Filed October 17, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01316
U.S. Patent No. 6,774,122

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,774,122

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '122 PATENT 5

A. Specification 5

B. Claims 6

C. Prosecution history 8

III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 11

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 12

A. Malignant diseases of the breast 12

B. Sufficient amount of castor oil vehicle 12

C. Whereby a therapeutically significant blood plasma fulvestrant concentration of at least 2.5 $ngml^{-1}$ is attained for at least 2 weeks after injection 13

D. Therapeutically significant 16

E. Attained 16

V. STATE OF THE ART 17

A. McLeskey [Ex. 1005] and Howell 1996 [Ex. 1006] 17

B. Active: A skilled artisan had no reason to start with fulvestrant 20

1. Petitioner ignores the many other treatment options available to the skilled artisan 21

2. Fulvestrant had not been established to be an effective treatment 23

C. Critical questions remained about the amount of fulvestrant to deliver and how 24

1. Amount: Therapeutically effective blood plasma levels 24

2. Administration: Route, excipients, and result intertwined 25

3. Claimed combination of excipients was unconventional 29

VI. THE '122 PATENT IS VALID AND NOT OBVIOUS 32

A. Law of Obviousness 32

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Page

B. Ground One: McLeskey 34
1. McLeskey describes the fulvestrant formulations as a "treatment failure" 39
2. McLeskey utilizes a different route of administration (subcutaneous) with vastly different subjects (genetically engineered mice) 42
3. McLeskey provides no pharmacokinetic data nor any suggestion of the specific blood plasma levels and durations claimed 46
4. McLeskey does not disclose the "exact" formulation 48
C. Ground Two: McLeskey In Combination With Howell 1996 49
1. No reason to combine McLeskey with Howell 1996 50
2. No reasonable expectation of success 53
VII. OBJECTIVE INDICIA DEMONSTRATE THE NONOBVIOUS NATURE OF THE CLAIMED METHOD OF TREATMENT 58
VIII. CONCLUSION 60

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2015-00357, 2015 WL 9899009 (P.T.A.B. June 29, 2015) 46

Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2015-00449, 2015 WL 4760572 (P.T.A.B. July 15, 2015).....38

BioDelivery Scis. Int'l, Inc. v. RB Pharms. Ltd.,
IPR2014-00325, 2015 WL 4045328 (P.T.A.B. June 30, 2015) 15

Boehringer Ingelheim Int'l GmbH v. Biogen Inc.,
IPR2015-00418, 2015 WL 4467391 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015)..... 38, 54

Bumble Bee Foods, LLC v. Kowalski,
IPR2014-00224, 2014 WL 2584188 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2014) 53

Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.,
619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 55

Eisai Co. Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.,
533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 55

General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Inc.,
IPR2015-01954, 2016 WL 1084221 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 9, 2016).....46

Griffin v. Bertina,
285 F.3d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 15

Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp.,
405 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 13

In re Cyclobenzaprine,
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 33, 34, 54

In re NTP, Inc.,
654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 51

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 34, 50

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

Page(s)

Lupin Ltd. v. Pozen Inc.,
IPR2015–01774, 2016 WL 1081583 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 1, 2016) 41, 42, 54

Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 34

Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.,
810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987) 33

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 57

Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 33, 38

Universal Remote Control, Inc. v. Uei Cayman, Inc.,
IPR2014-01111, 2014 WL 6737921 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 24, 2014).....45

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 32

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2)..... 37, 48

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.