

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. Nos. 09-00185 and 00186
(consolidated)

DEFENDANT MYLAN'S OPENING POST-TRIAL 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: July 7, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I.	NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS	1
II.	SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	1
III.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	3
A.	The Patents-In-Suit	3
1.	The '065 Patent	3
2.	The '221 Patent	4
B.	Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor (EGFR) Research In The 1990s	6
1.	EGFR And EGFR Inhibitors.....	6
2.	Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) And Its Association With EGFR Overexpression	6
C.	The Development Of Potent And Selective EGFR Inhibitors	7
1.	The Best Method To Make New EGFR Inhibitors Was To Start With Known Inhibitors	8
2.	Zeneca's '226 Application Identified 4-Anilinoquinazolines As Preferred EGFR Inhibitors	9
3.	Zeneca's '226 Application Had A Gap Not Covering Ethynyl	12
a.	An Ethynyl Group Is Closely Related To A Methyl Group	13
b.	The Ethynyl Gap In The Zeneca '226 Application.....	14
4.	Zeneca Inventor Barker's Abstracts Fill The Gap By Teaching "Small, Non-Polar" Groups At The 3'-Position	14
a.	Barker Twice Suggested That "Small, Non-Polar" Groups Are Preferred At The 3'-Position.....	15
b.	An Ethynyl Group Is A Small, Non-Polar Group, As Defined In The Barker Abstracts	16
c.	The Barker Abstracts, Considered Together With Zeneca's '226 Application, Suggested Which 4-Anilinoquinazolines Were The Best EGFR Inhibitors Not Covered By The '226 Application.....	16
D.	Pfizer Followed Zeneca's Road Map.....	17
1.	Pfizer Used High Throughput Screening And High Speed Synthesis To Identify EGFR Inhibitors	17
2.	Zeneca Scooped Pfizer No Less Than Three Times	18

3.	Pfizer Tried To “Rebound” By Analyzing Zeneca’s ‘226 Application And Identifying A Gap	20
4.	Pfizer Made Erlotinib Just Months After Barker Suggested Small, Non-Polar Groups At The 3’-Position	21
E.	Soon After The Erlotinib Patent Application Was Filed, Pfizer And OSI Told The World About Using Erlotinib For Treating NSCLC.....	21
1.	Pfizer’s ‘498 Patent Disclosed And Claimed The Use Of Erlotinib For Lung Cancer, Including NSCLC	22
2.	In The 1998 Cold Spring Harbor Abstract, Pfizer And OSI Scientists Taught The Use Of Erlotinib For NSCLC.....	23
3.	OSI, Pfizer, and Others Reported Erlotinib’s Development for NSCLC.....	24
a.	The 1997 AACR Abstracts (DTX 8) and Moyer Cancer Research Article (DTX 34).....	24
b.	The 1997 Klohs Article In <i>Current Opinion In Oncology</i> (DTX 389).....	26
c.	The 1997 OSI Press Release (DTX 63)	26
d.	The OSI 10-K SEC Filing (DTX 427).....	27
e.	The 1999 ASCO Abstracts (DTX 205A).....	27
4.	By 1999, The Idea Of Using Erlotinib To Treat NSCLC Was Well Known To The Public.....	28
IV.	ARGUMENT	28
A.	The Legal Standard For Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	29
B.	The Asserted Claims Of The ‘065 Patent Are Obvious.....	30
1.	A Medicinal Chemist Would Have Used A Small, Non-Polar Group, Such As Ethynyl, To Modify The Closest Prior Art Compound, Thus Making Erlotinib	31
a.	The Obvious Starting Point Was The 4-Anilinoquinazolines Of Zeneca’s ‘226 Application.....	32
b.	Zeneca’s ‘226 Application Suggested Preferred Groups For EGFR Inhibitors.....	34
c.	Barker Provides an Express Motivation To Use A Small, Non-Polar Group, Such As Ethynyl, At The 3’-Position.....	34
d.	The Prior Art Confirms The Use Of Ethynyl Groups In Pharmaceutical Compounds.....	35
2.	All Asserted Claims Of The ‘065 Patent Are Obvious.....	37

3.	Plaintiffs’ Asserted Secondary Considerations Do Not Overcome The Prima Facie Obviousness Of The Claims Of The ‘065 Patent	37
a.	Plaintiffs Offered No Relevant Evidence Of Unexpected Results And Ignored The Closest Prior Art Compound— Example 51 Of The Zeneca ‘226 Application	38
b.	To Claim Alleged Unexpected Results, Plaintiffs Erroneously Rely On The Testimony Of A Pancreatic Oncologist, But A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Pertinent To The ‘065 Patent Is A Medicinal Chemist.....	40
c.	Plaintiffs Have Not Proven That Others Tried But Failed To Make Erlotinib.....	42
d.	Weak And Irrelevant Evidence Of Commercial Success Is Insufficient To Rebut Erlotinib’s Obviousness.....	43
e.	Erlotinib Has Not Satisfied A Long-Felt Need.....	46
f.	No Evidence Of Skepticism Of Others.....	47
C.	Claim 53 Of The ‘221 Patent Is Anticipated	48
1.	Anticipation Occurs When A Prior Art Reference Discloses The Claimed Invention.....	48
2.	The ‘498 Patent Discloses Each And Every Limitation Of Claim 53.....	49
3.	The 1998 Cold Spring Harbor Abstract Also Discloses Each And Every Limitation Of Claim 53 And Renders The Claim Invalid.....	52
4.	Instead Of Disputing What Is In The Prior Art, Plaintiffs’ Experts Chose Not To Believe What Was In The Prior Art	52
D.	Claim 53 Of The ‘221 Patent Is Obvious.....	54
1.	All Elements Of Claim 53 Were Disclosed In Various Prior Art References.....	54
2.	By 1999, A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Have Reasonably Expected Erlotinib To Be Effective In Treating NSCLC.....	56
3.	Plaintiffs’ Asserted Secondary Factors Cannot Overcome The Obviousness Of Claim 53	58
V.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	39
<i>Altana Pharma AG v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 999, 1007 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	31
<i>Aventis Pharma Deutschland GmbH v. Lupin, Ltd.</i> , No. No. 2:05-CV-421, 2006 WL 2008962 (E.D. Va. July 17, 2006).....	46, 60
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	39
<i>In re De Blauwe</i> , 736 F.2d 699 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	39
<i>In re Dillon</i> , 919 F.2d 688 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc).....	31
<i>DiscoVision Assocs. v. Disc. Mfg., Inc.</i> , 25 F. Supp. 2d 301 (D. Del. 1998).....	52
<i>In re Donohue</i> , 766 F.2d 531 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	49, 52
<i>In re Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	47
<i>In re Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 902 F.2d 943 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	42
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	50
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	38, 58
<i>Geo M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Int'l LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	48
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	49, 53

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.