

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APOTEX INC., APOTEX CORP., ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,
ACTAVIS ELIZABETH LLC, TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., SUN
PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES, LTD., SUN PHARMACEUTICAL
INDUSTRIES, INC., and SUN PHARMA GLOBAL FZE,

Petitioners,

v.

NOVARTIS AG,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00854¹

U.S. Patent No. 9,187,405

NOVARTIS AG'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Mail Stop Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

¹ Cases IPR2017-01550, IPR2017-01946, and IPR2017-01929 have been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
FACTS	6
A. RRMS	7
B. Fingolimod Research as of June 2006	8
1. PK/PD Studies	9
(i) Budde.....	9
(ii) Kahan 2003	10
(iii) Park 2003 and 2005.....	12
2. RRMS Model Studies	15
(i) Webb	16
(ii) Kataoka.....	19
3. Phase II Clinical Trial.....	20
C. The Invention and Patent	20
D. The Phase III Trials	25
E. These Proceedings	28
ARGUMENT	31
I. The PTO Correctly Awarded the '405 Patent for an Inventive Method of Treating RRMS	31
A. The Discovery Here Was Contrary to the Prior Art, Produced Unexpected Results, and Defied Skepticism in the Field	33
1. Teaching Away	33

2.	Unexpected Results	39
3.	Skepticism	40
B.	The Petitions Fail to State Even a Threshold Case	41
1.	Hindsight Bias Infects All of Dr. Giesser’s Testimony.....	42
2.	Dr. Giesser Lacks Pharmacological Competence	44
C.	The Ground 1 References Flunk Virtually Every Major Obviousness Requirement	46
D.	The Ground 2 References Similarly Lack the Major Obviousness Elements	55
II.	Ground 3 Is Beyond the Scope of an IPR and Based on a Flawed Assumption.....	57
A.	Ground 3 Is a 112 Argument Prohibited in an IPR.....	57
B.	The Specification Amply Supports the Claims’ Exclusion of Loading Doses	61
	CONCLUSION.....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	33, 34
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Aurobindo Pharma LTD, et al.</i> , 232 F. Supp. 3d 636 (D. Del. 2017).....	42, 43
<i>Avanir Pharm., Inc. v. Actavis S. Atl. LLC</i> , 36 F. Supp. 3d 475 (D. Del. 2014), <i>aff'd sub nom. Avanir Pharm. Inc. v. Par Pharm. Inc.</i> , 612 F. App'x 613 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	40
<i>Belden, Inc. v. Berk-tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	44
<i>Bioactive Labs. v. BTG Int'l Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01305, Paper 19 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2015)	59
<i>Captioncall, L.L.C. v. Ultratec, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00636, Paper 97 (PTAB Sept. 7, 2016).....	44
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs (ADROCA) LLC v. Acorda Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01859, -01853, -01857, -01858, Paper 72 (PTAB Mar. 9, 2017)	61
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC, et. al. v. Biogen MA, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01993, Paper 63 (PTAB Mar. 21, 2017).....	32, 33, 39
<i>Crown Operations Int'l, Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	47
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	58
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Circ. 2012).....	54
<i>Dexcowin Glob., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00436, 2016 WL 5219873 (PTAB July 7, 2016).....	58

<i>Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd. v. Galderma Labs., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01778, 2016 WL 1082772 (PTAB Feb. 16, 2016)	59
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	39
<i>Ex Parte Gary B. Goldman</i> , APPEAL 2013-007593, 2015 WL 5530202 (PTAB Sept. 17, 2015)	62
<i>Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	38
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	31, 32
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Circ. 1994).....	33
<i>Hitkansut LLC v. United States</i> , 130 Fed. Cl. 353 (2017).....	48
<i>Inphi Corp. v. Netlist, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	61
<i>Keene Corp. v. United States</i> , 508 U.S. 200 (1993).....	58
<i>Ex Parte Kotrla</i> , APPEAL 2014-009348, 2016 WL 5846792 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2016)	47
<i>Lucent Techs. Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , No. 02CV2060-B(CAB), 2007 WL 1449804 (S.D. Cal. May 15, 2007)	46
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	31
<i>Mayfield v. Nicholson</i> , 499 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	59
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	33, 37

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.