

---

**In the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit**

---

ANACOR PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

*Appellant-Patent Owner,*

v.

JOSEPH MATAL,

*Acting Undersecretary of Commerce  
for Intellectual Property and Interim  
Director of the United States Patent &  
Trademark Office,*

*Intervenor.*

---

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2015-01776

---

**BRIEF OF APPELLANT-PATENT OWNER**

---

Michael N. Kennedy  
Andrea G. Reister  
Evan S. Krygowski  
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
One CityCenter  
850 Tenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 2001  
Tel: (202) 662-6000  
Fax: (202) 662-6291

*Attorneys for Appellant-  
Patent Owner*

## CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Pursuant to Federal Circuit Rule 47.4, Counsel for the Appellant-Patent Owner Anacor Pharmaceuticals, Inc. certifies the following:

**1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:**

Anacor Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

**2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:**

Sandoz Inc. was a real party in interest in IPR2015-01776 under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1), but Sandoz Inc. is not represented by me.

**3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curiae represented by me are:**

Pfizer Inc.

**4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court (and who have not or will not enter an appearance in this case) are:**

Covington & Burling LLP: Enrique D. Longton, Jeffrey B. Elikan, George F. Pappas, Christopher K. Eppich, Paul J. Berman.

Date: August 4, 2017

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/ Michael N. Kennedy  
Michael N. Kennedy

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	v
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES .....	vii
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	viii
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT .....	1
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES ON APPEAL .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	7
I.    Claim 6 of the '621 patent claims a method of treating onychomycosis, which is a fungal infection of the nail. ....	8
A.    Onychomycosis is primarily caused by dermatophytes, not yeasts such as those disclosed in Petitioner's primary reference.....	8
B.    The record here demonstrates the lack of guidance in the prior art concerning the possible use of boron-containing compounds to treat onychomycosis.....	11
II.   Proceedings before the Board.....	13
A.    The Petition argued that a POSA would have extrapolated the properties described in either <i>Brehove</i> or <i>Freeman</i> to the compounds of <i>Austin</i> based on the compounds' alleged structural similarities. ....	13
B.    The Board found the compounds of <i>Austin</i> , <i>Brehove</i> and <i>Freeman</i> to be structurally dissimilar. ....	14
C.    The Board found a reasonable expectation of successfully treating dermatophytes only by departing from the Petitioner's original obviousness theory.....	15
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	17

STANDARD OF REVIEW ..... 21

ARGUMENT ..... 22

I. The FWD should be reversed for failing to provide adequate notice of the arguments and evidence on which the FWD is based. .... 22

    A. The outcome-determinative argument in the Board’s obviousness analysis for Claim 6 was not in the Petition. .... 24

    B. The Board’s analysis of Claim 6 relied entirely on evidence that was not in the Petition. .... 27

II. The FWD should be reversed for improperly shifting the burden of proving nonobviousness onto Anacor. .... 30

    A. The Board improperly required Anacor to prove that tavaborole’s activity against *C. albicans* does not provide a reasonable expectation of activity against dermatophytes. .... 32

    B. The Board improperly required Anacor to prove that potency against *C. parapsilosis* is unrelated to potency against *C. albicans*. .... 34

III. The FWD should be reversed because the Board’s obviousness theory lacks a rational underpinning and is not supported by substantial evidence. .... 36

    A. Substantial evidence does not support the conclusion that the compounds of *Austin* are “structurally similar” to the compounds of *Brehove* and *Freeman*. .... 39

        1. Petitioner did not disagree that the compounds of *Austin* possess structural differences from the compounds of *Brehove* and *Freeman*. .... 40

        2. The Board ignored evidence from both parties that a POSA would have expected structural differences between the compounds of *Austin*, *Brehove* and *Freeman* to cause those compounds to exhibit different biological activities. .... 42

3. The Board failed to show by substantial evidence that the compounds of *Austin*, *Brehove* and *Freeman* are “structurally similar.” ..... 43

B. Substantial evidence does not support the conclusion that the compounds of *Austin* are “functionally similar” to the compounds of *Freeman*..... 47

C. Substantial evidence does not support the conclusion that the combination of *Austin* and *Freeman* would provide a POSA with a reasonable expectation of successfully treating dermatophytes with tavaborole. .... 48

CONCLUSION..... 51

# 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.