

Filed on behalf of: Aventis Pharma S.A.

By:

Dominick A. Conde
dconde@fchs.com
(212) 218-2100

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN LABORATORIES LIMITED

Petitioner,

v.

AVENTIS PHARMA S.A.

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00627
U.S. Patent No. 5,847,170

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY PATENT OWNER PURSUANT TO 37
C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION	4
	A. The Development of the '170 Patent	5
	B. The '170 Prosecution History	6
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	12
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
V.	LEGAL STANDARD	14
VI.	MYLAN'S ARGUMENTS ARE BASED ON IMPROPER HINDSIGHT	16
VII.	MYLAN FAILS TO PROPERLY APPLY LEAD COMPOUND ANALYSIS.....	18
	A. Mylan fails to establish that a POSA would have selected taxanes as a reasonable starting point for further modification.....	19
	B. Mylan fails to establish motivation to modify Kant Compound 20 or docetaxel to obtain the specific claimed compound	20
	1. Mylan fails to establish that a POSA would have sought to increase lipophilicity of taxanes.....	20
	2. Mylan fails to establish that a POSA would have had a reasonable expectation that cabazitaxel would successfully increase cytotoxicity and activity against drug resistant cell lines	26

3.	Mylan improperly suggests a POSA would make changes to substitutions of the Klein compounds that were key to those disclosures.....	27
VIII.	MYLAN'S ALLEGED INVALIDITY GROUNDS.....	30
A.	Ground 1: The Board should not institute review based on the alleged obviousness over Kant in view of Klein.....	30
1.	Mylan fails to show a POSA would have selected Kant Compound 20 as a lead compound	31
2.	There is no basis for Mylan to focus on activity of compounds with C-7/C-9 modifications in Klein and even if a POSA did, Mylan fails to show why one would have used only Klein's C-7 modification without also making the C-9 modification	34
3.	Mylan provides no reason why a POSA would eliminate the C-9 hydroxyl of Klein where that modification improves solubility	36
B.	Ground 2: The Board should not institute review based on the alleged obviousness over Colin in view of Kant and Klein	38
1.	Colin does not establish docetaxel as a lead compound.....	38
2.	Kant and Klein do not motivate C-7 or C-10 methylation.....	40
IX.	MYLAN FAILS TO REBUT OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	44
A.	It was unexpected that cabazitaxel would show anti-tumor efficacy in cancer resistant cell lines in spite of being a P-gp substrate	44
B.	Cabazitaxel met a long-felt need for anti-cancer agent capable of overcoming multidrug resistance.....	47

C. Failure of others.....48

D. The pharmaceutical industry has praised Jevtana[®]49

E. At least nine companies have copied Jevtana[®], which is covered by the '170 patent51

F. Jevtana[®] is a commercial success.....51

X. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED ON REDUNDANT GROUNDS53

XI. CONCLUSION.....54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Abbott Labs v. Syntron Bioresearch Inc.</i> , 334 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	30
<i>Apple, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	44
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	36
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Park Cheese & Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	36
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	17, 19, 27, 28
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Tech. LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	14
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	44
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	36
<i>In re Soni</i> , 54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	46
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	15, 17
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharms., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 348 F.Supp.2d 713 (N.D. W. Va. 2004).....	51
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co., Ltd. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	15, 16, 20
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	14
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	20, 24, 25
<i>Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1075(Fed. Cir. 2008)	18

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.