

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD  
\_\_\_\_\_

SANDOZ INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY,  
Patent Owner.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Case No. IPR2016-00318  
Patent No. 7,772,209  
\_\_\_\_\_

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**  
**UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... ii

I. BACKGROUND .....4

II. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE TRIAL.....5

    A. Trial Should Not be Instituted on Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18,  
    19, and 21 .....6

        1. The District Court Already Rejected the Very Line of  
        Arguments and References that Sandoz Raises Here .....6

        2. The Federal Circuit’s Decision on Appeal Will Virtually  
        Certainly Precede Any Decision on the Merits by this  
        Board ..... 12

        3. Trial Should Not Be Instituted on the Claims that Were  
        Litigated to the District Court and Which the Federal  
        Circuit Will Decide ..... 13

        4. Sandoz’s Attempt to Distinguish the District Court’s  
        Decision Is Without Merit ..... 18

    B. Trial Should Not Be Instituted on Claims 1-8, 11, 13, 16, 17,  
    20, and 22 ..... 19

III. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED  
AS TO GROUND 1 .....20

    A. Ground 1 Should Not Be Instituted Because Sandoz’s Proposed  
    Claim Construction of “Patient” Is Wrong .....21

    B. Ground 1 Should Not Be Instituted Because It Is Redundant .....29

CONCLUSION .....32

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**FEDERAL CASES**

*AVX Corp. v. Greatbatch Ltd.*, Case IPR2015-00710,  
2015 WL 4778529 (PTAB Aug. 12, 2005) .....7

*Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, No. 15–446, --- U.S. ---,  
2016 WL 205946 (U.S. Jan. 15, 2015).....22, 24

*Facebook, Inc. v. Pragmaus AV, LLC*, 582 F. App’x 864  
(Fed. Cir. 2014).....23

*Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*, --- F.3d ----, 2016 WL 798192  
(Fed. Cir. Mar. 1, 2016).....13

*In re Cipro Cases I & II*, 61 Cal. 4th 116 (Cal. 2015).....19

*In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC*, 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015),  
*cert. granted sub nom., Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, No. 15–  
446, --- U.S. ---, 2016 WL 205946 (U.S. Jan. 15, 2015).....24

*In re Swanson*, 540 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....19

*Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.*,  
Case CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) .....21, 30

*Nelson Prods., Inc. v. Bal Seal Eng’g, Inc.*, Case IPR2014-00573,  
2014 WL 4925284 (PTAB Sept. 29, 2014).....7

*Noven Pharm., Inc., et al., v. Novartis AG, et al.*,  
Case IPR2014-00549, 2015 WL 5782080 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2015) .....18

*Novo Nordisk A/S v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, No. 98-643, 1999 WL 1094213  
(D. Del. Nov. 18, 1999) .....28

*Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd. v. Vertex Pharms., Inc.*, Case IPR2013-00024,  
Paper No. 16 (Mar. 5, 2013) .....30

*Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm’t Am. LLC*, 669 F.3d 1362  
(Fed. Cir. 2012).....27

*Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels*, 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....24

*Valeo N. Am., Inc., et al., v. Magna Elecs., Inc.*, Case IPR2014-01204,  
2015 WL 410626 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015).....13

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R. § 42.107(c).....7

157 Cong. Rec. S952 (daily ed. Feb. 28, 2011).....14

35 U.S.C. § 315(b) .....5

Fed. R. App. P. 31(a)(1).....13

H. R. Rep. No. 112-98, pt. 1 (2011) .....15, 16

Sandoz’s Petition should be denied. Taken on its own terms, the Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that Sandoz would prevail as to at least one claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,772,209 (the “’209 patent”). That alone is reason enough not to institute trial.<sup>1</sup>

The Board should also decline to institute trial for an independent reason: essentially the same arguments—if not the identical arguments—that Sandoz raises concerning the validity of the ’209 patent have already been litigated in, and rejected by, a federal district court. This decision involved the same prior art that Sandoz raises in its grounds. Indeed, Sandoz even refers to purported “erroneous legal and factual findings” by the District Court as a reason to institute trial. Pet. at 4. But whether the District Court decision was erroneous is now squarely before the Federal Circuit. The appellate court will in all likelihood issue an opinion many months before any decision on the merits here, should trial be instituted. If Sandoz were correct that the District Court’s decision was erroneous, it is for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Patent Owner Lilly does not in this Preliminary Response seek to address the merits of Sandoz’s Petition, nor, necessarily, does it provide the evidence that it will rely on that shows that Sandoz’s contentions are without merit. Should trial be instituted, Lilly will address the merits and the nonobviousness of the ’209 patent in its Patent Owner Response.

# 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.