

Filed: June 29, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

Petitioner,

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 6,774,122

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,774,122**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. | MANDATORY NOTICES | 2 |
| | A. Real Parties-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))..... | 2 |
| | B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))..... | 2 |
| | C. Identification of Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)) | 3 |
| | D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))..... | 3 |
| III. | GROUND FOR STANDING AND PROCEDURAL STATEMENT | 4 |
| IV. | IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED | 4 |
| V. | THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW | 5 |
| VI. | STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED | 5 |
| | A. Summary of the Argument..... | 5 |
| | B. Background on Breast Cancer and Its Treatment Options..... | 8 |
| | C. Background of U.S. Patent No. 6,774,122 (“the ’122 patent”) | 10 |
| | 1. The ’122 Patent | 10 |
| | 2. The Prosecution of the ’122 Patent..... | 12 |
| | D. The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 14 |
| | E. Claim Construction..... | 15 |
| | F. Patents and Printed Publications Relied On In This Petition..... | 18 |
| | 1. McLeskey (Ex. 1005)..... | 19 |
| | 2. Howell 1996 (Ex. 1006)..... | 20 |
| | 3. Prior Art Informing the Knowledge of the POSA | 21 |
| | a. Fulvestrant Was Well Known As a Breast Cancer Treatment..... | 22 |
| | b. Oily Vehicles Were Used for Intramuscular Injections to Achieve Long-Acting Efficacy..... | 24 |
| | c. Conventional Excipients and Standard Formulation Principles Allowed Routine Formulation of Intramuscular Injections. | 28 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| | (i) The Profile of Conventional Excipients..... | 28 |
| | (ii) Standard Formulation Principles..... | 31 |
| G. | Petitioner’s Obviousness Positions. | 32 |
| | 1. The Law of Obviousness | 32 |
| | 2. The Prior Art Renders the Claims Obvious..... | 33 |
| H. | Ground 1: Claims 1–9 Were Unpatentable As Obvious Over McLeskey. | 36 |
| | 1. Independent Claim 1 Was Obvious over McLeskey. | 36 |
| | a. McLeskey Disclosed the Exact Formulation Recited in Claim 1. | 37 |
| | b. The Art Disclosed Treatment of a Malignant Disease of the Breast With Fulvestrant. | 39 |
| | c. The Art Disclosed Intramuscular Injection of Oily Fulvestrant Formulations..... | 40 |
| | d. The Blood Plasma Concentration Recited in Claim 1 Is a Statement of Intended Use..... | 41 |
| | (i) To the Extent It Is Given Patentable Weight, Claim 1’s Recitation of Blood Plasma Concentration Was Disclosed in the Art. | 41 |
| | e. McLeskey’s Formulation Did Not Result in Unexpectedly Improved Solubility..... | 42 |
| | 2. Independent Claim 5 Was Obvious over McLeskey. | 44 |
| | 3. Dependent Claims 2 and 9 Were Obvious over McLeskey..... | 45 |
| | 4. Dependent Claims 3 and 4 Were Obvious over McLeskey..... | 45 |
| | a. The Statements of Intended Result in Claims 3 and 4 Are Not Entitled to Patentable Weight..... | 45 |
| | b. To the Extent They Are Given Patentable Weight, the Recitations of Claims 3 and 4 Were Obvious. | 46 |
| | 5. Dependent Claims 6–8 Were Obvious over McLeskey. | 46 |
| I. | Ground 2: Claims 1–9 Were Unpatentable As Obvious over Howell 1996 in view of McLeskey..... | 47 |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1. | Independent Claim 1 Was Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey..... | 47 |
| 2. | Independent Claim 5 Was Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey..... | 51 |
| 3. | Dependent Claims 2 and 9 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey..... | 51 |
| 4. | Dependent Claims 3 and 4 Were Obvious over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey..... | 52 |
| 5. | Dependent Claim 6 Was Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey..... | 52 |
| 6. | Dependent Claim 7 Was Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey..... | 53 |
| 7. | Dependent Claim 8 Was Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey..... | 53 |
| J. | Any Secondary Considerations Fail to Overcome the Showing of Obviousness | 54 |
| 1. | Faslodex Sales Do Not Save the '122 Patent..... | 54 |
| a. | There is No Nexus Between the Claims and Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness | 54 |
| b. | Any Commercial Success of Faslodex Is Attributable to AstraZeneca's Extensive Marketing Efforts | 57 |
| 2. | The Claimed Methods Produced No Unexpected Results..... | 57 |
| 3. | The '122 Patent Satisfied No Long-Felt but Unmet Need | 58 |
| 4. | Copying Is Irrelevant | 59 |

LIST OF EXHIBITS

| Exhibit | Description |
|---------|---|
| 1001 | U.S. Patent No. 6,774,122 |
| 1002 | File History For U.S. Patent No. 6,774,122 |
| 1003 | Expert Declaration of Dr. Laird Forrest, Ph.D. |
| 1004 | Expert Declaration of Dr. Leslie Oleksowicz, M.D. |
| 1005 | McLeskey <i>et al.</i> , “Tamoxifen-resistant fibroblast growth factor-transfected MCF-7 cells are cross-resistant in vivo to the antiestrogen ICI 182,780 and two aromatase inhibitors,” 4 CLIN. CANCER RESEARCH 697–711 (1998) (“McLeskey”) |
| 1006 | Howell <i>et al.</i> , “Pharmacokinetics, pharmacological and anti-tumour effects of the specific anti-oestrogen ICI 182780 in women with advanced breast cancer,” 74 BRIT. J. CANCER 300–08 (1996) (“Howell 1996”) |
| 1007 | EP 0 346 014 (Dukes), published 12/13/1989 (“Dukes 1989”) |
| 1008 | Wakeling <i>et al.</i> , “A Potent Specific Pure Antiestrogen with Clinical Potential,” 51 CANCER RESEARCH 3867–3873 (1991) (“Wakeling 1991”) |
| 1009 | Alan E. Wakeling & Jean Bowler, “ICI 182,780: A New Antioestrogen with Clinical Potential,” 43 J. STEROID BIOCHEM. MOLEC. BIOL. 173–177 (1992) (“Wakeling 1992”) |
| 1010 | Spiegel & Noseworthy, “Use of Nonaqueous Solvents in Parenteral Products,” 52 J. PHARM. SCI. 917–927 (1963) (“Spiegel & Noseworthy”) |
| 1011 | Order, <i>AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , No. 14–03547 (D.N.J. July 29, 2015), ECF No. 102 |
| 1012 | A. Howell, “Response to a specific antioestrogen (ICI 182780) in tamoxifen-resistant breast cancer,” 345 LANCET 29–30 (1995) (“Howell 1995”) |
| 1013 | O’Regan <i>et al.</i> , “Effects of the Antiestrogens Tamoxifen, Toremifene, and ICI 182,780 on Endometrial Cancer Growth,” 90 J. NAT’L CANCER INST. 1552–1558 (1998) (“O’Regan 1998”) |

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.