

2012-1431

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

---

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

*Plaintiffs-Appellees,*

v.

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,

*Defendant-Appellant.*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Delaware in case no. 09-CV-0185, Judge Sue L. Robinson.

---

**BRIEF OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT  
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.**

---

James H. Wallace, Jr.  
Mark A. Pacella  
Gregory R. Lyons  
Matthew J. Dowd  
Adrienne G. Johnson  
WILEY REIN LLP  
1776 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 719-7000  
*Attorneys for Defendant-  
Appellant Mylan Pharmaceuticals  
Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST**

Pursuant to Federal Circuit Rule 47.4, counsel for the Defendant-Appellant

Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curiae represented by me are:

Mylan Inc.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court are:

Jack C. Phillips, Jr.  
Megan C. Haney  
Brian E. Farnan  
Phillips, Goldman & Spence, P. A.  
1200 N. Broom Street  
Wilmington, DE 19806

James H. Wallace, Jr.  
Mark A. Pacella  
Gregory R. Lyons  
Robert J. Scheffel  
Brian Pandya  
Matthew J. Dowd  
Karin A. Hessler  
Adrienne G. Johnson  
WILEY REIN LLP  
1776 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Date: July 31, 2012

/s/Mark A. Pacella  
Signature of counsel

Mark A. Pacella  
Printed name of counsel

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES .....	5
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....	6
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	7
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	9
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	11
I. THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT AND ASSERTED CLAIMS.....	11
A. The RE '065 Patent .....	11
B. The '221 Patent .....	12
II. EPIDERMAL GROWTH FACTOR RECEPTOR (EGFR) AND THE SEARCH FOR EGFR INHIBITORS IN THE 1990'S.....	13
A. EGFR And EGFR Inhibitors.....	13
B. Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer And Its Association With EGFR Overexpression.....	13
C. The Search For Potent And Selective EGFR Inhibitors .....	15
D. Pfizer's Rival, Zeneca, Discloses A Groundbreaking New Series Of EGFR Inhibitors, The 4-Anilinoquinazolines (4-AQs) .....	15
III. ZENECA CREATES A ROADMAP TO ERLOTINIB .....	18
A. Zeneca's '226 Application Identifies The Most-Preferred 4- AQs.....	18
B. Zeneca's '226 Application Discloses Biological Data Showing The 4-AQs As A Class Potently Inhibit EGFR.....	19
C. Zeneca's '226 Application Omits Coverage Of The Ethynyl Group At The 3'-Position.....	20
D. Barker's Abstracts Suggest "Small, Non-Polar" Groups At The 3'-Position Of Zeneca's 4-AQs.....	21
E. The Ethynyl Group Is A Small, Non-Polar Group, As Taught In Barker's Abstracts .....	22

F. Persons Of Ordinary Skill Involved In Drug Discovery Would Be Motivated To Avoid Coverage Of Competitor Patents .....22

G. Barker’s Abstracts In Conjunction With Zeneca’s ’226 Application Teach Which 4-AQs Were The Best EGFR Inhibitors Not Covered By The ’226 Application .....23

H. Making The Single Change Of Replacing The 3’-Substituent With The Small, Nonpolar Ethynyl And Vinyl Groups Results In Erlotinib .....24

IV. PFIZER FOLLOWED ZENECA’S ROADMAP AFTER FAILING TO FIND BETTER EGFR INHIBITORS THAN ZENECA’S 4-AQ’S .....25

V. PFIZER DISCLOSES AND CLAIMS THE USE OF ERLOTINIB TO TREAT LUNG CANCER AND THEN DISCLOSES ITS ERLOTINIB DEVELOPMENT.....27

A. Pfizer’s ’498 Patent Discloses And Claims Using Erlotinib To Treat Lung Cancer, Including NSCLC .....28

B. Between 1997 And 1999, Erlotinib’s Usefulness For Treating EGFR-Associated Cancers Such As NSCLC Is Widely Publicized .....30

1. Pfizer/OSI’s 1997 AACR Abstracts and Cancer Research Article.....30

2. Zeneca Discloses Selection of Gefitinib For Clinical Trials .....32

3. The 1997 Klohs Article.....32

4. OSI’s 1997 Press Release .....33

5. Pfizer/OSI’s 1998 Cold Spring Harbor Abstract .....34

6. OSI’s 1998 SEC Filing .....35

7. Pfizer’s 1999 ASCO Abstracts .....36

C. By 1999, Using Erlotinib To Treat NSCLC Is Well Known .....36

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....38

ARGUMENT .....40

I. STANDARDS OF REVIEW.....40

II. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN FINDING CLAIM 53 OF THE ’221 PATENT NOT ANTICIPATED.....41

A.	The District Court Committed Reversible Error In Concluding That Pfizer’s ’498 Patent Did Not Anticipate Claim 53 Of The ’221 Patent.....	41
B.	The District Court Committed Reversible Error In Concluding That Pfizer/OSI’s 1998 Cold Spring Harbor Abstract Did Not Anticipate Claim 53 Of The ’221 Patent.....	46
III.	THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN FINDING CLAIM 53 OF THE ’221 PATENT NONOBVIOUS.....	49
A.	The Law Of Obviousness.....	49
B.	The District Court Erred In Its Obviousness Analysis By Failing To Consider The Full Scope And Content Of The Prior Art And Imposing An Incorrect Standard For Success.....	50
IV.	THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN FINDING THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE RE ’065 PATENT WERE NOT OBVIOUS.....	55
A.	The District Court Erred By Requiring Selection Of A Single Lead Compound Based On Specific Biological Data.....	55
B.	The District Court Erred In Concluding There Was No Reasonable Expectation Of Success .....	64
C.	No Secondary Considerations Support The Court’s Nonobviousness Determination .....	66
	CONCLUSION.....	67

# 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.