

Filed: February 28, 2017

Filed on behalf of: Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALKERMES PHARMA IRELAND LTD.
and ALKERMES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

OTSUKA PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00287
Patent 9,125,939 B2

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Petitioner Has Not Established That Keck, Citrome & BMS/Otsuka Press Release Are Printed Publications As Required by § 311(b).....	3
A. An IPR Challenge Can Only Rely on Printed Publications.....	4
B. Petitioner Provides No Evidence of the Publication, Dissemination, or Public Availability of Keck and Citrome	6
1. Dr. Frances’s Testimony Fails to Establish that Keck and Citrome Were Published	6
2. Petitioner Did Not Provide the Source of Keck and Citrome.....	10
C. Petitioner Provides No Evidence of the Publication, Dissemination, or Public Availability of BMS/Otsuka Press Release.....	10
1. Petitioner Provides No Evidence Supporting the Publication of BMS/Otsuka Press Release Before the Critical Date	11
2. Petitioner Fails to Establish That Persons Interested in the Art Would Have Been Able to Access BMS/Otsuka Press Release.....	14
3. Petitioner Does Not Provide the Source of BMS/Otsuka Press Release.....	15
III. Even If Certain Documents Constitute Printed Publications, Which Petitioner Has Not Shown, Petitioner Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any Claim is Unpatentable.....	16
A. Petitioner Fails to Establish the Requisite Motivation to Support Its Proposed Grounds of Unpatentability.....	17

1.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That Atypical Antipsychotics Would Be Added to Mood Stabilizers “Whenever the Mood Stabilizer Was Insufficiently Effective”	17
2.	Petitioner Does Not Argue and Provides No Evidence that Aripiprazole Was Viewed as Interchangeable With Other Atypical Antipsychotics for Bipolar Disorder.....	21
3.	Petitioner’s Remaining Documents Do Not Cure These Deficiencies.....	23
B.	Petitioner Provides No Basis to Support a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	25
1.	Petitioner Does Not Account for Aripiprazole’s Distinctiveness	26
2.	Petitioner Does Not Account for the Claimed Patient Population	28
3.	Petitioner’s Allegation of Reasonable Expectation of Success Impermissibly Relies on the ’939 Patent Specification.....	32
IV.	Petitioner’s Grounds Should Be Denied as Redundant to the Art and Arguments Previously Considered and Overcome During Prosecution	33
A.	The Board Should Deny Institution Where the Same or Substantially the Same Prior Art or Arguments Were Previously Presented	33
B.	Summary of the Prosecution of the ’939 Patent	34
C.	Petitioner Relies on the Same or Cumulative Documents and Uses Them in the Same Way the Examiner Did.....	39
1.	Keck and BMS/Otsuka Press Release are Cumulative of Clinical Trial Report	39
2.	Tohen is Tohen.....	40

3.	Citrome is Almost Citrome S187.....	41
4.	APA Guidelines are Cumulative of Kowatch.....	43
5.	Expert Consensus Adds Nothing to the Art the Examiner Considered	46
6.	Conclusion	48
D.	Petitioner’s “Side Effects” Arguments Are Irrelevant.....	49
E.	Petitioner’s Arguments Regarding Dr. Hirose’s Declaration Are Irrelevant and Do Not Undermine the Examiner’s Conclusions Regarding Patentability	50
1.	The Hirose Data	50
2.	The Results Do Not Change by Expressing Them as % Suppression or by Normalizing Them	53
3.	The Data was Sufficiently Explained	54
4.	Dr. Au’s Synergy Model Would Not Have Been Appropriate	57
5.	Dr. Au’s Arguments Strongly Suggest that a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	57
V.	Petitioner’s Six Grounds of Unpatentability Are Redundant of One Another	59
A.	All Grounds Are Horizontally Redundant	59
B.	Grounds 1 and 4, Grounds 2 and 4, and Grounds 2 and 6 Are Vertically Redundant.....	61
VI.	Conclusion	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Air Liquide Large Indus. U.S., LP v. Praxair Tech. Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01074, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 26, 2015).....	13
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	25
<i>Apotex Inc. v. OSI Pharms., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01284, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2017)	33
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	18
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Int’l GmbH v. Biogen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00418, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	25
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Techs. L.L.C.</i> , IPR2014-01085, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2015)	15
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs IV LLC (“ADROCA”) v. Pharmacyclics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01076, Paper 33 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2015).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	49
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	28
<i>DIRECTV, LLC v. Qurio Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-02006, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 4, 2016)	18, 19
<i>EMC Corp. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00082, Paper 33 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2013)	60

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.