

Paper No. ____
Date Filed: March 8, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01332
Patent 8,822,438 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

EXHIBIT 1090
WIT: AUCHUS

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ISSUES5

III. THE PRIOR ART RELIED UPON BY MYLAN7

A. O’Donnell (Ex. 1003)7

B. Barrie (Ex. 1005).....8

C. Gerber (Ex. 1004).....9

IV. THE RECORD REFUTES THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF MYLAN’S HINDSIGHT-DRIVEN OBVIOUSNESS CHALLENGE10

A. Mylan Incorrectly Contends that Abiraterone Acetate Causes the Same Side Effects as Ketoconazole13

 1. Abiraterone Acetate and Ketoconazole Cause Very Different Effects on Steroid Biosynthesis13

 2. Mylan Incorrectly Contends that Ketoconazole and Abiraterone Acetate Cause the Same Side Effects17

 (a) There Is No Evidence that Ketoconazole Causes Mineralocorticoid Excess18

 (b) There Was No Evidence in 2006 that Abiraterone Acetate Would Cause Mineralocorticoid Excess19

B. O’Donnell Establishes No Need for Glucocorticoid Replacement with Abiraterone Acetate20

 1. O’Donnell Reports No Side Effects of Abiraterone Acetate Warranting Glucocorticoid Replacement20

 2. O’Donnell’s Synacthen Test Results Did Not Establish a Need for Glucocorticoid Replacement with Abiraterone Acetate.....24

C. Ketoconazole with Prednisone Was Not Known to be “Safe and Effective” for Prostate Cancer in 200627

 1. Gerber Did Not Establish that Ketoconazole with Prednisone Was Safe and Effective for Prostate Cancer.....27

 2. Other Prior Art Taught that Ketoconazole with Prednisone Was Not a Safe and Effective Treatment of Prostate Cancer.....29

D.	Prednisone’s Severe Side-Effects Would Have Dissuaded Skilled Persons from Using It without a Clear Clinical Benefit.....	30
1.	Use of Glucocorticoids Was Discouraged Because of Adverse Side Effects, Particularly in Prostate Cancer Patients	30
2.	The Prior Art Taught that Prednisone Could Fuel the Prostate Cancer	32
3.	If Symptoms of Mineralocorticoid Excess Occurred, a Skilled Person Would Have Addressed Them with Other Available Drugs	34
E.	In 2006, Prednisone Was Not Known to Have “Anti-Cancer Effects”	35
F.	A Skilled Person Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Achieving the ’438 Patented Invention	37
1.	The Prior Art Provided No Basis for a Skilled Person to Expect Prednisone Would Provide Anti-Prostate Cancer Effects	37
2.	The Unpredictability of Drug Combination Therapy For Prostate Cancer Precludes Obviousness	40
G.	Mylan’s Obviousness Grounds Rely on Hindsight.....	41
H.	Mylan Has Failed to Meet Its Burden of Demonstrating Obviousness of the Claimed Invention	43
1.	O’Donnell and Gerber Do Not Provide a Reason to Use Prednisone with Abiraterone Acetate to Treat Prostate Cancer ...	44
2.	Barrie and Gerber Do Not Provide a Reason to Use Prednisone with Abiraterone Acetate to Treat Prostate Cancer	46
3.	The Prior Art Taught Away from Using Prednisone in Prostate Cancer Patients	47
V.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS CONFIRM THE PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS.....	48
A.	The Claimed Methods Show Unexpected Results	48
1.	Multiple Clinical Studies Demonstrate Unexpected Anti-Cancer Effects of Glucocorticoid/ Abiraterone Acetate Combination Treatment.....	49
2.	Mylan’s Criticisms of the Invention’s Unexpected Results Are Unwarranted.....	54

B.	Skepticism and the Failure of Others	55
C.	The Claimed Invention Met a Long-Felt Need	57
D.	The Claimed Invention Has Significant Commercial Success	58
1.	A Nexus Exists Between the Claimed Invention and ZYTIGA®'s Commercial Success	59
E.	Mylan's Blocking Patent Argument is Flawed	62
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	64

I. INTRODUCTION

This proceeding involves a breakthrough in the treatment of prostate cancer patients with an advanced stage of the disease known as metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (“mCRPC”). Before the invention of U.S. Patent No. 8,822,438 (“the ’438 patent”), these patients faced a dismal prognosis, with few meaningful treatment options. The invention – a two time FDA priority approved method of administering abiraterone acetate with prednisone that corresponds directly to the claims of the ’438 patent – changed this picture dramatically; prostate cancer patients treated with this therapy enjoy a striking increase in patient survival that could not have been predicted.

Despite this unpredictable result, and the striking commercial success of this new and effective treatment, Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“Mylan”) contends it would have been obvious to the skilled person to co-administer prednisone with abiraterone acetate, advancing in its petition the same hindsight-infused theory of obviousness advanced previously by Amerigen Pharmaceuticals, Ltd. (*See* IPR2016-00286) (“Amerigen IPR”).¹ (*See* Mylan ID at 2-3). Under that theory, a skilled person would have co-administered abiraterone with prednisone based on experiences with another “CYP17 inhibitor,” ketoconazole, which Mylan contends was a safe and effective method for treating prostate cancer before 2006.

¹ IPR2016-0317 was joined with IPR2016-00286.

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.