

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC. and MYLAN LABORATORIES
LIMITED,
Petitioner,

v.

UCB PHARMA GMBH,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00510
Patent 6,858,650 B1

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. Related Litigation4

III. The Petition.....5

IV. The ‘650 Patent and the ‘980 Patent Family6

 A. Specification and Claims of the ‘650 Patent6

 B. Critical Date for the ‘650 Patent6

 C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art7

 D. Claim Construction for the ‘650 Patent7

 E. Prosecution of the ‘650 Patent7

 F. The ‘980 Patent Family8

 G. Prosecution of the ‘980 Patent Family9

V. Additional References Informing the Scope and Content of the Prior Art11

 A. Lin & Lu (Ex. 2028).....11

 B. Brynne 1999 (Ex. 2029)12

 C. Ashworth (Ex. 1018).....13

 D. Bundgaard 1991 (Ex. 2015)14

VI. Claims 1-5 and 21-24 Are Not Invalid as Obvious Over the Combination of Postlind, the Bundgaard Publications, the Detrol® Label, and Berge.....15

 A. Only Hindsight Explains Why a Skilled Artisan Would Have Selected Tolterodine and Then Set It Aside in Favor of 5-HMT ...16

 1) Tolterodine Did Not Stand Out as a Lead Compound.....16

 2) Polymorphism Provided No Reason to Switch Focus from Tolterodine to 5-HMT18

 3) Any Adverse Events Associated with Detrol® (Tolterodine) Were, If Anything, Suggested as Tied to 5-HMT23

- B. Petitioner’s Own Prior Art Proves by a Preponderance That There Was No Expectation 5-HMT Would Have Insufficient Absorption or Bioavailability26
- C. There Was No Reason for a Skilled Artisan to Pursue a Prodrug Design to Address the Alleged Bioavailability Problem31
 - 1) A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Have Known that Prodrug Design Is Disfavored.....32
 - 2) No Prodrug Teaching Existed in the Relevant Chemical, Biological, or Medical Classes of Compounds.....34
- D. Petitioner’s References Neither Teach Nor Suggest the Specific Molecular Modifications to 5-HMT Resulting in Fesoterodine35
 - 1) Petitioner’s Suggestion to Synthesize and Test a Limited Number of “Simple” Alkyl Ester Prodrug Substituents Is Unsupported by the Prior Art.....37
 - 2) It Would Not Have Been Obvious for a Skilled Artisan to Modify the Phenolic 2-Position Carbon of 5-HMT.....41
 - 3) A Skilled Artisan Would Not Have Been Motivated To Use an Isobutyryl Ester and Would Have Had No Expectation of Success44
- E. Postlind Does Not Teach the (R) Enantiomer of Fesoterodine.....49
- F. Berge’s General Disclosure Does Not Render the Claimed Salts of Fesoterodine, Especially the Hydrogen Fumarate Salt Form, Obvious50
- G. The Prior Art Does Not Render Use of the Claimed Salts of Fesoterodine to Treat Overactive Bladder Obvious.....54

- VII. Claims 1-5 and 21-24 Are Not Invalid as Obvious Over the Combination of Brynne 1998, the Bundgaard Publications, and Johansson56
 - A. Brynne 1998 Would Not Have Motivated a Person of Skill to Set Aside Tolterodine and Focus on 5-HMT56
 - B. The Bundgaard Publications Fail for the Same Reasons Stated Above58
 - C. Johansson’s Statement that Enantiomers Are Possible Does Not Teach the (R) Enantiomer of Fesoterodine58

IPR2016-00510

Patent 6,858,650 B1

D. Johansson’s Mention of a Fumarate Salt Does Not Render the Claimed Salts of Fesoterodine or Their Use To Treat Overactive Bladder Obvious59

VIII. Secondary Considerations Support a Finding of Nonobviousness61

A. Fesoterodine Fumarate’s Unpredictable Properties Demonstrate the Non-Obviousness of Optimization.....61

B. Fesoterodine Fumarate (Toviaz®) Has Several Unexpected Beneficial Properties and Met a Long Felt Need in the Field.....64

IX. Conclusion66

Table of Patent Owner's Exhibits

- Ex. 2001 Memorandum Opinion, *Pfizer Inc. et al. v. Sandoz, Inc. et al*, 13-cv-01110 (D. Del.).
- Ex. 2002 Declaration of William R. Roush.
- Ex. 2003 C.V. of William R. Roush.
- Ex. 2004 Lisbeth Nilvebrant et al., Tolterodine – A New Bladder Selective Muscarinic Receptor Antagonist: Preclinical Pharmacological and Clinical Data, 60 Life Sciences 1129 (1997) (“Nilvebrant 1997 II”).
- Ex. 2005 British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology (2011), 72(2), 235-246 – “A comprehensive non-clinical evaluation of the CNS penetration potential of antimuscarinic agents for the treatment of overactive bladder”; E. Callegari, B. Malhotra, P. Bungay, R. Webster, K. Fenner, S. Kempshall, J. LaPerle, M. Michel, G. Kay (“Callegari 2011”).
- Ex. 2006 Trial Transcript, July 13-16, 2015, *Pfizer Inc. et al. v. Sandoz, Inc. et al*, 13-cv-01110 (D. Del.).
- Ex. 2007 The file history of United States Patent No. 7,384,980.
- Ex. 2008 Urodynamics: Principles, Practice and Application (1994), 43-70 – “Pharmacologic treatment of voiding dysfunction”; A.J. Wein, P.A. Longurst, R.M. Levin. (“Wein 1994”).
- Ex. 2009 Detrol® LA Label 2004.
- Ex. 2010 File History for U.S.P.N. 6,713,464.
- Ex. 2011 File History for U.S.P.N. 7,230,030.
- Ex. 2012 File History for U.S.P.N. 6,858,650.

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.