

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS X LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

ANACOR PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2015-01776
Patent No. 7,582,621

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION	10
A. Treating onychomycosis requires a compound with selective toxicity	10
B. A POSA would have been concerned about the toxicity of tavaborole, a boron-containing compound.....	11
C. Anacor defied the conventional wisdom in developing KERYDIN	18
D. The '621 Patent	20
III. PETITIONER HAS NOT OFFERED TESTIMONY PROBATIVE OF THE VIEWS OF A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART AT THE TIME OF THE INVENTION	21
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF “THERAPEUTICALLY EFFECTIVE AMOUNT”	24
V. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO MEET ITS BURDEN OF PROVING THAT THE CLAIMS OF THE '621 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	26
A. Both Grounds fail because <i>Austin</i> is not analogous art.....	27
1. <i>Austin</i> and the '621 Patent are not from the same field of endeavor	28
2. <i>Austin</i> is not reasonably pertinent to the problem solved by the '621 Patent	31
3. Even if <i>Austin</i> were analogous art, there is no basis to conclude that a POSA would have selected tavaborole from among <i>Austin</i> 's multitude of compounds	33

B.	Petitioner has not established that Claims 1-12 are unpatentable over <i>Austin</i> and <i>Brehove</i> (Ground 1)	35
1.	Even if <i>Austin</i> and <i>Brehove</i> were combined, that combination would not disclose every limitation of any claim.....	35
2.	A POSA in 2005 would understand that <i>Brehove</i> is not credible.....	36
3.	Petitioner has not shown that there would have been reason to combine <i>Austin</i> and <i>Brehove</i>	41
a)	<i>Austin</i> and <i>Brehove</i> concern structurally different compounds.....	41
b)	Neither <i>Austin</i> nor <i>Brehove</i> discloses any activity against dermatophytes	43
c)	The goal of transungual delivery does not establish a reason to combine <i>Austin</i> and <i>Brehove</i> with a reasonable expectation of success in achieving transungual delivery	47
4.	Long-standing concerns about tavaborole's toxicity preclude a reasonable expectation of success in combining <i>Austin</i> and <i>Brehove</i>	50
5.	Under Petitioner's theory that boron-containing compounds share similar functional features, <i>Freeman</i> establishes that a POSA would have expected <i>Brehove</i> 's dioxaborinanes to be unsafe and ineffective for therapeutic antifungal use	53
C.	Petitioner has not established that Claims 1-12 are unpatentable over <i>Austin</i> and <i>Freeman</i> (Ground 2)	54
1.	Ground 2 fails for many of the same reasons as Ground 1.....	54
2.	<i>Freeman</i> negates a reasonable expectation of success because PBAs were shown to be toxic and appeared to be ineffective.....	55

VI. UNEXPECTED RESULTS COMPEL A FINDING OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS..... 60

VII. OBJECTIVE INDICIA CONFIRM NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 1-12..... 61

 A. KERYDIN succeeded—where others failed—in meeting the long-felt need for a safe and effective topical onychomycosis treatment..... 61

 B. KERYDIN has received praise in the industry 63

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	27
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	27, 30
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VI LLC v. Celgene Corp.</i> , IPR2015-01092, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 25, 2015).....	64
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VI LLC v. Celgene Corp.</i> , IPR2015-01169, Paper No. 22 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 16, 2015).....	42
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>reh'g en banc denied</i> , 793 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>cert. granted</i> , 136 S. Ct. 890.....	24
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	26
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 619 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	50
<i>Freund Indus. Co. v. Driam Metallprodukt GmbH & Co.</i> , No. 88 Civ. 3605, 1989 WL 88704 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 1989).....	30
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	36
<i>Hughes Network Sys., LLC v. Elbit Sys. Land and C4I Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-00135, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 27, 2016)	4
<i>In re ICON Health and Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	25

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.