

Filed: May 31, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BIOGEN MA INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2018-01403
Patent No. 8,399,514

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. Introduction.....	1
II. All of Petitioner’s Grounds Fail Because They Rely On Non-Prior Art References.....	4
A. Exhibits 1007, 1046, and 1016 Describe Dr. O’Neill’s Work.....	6
B. Dr. O’Neill’s Own Work Is Not Prior Art to Claims 1-16, 20	10
C. Dr. O’Neill’s Own Work Is Not Prior Art to Claims 17-19	10
D. The ’514 Patent Is Entitled to Its Provisional Filing Date	11
III. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	14
IV. Petitioner Has Failed to Establish Obviousness	14
A. Ground 1: Schimrigk 2004 in View of January 2006 Press Release.....	15
1. Schimrigk’s Fumaderm [®] Treatment Is Different Than DMF Monotherapy	18
2. Schimrigk Does Not Show Efficacy at the Three-Tablet Dose of Fumaderm [®] or Disclose a Range of Effective Doses	21
3. Ground 1 Provides No Motivation or Reasonable Expectation of Success to Treat MS with 480 mg/day of DMF	23
B. Ground 2: Kappos 2006 in View of Schimrigk 2004	25
1. Kappos 2006 and Schimrigk 2004 Do Not Establish an Effective DMF Dose Range.....	25
2. Petitioner’s Hindsight-Based Post-Hoc Analyses Are Irrelevant to Obviousness	27

3.	A POSA Would Have Been Directed Towards DMF Doses Greater Than 720 mg/day	37
4.	Petitioner’s Psoriasis References Do Not Support Obviousness	40
C.	Ground 3: Kappos 2006 in View of WO ’342	43
D.	Ground 4: Kappos 2006, ICH Guidelines, Clinical Trials, and Joshi ’999	44
V.	The Claims Are Patentable Based on Compelling Objective Evidence.....	49
A.	480 mg/day DMF Achieved Unexpected Results	49
1.	480 mg/day DMF’s Magnitude of Clinical Efficacy Was Unexpectedly High and Unexpectedly Similar to 720 mg/day	49
2.	Petitioner Fails to Rebut Unexpected Results	53
B.	Tecfidera® Embodies the ’514 Patent Claims	55
C.	The Claimed DMF Dosing Regimen Satisfied a Long-Felt Need.....	56
D.	Tecfidera® Has Been a Blockbuster Commercial Success	59
E.	The Claimed Dosing Regimen Has Been Extensively Praised.....	61
VI.	Conclusion	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	45
<i>Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 765 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	17
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	59
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	12
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00276, Paper 64 (PTAB Aug. 15, 2016).....	17
<i>Bone Care Int'l LLC v. Pentech Pharm., Inc.</i> , No. 08-cv-1083, 2010 WL 3928598 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 1, 2010).....	29
<i>In re Brana</i> , 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	12
<i>Braun v. Lorillard Inc.</i> , 84 F.3d 230 (7th Cir. 1996)	30
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs (ADROCA) LLC v. Acorda Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01850, Paper 72 (PTAB Mar. 9, 2017).....	6, 10
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs VIII, LLC v. Trs. of Univ. Penn.</i> , IPR2015-01835, Paper 56 (PTAB Mar. 6, 2017).....	55
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	16

<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig., 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)</i>	28, 56
<i>FWP IP ApS v. Biogen MA Inc., 749 Fed. Appx. 969 (Fed. Cir. 2018)</i>	43
<i>Haliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. Dynamic 3D Geosolutions LLC, IPR2014-01186, Paper 18 (PTAB Feb. 18, 2015)</i>	16
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., IPR2017-00804, Paper 83 (PTAB Oct. 3, 2018)</i>	35
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino, 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)</i>	61
<i>In re Katz, 687 F.2d 450 (CCPA 1982)</i>	5, 9, 10
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, 550 U.S. 398 (2007)</i>	28
<i>Lupin Ltd. v. Senju Pharm. Co., IPR2015-01099, Paper 69 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2016)</i>	59, 61
<i>Neptune Generics, LLC v. Eli Lilly & Co., 921 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2019)</i>	28, 31
<i>Okajima v. Bourdeau, 261 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2001)</i>	14
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc., No. 07-01000, 2010 WL 11636594 (D.N.J. Dec. 15, 2010)</i>	58
<i>Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc., 75 F.3d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1996)</i>	49
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc., 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)</i>	56
<i>Sanofi v. Watson Laboratories Inc., 875 F.3d 636 (Fed. Cir. 2017)</i>	27, 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.