Filed: August 8, 2018

Filed on behalf of: Eli Lilly and Company

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY
Petitioner

v.

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL GMBH
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2018-01426
Patent No. 9,890,211

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


I. Introduction....1

II. Requirements for *Inter Partes* Review Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104....3

A. Grounds for Standing....3

B. Identification of Challenge....3

III. The '211 Patent and Its Provisional Application....4

A. The Challenged Claims....5

B. Patent Owner Admissions in the Specification....7

1. Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies and Methods of Making Them, Including Humanization Techniques, Were Known....7

2. Methods to Obtain and Measure Particular Binding Affinities by SPR Were Known....9

3. Limitations of Dependent Claims Were Also Known....9

a) Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies That Bound to the C-Terminus of CGRP Were Known....10

b) IgG Sub-Types and Constant Regions Were Known....10

C. Prosecution of the '211 Patent....10

IV. Background and the Asserted Prior Art....11

A. CGRP Structure, Isoforms, and Function....11

B. Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies Were Well Known in the Art and Had Been Disclosed for Therapeutic Use in Humans....12

C. IgG Antibodies....13

D. Humanization of Antibodies....16

E. Binding Affinity....17



DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

F. The Asserted Prior Art .....17

1. Tan 1995 .....17

2. Wimalawansa .....19

3. Queen .....20

V. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....22

VI. Claim Construction .....22

VII. Claim 1 Is Obvious over Tan 1995, Wimalawansa, and Queen .....24

A. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Generate the Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody of Claim 1 .....25

1. The Prior Art Recommended the Use of Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies, Including Humanized Antibodies, for Therapeutic Use in Humans .....25

2. The Confirmed *In Vivo* Effectiveness of Prior Art Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies Provided Additional Motivation to Prepare a Humanized Antibody .....28

3. A POSA Would Have Targeted a Binding Affinity of 10 nM or Less .....30

4. The Prior Art Provided Additional Motivation to Prepare a Humanized Antibody .....32

B. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Successfully Making a Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody of Claim 1 .....34

1. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Successfully Producing an Antibody Against Human CGRP .....34

2. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success of Producing an Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody with a Binding Affinity of 10 nM or Less .....36

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

3. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Successfully Producing a Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody of Claim 1 ..... 39

C. The Prior Art Did Not Teach Away from Humanizing Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies, as Teva Incorrectly Argued During Prosecution ..... 43

D. The Claimed Antibodies Would Have Been Obvious ..... 48

VIII. The Challenged Dependent Claims Would Have Been Obvious ..... 50

A. Claim 2 ..... 51

B. Claims 3, 7, and 12 ..... 53

C. Claims 4, 8, 9, and 13 ..... 56

D. Claims 5, 10, and 14 ..... 58

E. Claims 6, 11, and 15 ..... 58

IX. Secondary Considerations Do Not Support Nonobviousness ..... 61

A. Teva Cannot Establish Nexus to the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims ..... 61

B. Lilly's and Other's Own Near-Simultaneous Development Precludes a Holding of Nonobviousness ..... 62

X. The Evidence Submitted in this Petition Was Not Previously Considered by the Office ..... 64

XI. Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 ..... 64

A. Real Parties-in-Interest ..... 64

B. Related Matters ..... 65

C. Lead and Backup Counsel ..... 65

D. Service Information ..... 67

XII. Payment of Fees ..... 67

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

XIII. Conclusion .....67

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE .....1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....2

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

# 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.