

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Defendants.

C.A. Nos. 09-185-SLR, 09-186-SLR  
(Consolidated)

**PLAINTIFFS' POST-TRIAL ANSWERING BRIEF**

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)  
Maryellen Noreika (#3208)  
Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP  
1201 N. Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899-1347  
(302) 658-9200  
[jblumenfeld@mnat.com](mailto:jblumenfeld@mnat.com)  
[mnoreika@mnat.com](mailto:mnoreika@mnat.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
OSI Pharmaceuticals Inc., Pfizer Inc. and  
Genentech Inc.*

*Of Counsel*

Leora Ben-Ami  
Benjamin Hsing  
Daniel Boglioli  
Sapna W. Palla  
Kaye Scholer LLP  
425 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

September 6, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
1. Mylan Has a Heightened Burden.....	1
2. Mylan Failed to Demonstrate <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness of Erlotinib .....	1
3. Mylan Failed to Show Anticipation or Obviousness of Claim 53 of the '221 Patent.....	2
4. Objective Indicia Support Finding of Non-Obviousness.....	3
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	3
I. NATURE OF THE PROCEEDING .....	3
II. PATENTS-IN-SUIT .....	4
A. The RE '065 Patent .....	4
B. The '221 Patent .....	4
III. ERLOTINIB STRUCTURE.....	4
IV. THE DISCOVERY OF ERLOTINIB.....	5
A. Pfizer's Discovery of the 4-Anilinoquinazoline Core .....	5
B. Pfizer's Strategy to Modify the 4-Anilinoquinazoline Core.....	6
C. Pfizer's Response to the Zeneca '226 Application.....	7
D. Pfizer's Discovery of the 6,7-Dimethoxyethoxy Tails .....	9
E. Pfizer's Discovery of the Ethynyl Substituent.....	10
F. Pfizer's Discovery of Erlotinib .....	12
G. Pfizer Was Not Able to Find A Compound Superior to Erlotinib.....	13
V. THE WORK OF OTHER PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES IN 1994-1995.....	14
VI. FAILED CLINICAL EGFR TYROSINE KINASE INHIBITOR CANDIDATES.....	15
VII. PFIZER'S DISCOVERY OF ERLOTINIB FOR THE TREATMENT OF NSCLC.....	16
VIII. THE ROLE OF EGFR OVEREXPRESSION WAS NOT CLEAR IN 1999 .....	18
IX. FDA APPROVED ERLOTINIB FOR NSCLC AND PANCREATIC CANCER.....	20
ARGUMENT .....	20

I.	MYLAN HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT THE RE '065 PATENT WAS OBVIOUS.....	21
A.	Mylan Has Not Demonstrated <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness.....	22
1.	Mylan Has a Heightened Burden Because Its Prior Art References Were Before the Patent Examiner.....	22
2.	Dr. Heathcock's Opinions Are Fundamentally Flawed.....	23
3.	Dr. Heathcock's Remaining Opinions Are Contrary to the Teachings of the Prior Art and What People of Ordinary Skill Actually Did.....	25
4.	Mylan Fails to Demonstrate that the "Salt" Claims Were Obvious.....	40
B.	Even If Mylan Could Show <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness, Evidence Of The Unexpected Properties of Erlotinib Would Establish Non-Obviousness .....	41
1.	Erlotinib Has Unexpectedly Superior Potency Compared to the Closest Prior Art .....	42
2.	Erlotinib's Metabolism Was Unexpected .....	43
3.	Erlotinib's Effectiveness Against Pancreatic Cancer Was Unexpected .....	43
C.	Secondary Considerations Support Finding of Non-Obviousness.....	44
1.	Commercial Success .....	44
2.	Failure of Others .....	46
3.	Copying.....	47
II.	MYLAN HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN THAT CLAIM 53 OF THE '221 PATENT WAS ANTICIPATED OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS .....	47
A.	The Prior Art Relied On by Mylan .....	47
1.	The '498 Patent.....	48
2.	The Cold Spring Harbor Abstract.....	48
3.	AACR Abstracts .....	49
4.	The Moyer Article.....	49
5.	The Klohs Article.....	49
6.	OSI Press Release .....	50
7.	OSI 10K .....	50
8.	ASCO Abstracts.....	50
9.	Mendelsohn Papers .....	51
B.	Claim 53 of the '221 Patent Is Not Anticipated.....	51
1.	The '498 Patent Does Not Disclose All the Elements of Claim 53.....	52
2.	The Cold Spring Harbor Abstract Does Not Anticipate Claim 53 .....	54
C.	Claim 53 of the '221 Patent Was Not Obvious.....	55
D.	Secondary Considerations Support Finding Non-Obviousness.....	59
1.	Long Felt Need .....	59
2.	Failure of Others .....	60
3.	Skepticism.....	60
4.	Copying.....	60
	CONCLUSION.....	60

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	47
<i>Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	54
<i>Am. Hoist &amp; Derrick Co. v. Sowa &amp; Sons, Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	20
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	23, 24, 56
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	47
<i>Canon Computer Sys., Inc. v. Nu-Kote Int’l, Inc.</i> , 134 F.3d 1085 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	21
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	passim
<i>Datascope Corp. v. SMEC, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 320 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	25
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	44, 46
<i>Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	22, 45
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 2004 WL 1724632 (S.D. Ind. July 29, 2004).....	57
<i>Ex Parte Humber</i> , 217 U.S.P.Q. 265 (Pat. & Tr. Off. Bd. App. 1981).....	43
<i>Forest Labs., Inc. v. Ivax Pharms., Inc.</i> , 438 F. Supp. 2d 479 (D. Del. 2006), <i>aff’d</i> , 501 F.3d 1263 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	24, 47
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	38

<i>Gould v. Quigg</i> , 822 F.2d 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	32
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	21
<i>Hewlett Packard Co. v. Bausch &amp; Lomb, Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	22
<i>Hoganas AB v. Dresser Indus, Inc.</i> , 9 F.3d 948 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	41
<i>Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies Inc.</i> , 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	22
<i>In re Arkley</i> , 455 F.2d 586 (C.C.P.A 1972) .....	52
<i>In re Blondel</i> , 499 F.2d 1311 (C.C.P.A 1974) .....	41, 43
<i>In re Brana</i> , 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	38
<i>In re Chu</i> , 66 F.3d 292 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	42
<i>In re Chupp</i> , 816 F.2d 643 (Fed. Cir 1987).....	42
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 2010 WL 3766530 (D. Del. Sept. 21, 2010).....	47
<i>In re Fouche</i> , 439 F.2d 1237 (C.C.P.A. 1971) .....	41
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331(Fed. Cir. 2009).....	55
<i>In re Mahurkar Double Lumen Hemodialysis Catheter Patent Litig.</i> , 831 F. Supp. 1354 (N.D. Ill. 1993), <i>aff'd</i> , 71 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	47
<i>In re Merchant</i> , 575 F.2d 865 (C.C.P.A. 1978) .....	41
<i>In re Soni</i> , 54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	38, 41

# 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.