

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

v.

BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM INTERNATIONAL GMBH,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01563
Patent 8,673,927 B2

PETITIONER MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.'S MOTION FOR
REHEARING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.71

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ARGUMENT..... 4

 A. Legal Standards 4

 B. The Proper Obviousness Standard was Not Applied. 5

 C. The Board Routinely Applies an Obviousness Presumption
 when a Prior Art Range Encompasses the Claimed Amount..... 8

 D. The Presumption of Obviousness was Not Overcome..... 11

 E. The Board Overlooked Petitioner’s Evidence Establishing a
 Reasonable Expectation of Success..... 12

III. CONCLUSION 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Ex Parte Berlin</i> No. 2011-009313, 2013 WL 3339398, at *5 (May 31, 2013).....	9, 10
<i>Ex Parte Fehr</i> No. 2013-006774, 2015 WL 4349960, at *3 (PTAB July 14, 2015)	10
<i>Ex Parte Reinsinger</i> , No. 2009-013204, 2012 WL 991653 (PTAB Mar. 22, 2012)	10
<i>Ex Parte Saitou</i> No. 2010-003525, 2011 WL 2174633, at *1–*2 (PTAB May 31, 2011).....	10
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	passim
<i>In re Baird</i> , 16 F.3d 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	11
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	4, 8, 11
<i>In re Jones</i> , 958 F.2d 347 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	11
<i>In re Malagari</i> , 499 F.2d 1297 (CCPA 1974)	4, 8
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	4, 5, 8
<i>In re Woodruff</i> , 919 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	11
<i>Merck Sharp & Dohme B.V. v. Warner Chilcott Co., LLC</i> , No. 13-cv-2088, 2016 WL 4497054 (D. Del. Aug. 26, 2016)	11

Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.,
463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 4, 6, 7, 8

OSRAM Sylvania v. Am. Induction Techs.,
701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 7, 8

Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Home Semiconductor Corp.,
No. IPR2015–00467, 2016 WL 3228146 (PTAB June 13, 2016)..... 5

Star Fruits S.N.C. v. United States,
393 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 4

Warner Chilcott Co., LLC v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
89 F. Supp. 3d 641, 654, 673–74 (D.N.J. 2015) *aff'd*, 642 F. App'x 996
(Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 6, 11

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.71 4

Petitioner Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. respectfully requests rehearing of the Board's February 3, 2017 decision denying *inter partes* review of claims 2–9 and 11–26 (collectively the “Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,673,927 as obvious based on Petitioner's Ground 3.¹ (Paper 16 at 22). Rehearing is warranted because the Board's decision was based on an incorrect legal standard for obviousness.

I. INTRODUCTION

Under Federal Circuit precedent, the Challenged Claims are presumed obvious because the claimed linagliptin dosages and dosage ranges fall squarely within the prior art range disclosed in the '510 Publication (Ex. 1003), and Patent Owner did not meet its burden to overcome this presumption. *See Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.*, 737 F.3d 731, 737–38 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (Patent Owner has burden of overcoming obviousness presumption “where there is a range disclosed in the prior art, and the claimed invention falls within that range”).

The Challenged Claims are directed to administering specified dosages and dosage ranges of a combination of the drugs metformin and linagliptin to treat patients with type II diabetes. (Paper 2, Tables 2–3). It is undisputed that, as of the

¹ The Board instituted *inter partes* review on claims 1 and 10 based on Ground 3 but denied review of the Challenged Claims. (Paper 16 at 22–23). The Board also denied *inter partes* review of claims 18–26 as anticipated over the '510 Publication (Ex. 1003) (Ground 1) and of claims 1–26 as obvious based on Ground 2. (*Id.* at 11, 14–15). Petitioners do not seek rehearing of the Board's decision on Grounds 1 or 2.

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.