

Filed: November 8, 2018

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	4
A. The Challenge of Multiple Sclerosis.....	4
B. Biogen’s Phase II Clinical Trial.....	5
C. Biogen’s Phase III Clinical Trials.....	7
D. The FDA Approves Tecfidera®.....	8
E. Biogen Launches Tecfidera®—Embodied by the ’514 Patent Claims—to Great Success.....	9
III. The Prosecution and Issuance of the ’514 Patent.....	9
IV. The Serial Challenges to the ’514 Patent Before the PTAB.....	11
A. <i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Biogen MA Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01136 (“ <i>Coalition I</i> ”).....	13
B. <i>Biogen MA Inc. v. Forward Pharma A/S</i> , Intf. 106,023 (“ <i>FP Interference</i> ”).....	14
C. <i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Biogen MA Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01993 (“ <i>Coalition II</i> ”).....	16
V. The Petition Should Be Denied Because Mylan Fails to Rebut the Office’s Repeated Findings of Unexpected Results.....	19
A. Mylan’s Reliance on Post-Filing Date References to Challenge the Phase II Trial Results is Legally Deficient.....	20
1. The Board Previously Considered Mylan’s Proposed <i>Post Hoc</i> Change to the Phase II Results.....	21
2. Mylan Improperly Relies on Later-Dated References That Do Not Qualify as Prior Art.....	22

3.	Mylan’s Arguments Regarding the Phase II Trial Results Contradict the Asserted References and Do Not Address the Unexpected <i>Magnitude</i> of Efficacy of the Claimed 480 mg/day Dose .....	25
B.	Mylan Fails to Meaningfully Address the Phase III Trial Results Establishing Unexpected Results .....	29
VI.	The Petition Should Be Denied Under § 325(d) Because the Office Considered Substantially the Same Disclosures and Arguments During Prosecution and Multiple PTAB Proceedings .....	32
A.	Summary of the Argument.....	32
B.	Legal Standards .....	35
C.	The Office Allowed the Claims and the Board Upheld Their Patentability over the Combination of Schimrigk’s Small Study with Biogen’s Phase II Trial Results.....	37
1.	Grounds 1 and 2 Allege Combinations of Schimrigk’s Study with Biogen’s Phase II Trial.....	37
2.	These Grounds Were Considered and Rejected During Prosecution.....	38
3.	The Board Also Considered the Schimrigk Study and Biogen’s Phase II Trial .....	40
4.	The Additional References That Mylan Cites—But Does Not Assert—in Grounds 1 and 2 Were Similarly Considered .....	42
D.	Ground 4 Is the Very Same Ground Presented in <i>Coalition II</i> .....	43
E.	Ground 3 Contradicts the Board’s and Federal Circuit’s Decisions in the <i>FP Interference</i> .....	45
F.	Mylan Fails to Challenge Biogen’s Extensive Antedating Evidence .....	47

VII. Mylan’s Concurrent Litigation Involving the Same Issues Strongly  
Favors Denial Under § 314(a) .....49

VIII. Conclusion .....52

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	23
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017) .....	34
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese &amp; Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	22, 26
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01792, Paper 14 (PTAB Mar. 11, 2016) .....	20
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	23, 24
<i>FWP IP ApS v. Biogen MA Inc.</i> , No. 2017-2109, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Oct. 24, 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....	48
<i>Graco Children’s Prods. Inc. v. Kolcraft Enters., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00810, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2016).....	47, 48
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	26
<i>Hologic, Inc. v. bioMérieux, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00568, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 7, 2018).....	35, 36, 49
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 (PTAB July 27, 2017) .....	35
<i>Hulu, LLC v. Intertainer, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01456, Paper 8 (PTAB Mar. 6, 2015).....	47, 48

# 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.