

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTELGEX CORP.

Petitioner

v.

ICOS CORP.

Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,943,166

Issued: September 13, 2005

Filed: April 26, 2000

Inventors: Pullman and Whitaker

Title: COMPOSITIONS COMPRISING PHOSPHODIESTERASE INHIBITORS
FOR THE TREATMENT OF SEXUAL DYSFUNCTION

Inter Partes Review No. - not yet assigned

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,943,166
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.1**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. OVERVIEW1

III. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)).....4

 A. Person of ordinary skill in the art.....4

 B. State of the art before April 30, 1999.....5

 1. Sexual dysfunction was a well-known disorder.....5

 2. Selectively inhibiting PDE5 was a known effective treatment for sexual dysfunction.....5

 3. Tadalafil was a known, potent, highly selective PDE5 inhibitor useful for treating sexual dysfunction.....9

 4. Identifying a drug's optimal dose range for therapeutic efficacy was routine practice in the art11

 C. The '166 patent14

 D. Claim Construction.....15

 1. "Compound having the structure"15

 2. "Female arousal disorder"16

 3. "Free drug"17

 E. Identification of the challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....17

 1. Ground 1: Claims 1-12 would have been obvious over Daugan '67520

 2. Ground 2: Claims 1-12 would have been obvious over Daugan '675 and the SNDA38

F. Objective indicia of non-obviousness47

1. Patent Owner's allegations of objective indicia are insufficient to show non-obviousness47

 a. Patent Owner cannot show unexpectedly superior results48

 b. Patent Owner's alleged evidence of unexpected results is not commensurate in scope with the claims52

2. There is no evidence that the art taught away from the claimed invention.....56

3. There was no long-felt need satisfied by the claimed invention ..56

4. There is no evidence of commercial success that supports patentability.....57

5. There is no other evidence of objective indicia of non-obviousness58

IV. CONCLUSION58

V. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A)) AND PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS59

VI. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1))59

I. INTRODUCTION

INTELGENX CORP. (Petitioner) petitions for *inter partes* review, seeking cancellation of claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,943,166 ("the '166 patent") (INX1001), as unpatentable for obviousness. According to USPTO records, the '166 patent is assigned to ICOS CORP. On information and belief, ICOS CORP. is owned by ELI LILLY AND CO. (collectively, "Patent Owner").

II. OVERVIEW

The '166 patent claims would have been obvious over the prior art—Daugan '675 (INX1002). Like every claim of the '166 patent, Daugan '675 is directed toward treating sexual dysfunction with a potent, highly-selective phosphodiesterase type 5 (PDE5) inhibitor known as tadalafil. INX1002, 1-5. Daugan '675 explicitly describes that tadalafil can be administered through a variety of dosage forms, across a range of doses, once or more a day to treat both male and female sexual dysfunction. INX1002, 1-5; 12-17. The only purported difference between Daugan '675 and the '166 patent claims is that Daugan '675 discloses a dosing range of 0.2–400 mg whereas the '166 patent more narrowly claims 1–20 mg. When "there is a range disclosed in the prior art, and the claimed invention falls within that range, there is a presumption of obviousness." *Iron Grip Barbell Co., Inc. v. USA Sports, Inc.*, 392 F.3d 1317, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Patent Owner argued during prosecution that the range claimed by the '166

patent is non-obvious due to the "unexpected result" that administering a lower dose of tadalafil resulted in lower side effects without a loss of efficacy.

INX1024, 536-538, 612-614. But Patent Owner's argument should be rejected for several reasons. First, there is no evidence of record that a person skilled in the art ("POSA") would have been surprised to discover that a lower dose of tadalafil would be associated with reduced side effects. To the contrary, these are merely differences in degree of results (rather than differences in kind), which would be very much expected by a pharmacologist or similar skilled artisan. INX1007, ¶47. Indeed, the Examiner rejected this argument for the same reasons. INX1024, 628. Second, identifying the optimum dosing regimen for a drug such as tadalafil would have required only routine experimentation and optimization. INX1007, ¶¶16-17, 27-33; INX1005, ¶¶60, 84-89. Indeed, before 1999 and even today, it is commonplace when seeking approval for a new drug to conduct a dose-ranging study to establish a safe and effective dosing regimen. A POSA following the teachings of Daugan '675 and accepted industry practices would have quickly and easily arrived at the range of 1-20 mg as set forth in Ground 1. INX1007, ¶47. Third, even if Patent Owner's evidence of alleged unexpected results is given any weight, the evidence is not commensurate with the full scope of the claims. INX1007, ¶¶51-53; INX1005, ¶¶ 156-158. The broadest claim of the '166 patent covers doses as low as one twentieth of the 20 mg dose, covers administration

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.