

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FLATWING PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC and  
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

ANACOR PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2018-00169<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No. 9,566,289

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

---

<sup>1</sup> Case No. IPR2018-01359 has been joined with this proceeding.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

TABLE OF EXHIBITS.....v

REPLY ..... 1

I. What Is NOT In Dispute..... 1

II. Patent Owner’s Experts Do Not Rebut Petitioner’s Case. ....7

    A. Dr. Reider’s Testimony Does Not Undercut Petitioner’s Proof that  
    the Remaining Claims Are Invalid.....8

        1. Dr. Reider’s Testimony Does Not Address the Proper  
        Standard, of Whether a POSA Would Have Had A  
        Reasonable Expectation of Success with 5%. ....9

        2. Dr. Reider Testified that Boron-Containing Compounds  
        Ultimately Break Down In Water, But Fails To Consider  
        Reaction Kinetics Showing How Long the Supposed Break  
        Down Would Take.....10

        3. Dr. Reider Also Repeats Previously Rejected Arguments  
        About Boron’s “Promiscuity” and “Keratin-Binding  
        Affinity.” .....11

    B. Dr. Lane’s Testimony Does Not Undercut Petitioner’s Proof that  
    the Remaining Claims Are Invalid.....12

        1. Dr. Lane Did Not Consider that Dose Ranging Studies Are  
        A Routine Part Of Drug Development Which Would Lead  
        A POSA To The 5% Solution Claimed. ....13

        2. Dr. Lane Continues To Rely on Theories the Board Has  
        Already Rejected.....14

III. Petitioner has proven by at least a preponderance of the evidence that a  
    POSA would have a reasonable expectation of success at 5%. ....17

Case No. IPR2018-00169

U.S. Patent No. 9,566,289

A.	A POSA Would Seek a Formulation with the Minimum Effective Amount, Not Just Assume More Is Better. ....	17
B.	Dose Ranging Studies Are Routine, and Here Lead to a 5% Solution. ....	18
C.	Patent Owner Does Not Even Argue that the 5% Solution Produces an Unexpected Result, and Its “Teaching Away” Argument Is Legally Insufficient. ....	21
	CONCLUSION.....	24
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT.....	26
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	27

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

*Anacor Pharm., Inc. v. Iancu*,  
889 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....2, 6

*Baxter Int’l, Inc. v. McGaw, Inc.*,  
149 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....24

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs X LLC v. Anacor Pharm., Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01776 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 23, 2017),  
Paper #70..... 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 16, 21, 24

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs X LLC v. Anacor Pharm., Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01780 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 23, 2017),  
Paper No. 70..... 2, 4, 5, 24

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs X LLC v. Anacor Pharm., Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01785 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 23, 2017),  
Paper No. 70..... 2, 4, 5, 24

*DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.*,  
567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....23

*EI DuPont De Nemours & Co. v. Synvina C.V.*,  
904 F.3d 996 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....22

*Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.*,  
737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....23

*Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.*,  
No. 07-4417,  
2012 WL 869572 (D.N.J. Mar. 14, 2012),  
*aff’d*, 496 F. App’x 46 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ..... 12, 18

*In re Aller*,  
220 F.2d 454 (CCPA 1955) .....19

*In re Antonie*,  
559 F.2d 618 (CCPA 1977) .....21

Case No. IPR2018-00169

U.S. Patent No. 9,566,289

*In re Boesch,*

617 F.2d 272 (CCPA 1980) .....19

*In re Dow Chemical Co.,*

837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....20

*In re Geisler,*

116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ..... 19, 21, 22, 23

*In re O'Farrell,*

853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ..... 12, 15

*In re Peterson,*

315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... 19, 21, 22

*Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Labs., Inc.,*

874 F.2d 804 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ..... 12, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23

*Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,*

480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....19

*Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP v. Mut. Pharm. Co.,*

No. 07-1299 (SRC),

2010 WL 1799457 (D.N.J. May 5, 2010),

*aff'd*, 642 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ..... 17, 18

*United States v. Telectronics, Inc.,*

857 F.2d 778 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....20

# 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.