

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LOWER DRUG PRICES FOR CONSUMERS, LLC
Petitioner,

v.

FOREST LABORATORIES HOLDINGS LIMITED
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00379
Patent 6,545,040

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107
OF PATENT OWNER**

Table of Contents

I. Summary of the Argument1

II. Background of the Invention, the '040 Patent and the Prior Art.....4

A. Nebivolol.....4

B. The '040 Patent.....6

C. Effective Filing Date of the '040 Patent and Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....7

D. Prosecution History of the '040 Patent.....7

1. The Examiner Rejected the Claims as Obvious Over the '362 Patent.....7

2. The Board Found Substantial Evidence of Unexpected Results Rendered the Claims Non-Obvious 11

3. Further Prosecution Narrowed the Claims and Provided Additional Evidence of Non-Obviousness 13

E. The Primary Reference of the Grounds – the '362 Patent.....14

1. The '362 Patent Does Not Describe the Absolute Stereochemistry of Any of the Disclosed Compounds..... 16

2. The '362 Patent Does Not Describe RSSS-Nebivolol or the Combination of RSSS- and SRRR-Nebivolol 18

3. The '362 Patent Provides Biological Data Demonstrating Cardioselectivity for Many Compounds.....20

F. The Secondary References.....21

III. Claim Construction22

IV. The PTAB Should Dismiss the Petition and Not Institute Trial.....23

A. The Petition Fails to Set Forth a *Prima Facie* Showing of Obviousness of the Claims Over the '362 Patent24

1. The Petition Fails to Identify a Credible Basis for Selecting Compound 84 for Further Investigation24

a. The Arbitrary >15,000 Cardioselectivity Ratio Theory Is Inconsistent with the '362 Patent Disclosure28

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| b. | The Prior Art Does Not Support Petitioner’s Arbitrary >15,000 Relative Cardioselectivity Value as Being the Sole Selection Criteria for Investigating Compounds | 32 |
| c. | Petitioner’s Selection of Compound 84 Conflicts Even With Its Own Rationale for Selecting Compounds for Further Investigation..... | 35 |
| 2. | A Skilled Person Would Not Have Modified the Prior Art to Yield the Claimed Compound and Composition..... | 37 |
| B. | The Board Found Secondary Considerations Rendered the Contested Claims Not Obvious over the ’362 Patent..... | 44 |
| 1. | The Evidence Before the Board During Examination Established the Inventions of Claims 1 and 2 Had Significant Unexpected Results..... | 46 |
| 2. | The Petition Does Not Substantively Challenge the Evidence of Objective Considerations | 51 |
| C. | The Board Should Deny the Petition Under § 325(d)..... | 56 |
| V. | Conclusion | 60 |

Table of Authorities

| Cases | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Aventis Pharma Deutschland GMBH v. Lupin, Ltd.</i> , 499 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir 2007) | 38, 39, 40 |
| <i>Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000) | 53 |
| <i>Conoco, Inc. v. Energy & Env'tl. Int'l, L.C.</i> , 460 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 23 |
| <i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. Med. Components, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01660, Paper 9 (Feb. 9, 2016)..... | 28 |
| <i>Daiichi Sankyo Co., v. Matrix Labs.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010) | 24, 37 |
| <i>Forest Labs., Inc., v. Ivax Pharms., Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1263 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 44 |
| <i>Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 52 |
| <i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 1, 2016)..... | 28 |
| <i>Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. BP Chem. Ltd.</i> , 78 F.3d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1996) | 30 |
| <i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 54 |
| <i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skywork Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (Sept. 23, 2014)..... | 28 |
| <i>Knoll Pharm. Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 367 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 52 |
| <i>Neil Ziegman, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens</i> , IPR2015-01860, Paper 11 (Feb. 24, 2016)..... | 60 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH v. Glenmark Pharms., Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 52 |
| <i>Sensus USA, Inc. v. Certified Measurement LLC</i> , IPR2015-01311, Paper 13 (Dec. 8, 2015)..... | 28 |
| <i>Spectrum Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 802 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 38 |
| <i>Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.</i> , 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 24 |
| <i>Torrent Pharm. Ltd. v. Merck Frosst Canada & Co.</i> , IPR2014-00559, Paper 8 (Oct. 1, 2014) | 24 |
| <i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 22 |
| Statutes | |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103 | 40, 42 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) | 4, 24, 56, 60 |

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.