

IN THE 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 IPR2018-01710
U.S. Patent No. 8,586,045

**TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL GMBH'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	CGRP, CGRP receptor antagonists, and the inventors' unorthodox switch to CGRP antagonist antibodies to treat headaches, including migraine.....	5
III.	The Board should deny institution under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) because the Petition is based on substantially the same prior art and arguments already considered by the USPTO	12
	A. The same examiner reviewed the references or equivalents thereof and rejected Petitioner's arguments during prosecution of the '045 patent	14
	B. All of the <i>Becton Dickinson</i> factors strongly favor denying institution under § 325(d).....	16
	1. Each of the primary references—Olesen, Tan, and Queen—is the same or substantially the same as the art that was overcome during examination	16
	2. The asserted art was fully evaluated during examination and was the basis for rejection	22
	3. The Petition's prior art references are cumulative of the art evaluated during prosecution	23
	4. The arguments in the Petition substantially overlap with the arguments considered during prosecution	24
	5. Lilly offers no explanation for how the examiner erred during prosecution when evaluating the same art.....	25
	6. Lilly provides no justification to reconsider the same art and arguments from prosecution	27
IV.	Petitioner failed to establish a reasonable likelihood of prevailing as to any challenged claim	28
	A. Claim construction	29
	1. "reducing incidence of or treating"	30
	2. "effective amount"	31
	B. Person of ordinary skill in the art.....	32
	C. Lilly should be held to its Olesen, Tan, and Queen obviousness combination	33
	D. Lilly does not demonstrate why a POSA would have been motivated to treat migraine with anti-CGRP antibodies.....	34
	1. Lilly's argument that a POSA would have understood Olesen's results to extend beyond the small molecule	

	CGRP-receptor antagonists is wrong in view of a plain reading of Olesen	36
2.	Lilly fails to show a motivation to target CGRP instead of CGRP receptors for treating migraine	39
3.	Lilly fails to show motivation to treat migraine with anti-CGRP antibodies	44
E.	Lilly does not demonstrate why a POSA would have humanized Tan's full-length antibody to treat migraine	46
1.	Tan did not establish that C4.19 antagonized endogenous CGRP; a critical prerequisite to Lilly's argument that is missing for motivation	49
2.	Lilly fails to address why a POSA would not expect Tan's negative result to also apply to other full-length anti-CGRP antibodies	53
F.	Lilly has also failed to meet its burden with respect to its challenge of claim 1	57
G.	The Petition entirely fails to address motivation to humanize the Fab' fragment of Tan	58
1.	The Petition omits a motivation, and indeed argues against any motivation, to humanize a Fab' fragment	59
2.	Lilly's evidence submitted with its Petition does not support a motivation to humanize a Fab' fragment.....	60
H.	Lilly's near-simultaneous invention theory is neither supported by the facts nor the law.....	61
V.	Conclusion	63

Case IPR2018-01710

Patent No. 8,586,045

Patent Owner Teva Pharmaceuticals International GmbH ("Patent Owner") provides this preliminary response to Petitioner Eli Lilly and Company's ("Lilly") petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1, 3, 4, 8-17, 19, 20, and 24-31 of U.S. Patent No. 8,586,045 ("the '045 patent"; EX1001) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).

I. Introduction

In this proceeding, Lilly wants to cancel Teva's patent claims protecting its groundbreaking methods of using humanized monoclonal anti-CGRP antagonist antibodies to treat headache, including migraine¹. Yet Lilly's entire effort to cancel as obvious claims to something that it once itself thought worthy of patenting is troubling. *See* EX1127. Until the present inventors' contribution, the early-stage therapeutic focus for CGRP receptor-mediated disorders was on CGRP *receptor* antagonism, and the antagonist development focused on *small molecule receptor* antagonists, such as BIBN4096BS. EX1025. Before the present inventors filed

¹ Claim 1 is directed to treating any vasomotor symptom, and is not specific to migraine. EX1001. However, Lilly's arguments against claim 1 rely on migraine treatment. Petition, 49-50. To the extent that Lilly offers an additional reason as to why a POSA would have been motivated to use an anti-CGRP antagonist antibody "to reduce incidence of or treat skin vasodilation" (Petition, 50), Lilly's argument also fails, for the reasons described below.

Case IPR2018-01710

Patent No. 8,586,045

their patent applications, to the extent that antibodies to CGRP were used, it was as research tools to answer basic science questions related to, for example, receptor-ligand interaction. That Lilly now turns to those same research tools as a basis for its obviousness challenge contradicts its own contemporaneous efforts to seek patent protection for methods of using anti-CGRP antibodies to treat migraine. *See* EX1127.

To be instituted, an IPR petition must establish a reasonable likelihood that it could prevail against at least one challenged claim. Lilly's Petition fails to meet this requirement here for multiple separate and independent reasons, any one of which compels denial of institution. This Board routinely exercises its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.5 to deny institution when it determines, as it should here, that a petitioner fails to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on at least one challenged claim. *See Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.*, IPR2015-00355, Paper 9 at 15-16 (PTAB June 26, 2015).

As a threshold matter, institution should be denied under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) because Lilly's Petition does no more than attempt to resurrect the same or substantially the same prior art and arguments that were previously before the examiner during prosecution and were overcome. What's more, each of the primary references in the challenged ground were either already squarely before the examiner, or are cumulative to references raised and overcome during prosecution,

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.