

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

OSI PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., PFIZER
INC., and GENENTECH, INC.,

Plaintiffs/Counterclaim Defendants,

v.

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC. and
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,

Defendants/Counterclaim Plaintiffs.

C.A. No. 09-00185-SLR

DEFENDANT MYLAN'S POST-TRIAL REPLY BRIEF

John C. Phillips, Jr. (#110)
Megan Haney (#5016)
PHILLIPS, GOLDMAN & SPENCE, P.A.
1200 North Broom Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19806
Tel: (302) 655-4200
Fax: (302) 655-4210
jcp@pgslaw.com
mch@pgslaw.com

James H. Wallace, Jr.
Mark A. Pacella
Matthew J. Dowd
Adrienne Johnson
WILEY REIN LLP
1776 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: (202) 719-7000

*Attorneys for Defendant Mylan
Pharmaceuticals Inc.*

Date: October 7, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. SUMMARY OF THE REPLY	1
II. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE RE '065 PATENT ARE OBVIOUS	2
A. Zeneca's Prior Art Suggested Erlotinib Among Other Obvious EGFR Inhibitors	2
1. Plaintiffs Mischaracterize Dr. Heathcock's Analysis And Opinion	3
2. Plaintiffs Ignore That The Limited Biological Data In The '226 Application Was Of Little Value In Selecting Preferred Compounds	7
3. The Testimony Of Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Bridges Is Flawed Because He Relied On Non-Prior Art.....	9
4. Zeneca's Barker Abstracts Provided An Explicit Reason To Modify The 3'-Position And Create Erlotinib	11
5. Pfizer's Own Patents Confirm That An Ethynyl Group Is Used Routinely By Medicinal Chemists	13
6. Plaintiffs Offered No Evidence To Challenge The Obviousness Of The Hydrochloride Salt Of Erlotinib	13
B. Plaintiffs' Evidence of Alleged Secondary Factors Does Not Overcome The Obviousness Of Erlotinib Based On The Zeneca Prior Art.....	14
1. Plaintiffs Rely On A Legally Flawed Comparison To A Non-Prior Art Compound And Thus Offered No Relevant Evidence of Increased Potency	14
2. Plaintiffs Offered No Relevant Evidence Of Unexpected Effectiveness Against Pancreatic Cancer.....	16
3. Plaintiffs Point To No Relevant Expert Testimony Concerning The Metabolism Of Erlotinib.....	16
4. Plaintiffs' Commercial Success Evidence Is Irrelevant To The RE '065 Patent And, In Any Event, Is Insufficient To Overcome The Strong <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness Based On The Zeneca Prior Art	17
5. Plaintiffs' Evidence Of Alleged Failures Of Others Is Insufficient To Overcome Obviousness	19
III. Claim 53 Of The '221 Patent Is Anticipated	20
A. Plaintiffs' Expert Never Identified A Single Element Of Claim 53 Not Disclosed In The '498 Patent.....	20
B. Plaintiffs Cannot Overcome Anticipation By Ignoring Relevant Precedent	22
C. The 1998 Cold Spring Harbor Abstract Also Anticipates Claim 53	23

IV. Claim 53 Of The ‘221 Patent Is Obvious..... 24

A. Plaintiffs Ignore The Plethora Of Prior Art Suggesting The Use Of Erlotinib To Treat NSCLC..... 24

B. Plaintiffs’ Definition Of A “Success” As Obtaining FDA Approval Is Without Legal Support..... 26

C. The Well-Known Relationship Between EGFR Expression And NSCLC Continues Today, Despite Plaintiffs’ Misplaced Attempt To Ignore It..... 27

D. Plaintiffs’ Secondary Factors Fail To Rebut The Obviousness Of Claim 53 28

V. CONCLUSION..... 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commission</i> , 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	22, 23
<i>Aventis Pharma Deutschland GmbH v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , No. 2:05-cv-421, 2006 WL 2008962 (E.D. Va. July 17, 2006).....	20
<i>Aventis Pharma Deutschland GmbH v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , 403 F. Supp. 2d 484 (E.D. 2005)	20
<i>Celeritas Technologies, Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	21
<i>Datascope Corp. v. SMEC, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 320 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	5
<i>In re Deters</i> , 515 F.2d 1152 (C.C.P.A. 1975)	16
<i>DiscoVision Associates v. Disc Manufacturing, Inc.</i> , 25 F. Supp. 2d 301 (D. Del. 1998).....	24
<i>In re Dow Chemical Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	29
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.</i> , No. IP 02-0512-C-B/S, 2004 WL 1724632 (S.D. Ind. July 29, 2004)	20
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Barr Laboratories, Inc.</i> , 437 F.3d 1181 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	16
<i>Forest Laboratories, Inc. v. Ivax Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 438 F. Supp. 2d 479 (D. Del. 2006).....	11
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	21
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	7, 15, 18
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	19

Ex parte Humber,
 217 U.S.P.Q. 265 (Pat. & Tr. Off. Bd. App. 1981).....15

Inline Connection Corp. v. AOL Time Warner Inc.,
 470 F. Supp. 2d 424 (D. Del. 2007).....10

Koito Manufacturing Co., Ltd. v. Turn-Key-Tech, LLC,
 381 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....14

KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....5

Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.,
 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....18

In re Merck & Co.,
 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....26

Net MoneyIN, Inc., v. VeriSign, Inc.,
 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....22, 23

Oxford Gene Technology Ltd. v. Mergen Ltd.,
 345 F. Supp. 2d 431 (D. Del. 2004).....10

In re Payne,
 606 F.2d 303 (C.C.P.A. 1979)15

Purdue Pharma Products L.P. v. Par Pharmaceutical, Inc.,
 642 F. Supp. 2d 329 (D. Del. 2009).....17

Rasmusson v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.,
 413 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....21

Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.,
 550 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....22

Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.,
 720 F. Supp. 2d 427 (D. Del. 2010).....20

Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.,
 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....16

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102.....10, 30

35 U.S.C. § 103.....30

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.