

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
TEVA PARENTERAL MEDICINES, INC., )  
APP PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC, )  
PLIVA HRVATSKA D.O.O., )  
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., )  
and BARR LABORATORIES, INC., )  
)  
Defendants. )

CASE NO. 1:10-CV-1376-TWP-DKL

**DEFENDANTS' OPENING POST-TRIAL BRIEF REGARDING  
THE INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,772,209**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	vii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	2
I.    The Science Of Folates And Antifolates .....	2
II.   The Public History Of The Development Of Antifolates With Vitamins .....	3
A.    Lilly Conceives Of, Patents, And Publishes In The Prior Art The Idea To Use Folic Acid Supplementation With Its Antifolates In The 1990s.....	4
B.    Dr. Niyikiza’s Research Regarding Predicting, And Finding Ways Of Reducing, Pemetrexed’s Toxicity Was Disclosed To The Public .....	5
1.    Dr. Niyikiza’s Conclusions Were Published Before A Patent Application Was Filed.....	6
2.    Preclinical And Clinical Studies Disclosed Using Folic Acid With Pemetrexed .....	8
3.    Additional Information Was Publicly Known About Pemetrexed’s Promising Activity And Toxicity Profile As Of June 1999 .....	10
III.   The ‘209 Patent And Litigation .....	11
INVALIDITY OF THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE ‘209 PATENT .....	12
I.    Each Of The Asserted Claims Of The ‘209 Patent Is Obvious .....	12
A.    Worzalla Or Hammond Teach The Use Of Folic Acid Pretreatment With Pemetrexed .....	13
B.    A POSA Would Be Motivated To Add Vitamin B12 To The Folic Acid Pretreatment Regimen Taught In Worzalla Or Hammond .....	14
1.    A POSA Would Be Motivated To Add Vitamin B12 Pretreatment To Reduce Pemetrexed-Related Toxicity .....	15

2.	A POSA Would Be Motivated To Add Vitamin B12 Pretreatment For Additional Reasons.....	17
C.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Remove The Folic Acid Pretreatment Regimen Taught In Worzalla or Hammond.....	18
1.	Worzalla Confirms The Benefits Of Folic Acid Supplementation.....	18
2.	Hammond Does Not Teach That Folic Acid Supplementation Decreases Pemetrexed’s Efficacy.....	21
3.	The ‘974 Patent Teaches A POSA That Folic Acid Supplementation Is Beneficial To Pemetrexed Therapy.....	24
4.	Theoretical Concerns Regarding Folic Acid’s Impact On Pemetrexed’s Efficacy Would Not Discourage A POSA From Practicing Folic Acid Pretreatment With Pemetrexed.....	25
D.	The Prior Art Did Not Teach Away From Adding Vitamin B12 To The Folic Acid Pretreatment Regimen Of Worzalla Or Hammond.....	26
E.	The Claimed Doses And Schedules For Administering Folic Acid And Vitamin B12 Do Not Confer Any Novelty To The ‘09 Patent Claims.....	29
1.	The Claimed Doses Of Folic Acid And Vitamin B12 Are Obvious.....	31
2.	The Claimed Schedules For Administering Folic Acid And Vitamin B12 Are Obvious.....	33
F.	A POSA Would Have A Reasonable Expectation Of Success That The Claimed Pretreatment Regimen Would Provide A Therapeutic Benefit.....	33
G.	Lilly’s Argument That A POSA Would Have Used Other Methods Of Reducing Pemetrexed’s Toxicity In Place Of Folic Acid And Vitamin B12 Supplementation Is Both Factually And Legally Wrong.....	35
II.	Each Asserted Claim Is Invalid For Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	36
III.	Secondary Considerations Do Not Support The Nonobviousness Of The Claimed Methods Of Use.....	39
A.	Lilly’s Evidence Of Skepticism Is Entitled To Little, If Any, Weight.....	40

1.	The FDA’s Statements Regarding Lilly’s Compliance With Federal Regulations Is Not Relevant Evidence Of Skepticism .....	40
2.	Lilly Represented To The FDA That It And Its External Consultants Were Not Skeptical About The Efficacy Of The Claimed Methods.....	41
3.	Statements By Lilly’s Litigation Experts Years After The Relevant Date Are Not Probative Of Skepticism .....	42
B.	There is No Evidence That The Asserted Claims Have Unexpected Results Or Properties .....	43
1.	The Closest Prior Art Is The Folic Acid Regimen Disclosed In The Hammond Study .....	43
2.	The Claimed Regimen Has No Unexpected Results Or Properties Over The Hammond regimen.....	44
IV.	The Asserted Claims Of The ‘209 Patent Do Not Meet The Requirements Of 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph.....	46
A.	The Asserted ‘209 Patent Claims Are Not Adequately Described.....	47
B.	The Asserted ‘209 Patent Claims Are Not Enabled .....	48
	CONCLUSION .....	50

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	34
<i>Allergan, Inc., v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	12, 14, 40
<i>Allergan Inc. v. Watson Labs</i> , 869 F. Supp. 2d 456 (D. Del. 2012) .....	42
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....	47
<i>AstraZeneca Pharms. LP v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 583 F.3d 766 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	43
<i>Aventis Pharma Deutschland GmbH v. Lupin, Ltd.</i> , 499 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	27
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms. Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	36, 40
<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	14
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 923 F. Supp. 2d 602 (D. Del. 2013) .....	42, 43
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	21
<i>Dow Jones &amp; Co. v. Ablaise Ltd.</i> , 606 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	41
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	37
<i>Fina Oil &amp; Chem. Co. v. Ewen</i> , 123 F.3d 1466 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	31
<i>Geneva Pharms., Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC</i> , 349 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	36
<i>Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. U.S. Gypsum Co.</i> , 195 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	37-38

# 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.