Filed: September 10, 2019

Filed on behalf of: Eli Lilly and Company

DOCKET

#### 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. IPR2018-01427 Patent No. 8,597,649

### **PETITIONER'S REPLY**

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Introduction1				
II.	Teva Fails to Rebut the Prior Art's Express Motivation to Make a Claimed Antibody				
	A.	a's Motivation Arguments Are Not Directed to the Claimed ect Matter			
	B.		's Unfounded Safety Concerns Do Not Undermine vation		
		1.	Clinical Studies Demonstrated that the CGRP Pathway Could Be Safely Antagonized To Treat Migraine		
		2.	Long-Acting Ligand Antagonists Had Desirable Benefits and Did Not Raise Safety Concerns10		
		3.	The Prior Art Would Not Have Dissuaded a POSA from Pursuing a Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody13		
		4.	Absolute Risk of Stroke in Migraine Patients Was Very Low		
	C. Hypothetical "Spare Receptor Theory" Concerns Did No Undermine Motivation				
	D. Ligand Cross-Binding Did Not Undermine Motivation		nd Cross-Binding Did Not Undermine Motivation17		
	E.	Teva	's Binding-Affinity Arguments Are Incorrect		
III.	Teva	Teva's Reasonable Expectation of Success Arguments Are Irrelevant			
IV.	Teva's Alleged Secondary Considerations Do Not Support Nonobviousness				
	A.		's Secondary Considerations Evidence Is Not mensurate with the Scope of the Challenged Claims		
	B. Teva's Secondary Considerations Lack Nexus to the Claims		's Secondary Considerations Lack Nexus to the Claims24		
	C.	Teva	a's Reliance on Industry Acclaim Is Misplaced24		

IPR2018-01427 Patent No. 8,597,649

D.	Teva Failed to Establish Unexpected Results or Industry Skepticism	26
E.	Teva's Purported Evidence of Commercial Success, Licensing, and Long-Felt Need Do Not Support Patentability	26
Con	clusion	27

V.

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

## Page(s)

## **Federal Cases**

Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. Immunex Corp.,	
IPR2017-01884, Paper 96 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2019)	5, 10, 19
Soft Gel Techs., Inc. v. Jarrow Formulas, Inc.,	
864 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	3
×	

## DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.