

Paper No. ____
Date: February 8, 2018

Filed on behalf of: Astellas Pharma Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAWAI USA, INC. and SAWAI PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.
Petitioners,

v.

ASTELLAS PHARMA INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2018-00079
Patent No. 6,346,532

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
	A. What Is Mirabegron?.....	2
	B. The Petition Should Be Denied Institution	3
II.	Background.....	6
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
IV.	Law	9
	A. Burden of Proof.....	9
	B. Board’s Discretion Based on Art Already Considered During Prosecution.....	9
	C. Obviousness.....	10
V.	Ground 1 – Merck US197 in View of Blin, in Combination with Silverman and/or Thornber.....	14
	A. This Board Should Exercise Its Discretion Not to Institute Ground 1 of This Petition.....	14
	B. Petitioners’ “Most Structurally Similar Compound” Analysis Is Wrong	17
	C. Petitioners Are Wrong as a Matter of Law That “Mirabegron Sulfonamide” Is Disclosed in Merck US197	20
	1. Petitioners’ Hindsight Construction Does Not Account for the Overall Teachings in Merck US197.....	23
	2. Petitioners’ “Preferred Subgenus” Does Not Single Out a Definite and Limited Class of Compounds.....	27
	3. Petitioners’ Representations Regarding Blin Do Not Narrow the Disclosure in Merck US197 in Support of Creating “Mirabegron Sulfonamide”	32

D.	The Substitution of the Sulfonamide for the Amide Is Based on Hindsight	35
1.	Petitioners Provide No Reasoned Motivation to Swap Out a Key Component of Merck US197	35
2.	Petitioners Ignore the Overall Teaching of Thornber and Silverman	37
3.	Thorber and Silverman Disclose Other Possible Bioisosteres	38
E.	Petitioners Fail to Credibly Articulate What the Reasonable Expectation of Success Would Be	39
F.	Petitioners Are Wrong with Respect to Their Arguments About Binding Omissions at the PTO.....	41
G.	Petitioners' Obviousness Arguments for Composition Claims Also Fail.....	42
VI.	Ground 2 - Merck US197, in View of Blin, in Combination with Merck US048 and Silverman and/or Thornber	43
A.	Petitioners Do Not Account for the Full Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	43
1.	Blin Discloses Other Compounds with Data	44
2.	Blin Disclosures Do Not Narrow the Selection As Petitioners Describe	44
3.	Petitioners Admit That Other Companies Were Working On and Disclosing β_3 Compounds.....	46
4.	Petitioners Fail to Account for the Full Scope of the Merck Patent Estate on β_3	46
B.	Petitioners' Hindsight Selection of Compounds 90-92 as Leads Goes Against the Teachings of Merck US197	48
C.	Structural Modifications on Petitioners' Lead Compounds Are Based on Hindsight.....	51

1.	The Substitution of the Sulfonamide for the Amide Is Based on Hindsight	53
2.	Petitioners' Argument Regarding Bioisosteres Contradicts Their Argument for Adding a Methylene Spacer.....	53
3.	Petitioners' Arguments Regarding Side Chain Are Based on Hindsight	55
D.	Petitioners Fail to Credibly Articulate What the Reasonable Expectation of Success Would Be.....	57
E.	Petitioners Are Wrong with Respect to Their Arguments About Binding Omissions at the PTO.....	58
F.	Petitioners' Obviousness Arguments for Composition Claims Also Fail.....	58
VII.	Conclusion	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	22, 23
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	12, 13, 36
<i>Diamond Rubber Co. v. Consol. Rubber Tire Co.</i> , 220 U.S. 428 (1911)	4, 12
<i>Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	11, 12
<i>Ex Parte Jimenez Mayorga</i> , No. 2010-012157 (B.P.A.I. Sept. 30, 2011)	19
<i>In re Baird</i> , 16 F.3d 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	20, 22, 25, 26
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10
<i>In re Dillon</i> , 919 F.2d 688 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	12, 18, 19, 20
<i>In re Jones</i> , 958 F.2d 347 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	22
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	9
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	20
<i>In re McLamore</i> , 54 C.C.P.A. 1544 (1967)	22
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2006)	9, 19

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.