

**Filed On Behalf Of:**  
Novartis AG

**By:**  
Nicholas N. Kallas  
NKallas@fchs.com  
ZortressAfinitorIPR@fchs.com  
(212) 218-2100

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

NOVARTIS AG,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01479

Patent No. 9,006,224

---

**NOVARTIS'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	THE POSA .....	4
III.	STATE OF THE ART .....	7
	A. NETs Were Known To Comprise A Heterogeneous Group Of Tumors .....	7
	B. It Was Known That Advanced PNETs Were Distinct From Other Tumors Of The Pancreas .....	11
	C. Advanced PNETs Were Harder To Treat After Failure Of Cytotoxic Chemotherapy.....	13
	D. The Role Of mTOR Inhibitors In Treating Cancer Was Uncertain .....	15
	E. The Etiology Of PNETs Was Poorly Understood .....	19
IV.	THE '224 PATENT.....	21
V.	GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1–3 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER ÖBERG 2004, BOULAY 2004, AND O'DONNELL .....	23
	A. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Select Everolimus Over Other Prior Art Compounds .....	23
	B. Öberg 2004 Would Not Have Motivated A POSA To Select Everolimus Over Other Prior Art Compounds.....	26
	C. Dr. Ratain's New Öberg 2004 Deposition Argument Is Unsupported And Wrong As A Matter Of Law .....	29
	D. Boulay 2004 Would Not Have Motivated A POSA To Select Everolimus Or Provided A Reasonable Expectation Of Success .....	30

1.	A POSA Would Have Known That CA20948 In Boulay 2004 Is A Rat Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma Cell Line.....	30
2.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected A Drug Active <i>In Vivo</i> Against CA20948 To Be Effective To Treat PNETs .....	33
E.	O'Donnell Would Not Have Motivated A POSA To Select Everolimus Or Provided A Reasonable Expectation Of Success .....	38
1.	O'Donnell Was Not An Efficacy Study .....	38
2.	O'Donnell Did Not Suggest That Everolimus Would Be Effective To Treat Advanced PNETs After Failure Of Cytotoxic Chemotherapy .....	40
F.	Claims 1–3 Are Not Obvious Over The Combination Of Öberg 2004, Boulay 2004, And O'Donnell .....	42
VI.	GROUND 2: CLAIM 2 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER ÖBERG 2004, BOULAY 2004, O'DONNELL, AND TABERNERO.....	46
VII.	GROUND 3: CLAIMS 1–3 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER BOULAY 2004, O'DONNELL, AND DURAN .....	48
A.	Duran Did Not Suggest That Temsirolimus Would Be Effective To Treat Advanced PNETs After Failure Of Cytotoxic Chemotherapy.....	48
B.	Duran Did Not Suggest That Everolimus Would Be Effective To Treat Advanced PNETs After Failure Of Cytotoxic Chemotherapy.....	53
C.	Dr. Ratain's New Boulay 2004 Deposition Argument Is Wrong And Should Be Rejected .....	55
D.	Claims 1–3 Are Not Obvious Over The Combination Of Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, And Duran .....	56
VIII.	GROUND 4: CLAIM 2 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER BOULAY 2004, O'DONNELL, DURAN, AND TABERNERO .....	59

IX. CLAIMS 1–3 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER PAR’S  
REMAINING PRIOR ART.....59

X. OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS .....61

    A. Claims 1–3 Demonstrate Unexpected Results .....61

    B. Claims 1–3 Satisfied A Long-Felt Unmet Need That  
    Existed In November 2005.....65

    C. The ’224 Patent Inventors Succeeded Where Others  
    Failed.....67

XI. CONCLUSION.....67

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Coal. For Affordable Drugs V LLC. v. Biogen Ma Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01993, Paper 63 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 21, 2017).....	62
<i>Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Robert Bosch LLC</i> , IPR2016-00041, Paper 70 (P.T.A.B. April 12, 2017).....	5, 6
<i>Cumberland Pharms. Inc. v. Mylan Institutional LLC</i> , 846 F.3d 1213 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	45, 48
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC</i> , 435 F. App'x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	43
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 619 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	30
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	66, 67
<i>Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	23, 25
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01633, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 4, 2016).....	58
<i>Knoll Pharm. Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 367 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	67
<i>L.A. Biomed. Research Inst. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	passim
<i>Merck &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	50
<i>Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	25, 26
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 803 F. Supp. 2d 409 (E.D. Va. 2011).....	26

# 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.