

Filed On Behalf Of:
Novartis AG

By:
Nicholas N. Kallas
NKallas@fchs.com
ZortressAfinitorIPR@fchs.com
(212) 218-2100

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

NOVARTIS AG,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00084

Patent No. 5,665,772

NOVARTIS'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Argument Overview	2
III.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3 And 10	6
A.	A POSA With Par’s Goals Would Not Have Been Motivated To Modify Rapamycin To Make Everolimus Nor Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Achieving Those Goals.....	6
1.	Lemke And Yalkowsky Do Not Provide A Motivation To Make Everolimus Nor A Reasonable Expectation Of Increasing Water Solubility	7
a.	Par Focuses On Lemke’s Teachings About Adding Hydroxyl Groups, But Adding Hydroxyl Groups To Rapamycin Would Not Lead To Everolimus	7
b.	Lemke Would Not Have Motivated A POSA To Add An Ethyleneoxy Because A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Have Increased Water Solubility.....	9
c.	Lemke Would Have Suggested Other Modifications To Rapamycin, Not The Addition Of An Ethyleneoxy.....	12
d.	Dr. Jorgensen’s New Deposition Arguments Do Not Reflect How A POSA Would Have Interpreted Lemke.....	14
e.	Dr. Jorgensen’s New Deposition Argument That Primary Alcohols Would Have Been Reasonably Expected To Impart Greater Solubility Than Secondary Alcohols Is Unsupported.....	16

f.	Yalkowsky’s Teachings Are Inapplicable To Rapamycin’s Or Everolimus’s Water Solubility.....	17
i.	Everolimus Is Not A Long-Chain Derivative Of A Rigid Molecule Under Yalkowsky.....	20
ii.	Dr. Jorgensen’s New Deposition Argument Is Unsupported As Figure 2 Only Applies To Long-Chain Derivatives.....	23
g.	Water Solubility Is Unpredictable	25
2.	Dr. Jorgensen’s Reliance On Polyethyleneoxy (PEG) Groups Is Not Supported Nor Relevant To The Addition Of A Single Ethyleneoxy Group To Rapamycin	26
3.	Par Has Not Established A Reasonable Expectation Of Increasing Rapamycin’s Water Solubility Sufficiently To Provide A Practical Benefit.....	29
4.	Conclusion	31
B.	Par Has Not Established That A POSA Would Have Been Motivated To Make Only The Three Specific Compounds Par Proposes, With A Reasonable Expectation That They Would Maintain Rapamycin’s Immunosuppressive Activity.....	31
1.	Prior Art Rapamycin Derivatives Were Not Limited To Those With Small C40 Groups.....	32
2.	The Structure Of Rapamycin Bound To FKBP-12 Would Not Have Led A POSA To Consider Only Small Substituents.....	36

3.	The Art As A Whole Would Have Taught A POSA To Synthesize Ester And Amide Derivatives, Not Avoid Them.....	38
4.	Par’s List Of Possible C40-Substituents Ignores Numerous Options A POSA Would Have Considered	40
5.	A POSA Would Not Have Expected Everolimus To Have Immunosuppressant Activity Comparable To Rapamycin With Improved Solubility As Par Suggests	42
C.	In Selecting Its Lead Compound, Par Ignored The Prior Art As A Whole.....	47
D.	Par Fails To Show A Motivation To Modify Rapamycin To Increase Water Solubility, Let Alone A Motivation To Do So By Chemical Synthesis Of Everolimus.....	50
1.	Contrary To Par’s Allegation, Morris Does Not Provide A Motivation To Improve Rapamycin’s Water Solubility	51
2.	Par Ignores Preferred Methods Of Addressing Water Solubility	53
E.	Par Fails To Show A Sufficient Motivation To Modify Rapamycin’s C40 Position Over Other Positions	55
F.	Par Fails To Show That A POSA Would Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Have Its Unique Combination Of Properties.....	56
1.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus’s Combination Of Immunosuppressive Properties	56
2.	A POSA Also Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus’s Observed Antitumor Activity.....	58

G.	Compelling Objective Indicia Further Support Non-Obviousness.....	60
1.	Everolimus’s Antitumor Properties Provide Evidence That Claims 1-3 And 10 Are Non-Obvious	61
a.	Everolimus Satisfied Long-Felt But Unmet Medical Needs In RCC And Breast Cancer	61
b.	Others Tried And Failed To Develop Effective Therapies For Advanced RCC And Breast Cancer	62
c.	Everolimus Unexpectedly Has FDA Approval For Six Antitumor Indications.....	63
d.	Everolimus Has Achieved Significant Commercial Success.....	66
e.	Everolimus Has Received Industry Praise	66
2.	Everolimus’s Immunosuppressant Properties Provide Evidence Of Non-Obviousness Of Claims 1-3 And 10	67
a.	Others Tried And Failed To Develop Rapamycin Derivatives For Preventing Transplant Rejection.....	67
b.	Everolimus Met A Long Felt Need For An Immunosuppressive Regimen For Liver Transplant Recipients	68
c.	Everolimus Has A Significantly Shorter Half-Life Than Rapamycin And Can Be Safely Co-Administered With Cyclosporin A	68
IV.	Ground 2: Claims 8 And 9.....	69
V.	Conclusion	71

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.