

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
I. LILLY HAS FAILED TO REBUT DEFENDANTS’ CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT THE CLAIMS ARE INVALID FOR OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING .....	2
II. LILLY DOES NOT ADDRESS MUCH OF THE EVIDENCE ADDUCED AT TRIAL ON OBVIOUSNESS .....	4
III. LILLY MISSTATES AND MISAPPLIES THE LAW OF OBVIOUSNESS IN ATTEMPTING TO DEFEND THE NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE ‘209 PATENT.....	8
A. Lilly Attempts To Improperly Create A “Lead Reference” Requirement.....	8
B. Lilly Seeks To Require An Explicit Motivation In The Prior Art But The Supreme Court Rejected That Standard. ....	9
C. Lilly Misapplies The Proper Meaning Of “Teaching Away”.....	11
D. Lilly Improperly Focuses On Isolated Vitamin B12 References Rather Than On The Prior Art As A Whole.....	12
E. Lilly Improperly Relies On Defendants’ ANDA To Suggest That The Claimed Doses Of Vitamins Are Not Arbitrary.....	12
IV. LILLY HAS ABANDONED ALL BUT TWO SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS, NEITHER OF WHICH SUPPORT THE NONOBVIOUSNESS OF THE ‘209 PATENT CLAIMS .....	13
V. IF THE COURT AGREES WITH LILLY’S INTERPRETATION OF THE PRIOR ART, THEN THE ‘209 PATENT SPECIFICATION IS DEFICIENT .....	14

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	10
<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	9, 13
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	9
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	11
<i>Eisai Co. Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	8
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 619 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	9
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , No. 2013-1034, 2013 WL 6483704 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 11, 2013) .....	8, 9
<i>In re '318 Patent Infringement Litig.</i> , 583 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	15
<i>In re Gardner</i> , 427 F.2d 786 (C.C.P.A. 1970).....	15
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	9
<i>In re Hasse</i> , 2013 WL 5813645 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 30, 2013) .....	3
<i>In re Napier</i> , 55 F.3d 610 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	11, 12
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	9, 10
<i>Metso Minerals, Inc. v. Powerscreen Int'l Distrib., Ltd.</i> , Nos. 2011-1572, 2012-1168, 2012-1169, 2013 WL 1969309 (Fed. Cir. May 14, 2013) .....	10
<i>Mutual Pharm. Co., Inc. v. Bartlett</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2466 (2013) .....	13

*Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech. Inc.*,  
463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ..... 3

*Pliva, Inc., v. Mensing*,  
131 S. Ct. 2567 (2011) ..... 13

*Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP v. Mutual Pharm. Co., Inc.*,  
642 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ..... 13

**STATUTES**

21 U.S.C. § 355 ..... 12

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

21 CFR § 314.94..... 12, 13

**TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Document Description</b>
<b><u>General</u></b>	
“Defendants”	Teva Parenteral Medicines, Inc., APP Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Pliva Hrvatska D.O.O., Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., and Barr Laboratories, Inc.,
“Def. Br.”	Defendants’ Opening Post-Trial Brief Regarding The Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 7,772,209 (D.I. 331)
“Lilly”/”Eli Lilly”	Eli Lilly and Company
“Asserted Claims”	Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21 of the ‘209 patent
“Pl. Br.”	Plaintiff Eli Lilly And Company’s Post-Trial Brief (D.I. 332)
“POSA”	Person of ordinary skill in the art
“TX”	Trial Exhibit
<b><u>Testimony</u></b>	
“Ratain Tr.”	Trial testimony of Dr. Mark J. Ratain
“Green Tr.”	Trial testimony of Dr. Ralph Green
“Niyikiza Tr.”	Trial testimony of Clet Niyikiza
“Chabner Tr.”	Trial testimony of Dr. Bruce A. Chabner
“Calvert Dep. Tr.”	Deposition testimony of Dr. A. Hilary Calvert
<b><u>Patents</u></b>	
“the ‘209 patent”/”patent-in-suit”	U.S. Patent No. 7,772,209 (TX 1)
“the ‘974 patent”	U.S. Patent No. 5,217,974 (TX 916)
<b><u>Compounds, Enzymes, and Conferences</u></b>	

# 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.