARGUMENTS ARE NOT PROPERLY POSED IN AN IPR PROCEEDING, AND LACK MERIT	39
V. CONCLUSION.....	44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

PAGE

Cases

<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)	27
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharm USA., Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	28
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co, Ltd.. v. Matrix Labs, Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	14, 20, 23
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Mylan Pharm., Inc.</i> , 670 F. Supp. 2d 359 (D.N.J. 2009)	23
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	14
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm. Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	14
<i>Ex Parte Cullis</i> , 11 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1876 (BPAI 1989)	5, 40
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 265 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	5, 40, 41
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	9, 10
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	13
<i>In re Deckler</i> , 977 F.2d 1449 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	41, 42
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	13

<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	23
<i>In re Kroekel</i> , 803 F.2d 705 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	41, 42
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	20
<i>In re Ogiue</i> , 517 F.2d 1382 (CCPA 1975)	40
<i>In re Risse</i> , 378 F.2d 948 (CCPA 1967)	40
<i>In re Rosuvastatin Calcium Patent Litig.</i> , 703 F.3d 511 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	28, 29
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	23, 26, 32
<i>Kowa Company, Ltd., et al. v. Apotex Inc., et al.</i> , C.A. No. 14-cv-7934 (S.D.N.Y.)	37
<i>Kowa Company, Ltd., et al. v. Lupin Limited, et al.</i> , C.A. No. 15-cv-3935 (S.D.N.Y.)	37
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States</i> , 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	13
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012),	passim
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 10-528, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 150283 (D.Del. Oct. 22, 2014)	23
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Teva Pharm. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 555 F. App’x 961 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	18
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	31

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.