

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  
Patent 8,586,045 B2

---

**TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL  
GMBH'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

***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.	Background.....	7
	A. Calcitonin Gene-Related Peptide (“CGRP”) .....	7
	B. By 2005, there was no consensus as to the pathophysiology of migraine.....	8
	C. The ’045 patent and its commercial embodiments .....	8
III.	Claim construction.....	10
	A. “reducing incidence of or treating” .....	10
	B. "effective amount" .....	10
IV.	The challenged claims are not <i>prima facie</i> obvious .....	11
	A. Lilly mischaracterizes what the prior art discloses .....	11
	B. There was uncertainty in the field regarding CGRP being a biomarker for migraine—a fact that Lilly ignores .....	17
	C. Lilly incorrectly extrapolates Olesen’s small-molecule receptor antagonist results to any CGRP antagonist, in particular, an anti-CGRP antibody .....	20
	1. Olesen’s “proof of concept” study would not have given a POSA a reasonable expectation that an anti-CGRP antibody would be effective in treating migraine .....	20
	2. There would not have been an expectation of any therapeutic advantages for using an anti-CGRP antibody to treat migraine .....	24
	3. Tan’s data negates any reasonable expectation that a full-length antibody would safely treat migraine .....	35

4.	A POSA also would not have expected a full-length antibody to be efficacious because the field in 2005 was moving toward a central site of action for anti-migraine drugs.....	38
5.	None of the additional art Lilly cites provides a reasonable expectation that an anti-CGRP antibody can be safely used for treating migraine in humans .....	42
D.	Federal Circuit precedent demands a finding of non-obviousness .....	45
E.	Lilly failed to address a motivation to humanize Tan’s Fab’ fragment.....	47
F.	Lilly failed to prove that a POSA would have arrived at the affinity ( $K_D$ ) to CGRP, as claimed in claims 4 and 20.....	50
V.	Strong objective evidence compels finding non-obviousness of the challenged claims.....	55
A.	The challenged claims have a presumption of nexus to the objective indicia of nonobviousness .....	55
B.	The claimed methods have received industry-wide acclaim .....	56
C.	The claimed methods satisfied a long-felt, unmet need.....	58
D.	The claimed methods achieved unexpected results .....	60
E.	Humanized anti-CGRP antibodies faced industry skepticism .....	61
F.	Commercial success reinforces the non-obviousness of the claimed invention .....	62
G.	AlderBio’s decision to take a royalty-bearing license to Teva’s patents supports nonobviousness .....	63
H.	Lilly’s simultaneous invention argument is not supported by the facts or the law .....	64
VI.	Lilly has failed to carry its burden so the Board must find for Patent Owner.....	65

Teva Pharmaceuticals International GmbH timely submits this Patent Owner Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,586,045 filed by Eli Lilly and Company. Teva’s Response is supported by the expert declarations of Drs. Michel Ferrari, Ian Tomlinson, Steven Foord, Alan Rapoport, and Robert Stoner, and fact declaration of Jaume Pons. EX2268, ¶¶4-11; EX2271, ¶¶4-9; EX2265, ¶¶1-13; EX2262, ¶¶4-11; EX2274, ¶¶1-4; EX2331.

## I. Introduction

The challenged claims recite novel methods of treating vasomotor symptoms, including migraine, using humanized anti-Calcitonin Gene-Related Peptide (“CGRP”) antagonist<sup>1</sup> antibodies. Patent Owner Teva’s discovery was a breakthrough, representing the first time that *anyone, anywhere* developed a humanized anti-CGRP antibody for human therapeutic use. As a result, the approved use of Teva’s Ajovy® (fremanezumab-vfrm)—a commercial embodiment of the challenged patent claims—was the *first and only* approved use of an anti-CGRP drug for treating migraine.<sup>2</sup> Confronted with the pioneering nature of Teva’s invention, Lilly resorts to hindsight to build its faulty obviousness case.

---

<sup>1</sup> Antagonism is inhibition of a physiological function. EX2265, ¶24.

<sup>2</sup> Ajovy® is indicated for the preventive treatment of migraine. EX2168, 1.

In deciding to institute trial, the Board accepted Lilly’s allegations that a skilled artisan (“POSA”<sup>3</sup>) would have been motivated to treat migraine using a humanized anti-CGRP antibody based on Olesen’s data related to a small-molecule CGRP receptor antagonist, BIBN4096BS, and Tan—a basic laboratory research paper attempting to “prob[e] the role of CGRP as an endogenous vasodilator” in rats. EX1022, Abstract. But institution was based on a limited record reflecting Lilly’s one-sided rendition of the facts. As shown in this Response, Lilly’s arguments suffer from multiple flaws and missing steps that defeat its obviousness case. Upon consideration of the full record, the Board should find that substantial evidence exists to revisit and reverse its preliminary determination, which was based on a limited record. *See Apotex Inc. et. al. v. Novartis AG*, IPR2017-00854, Paper 109, 19, 23-24 (PTAB July 11, 2018). The full record demonstrates that a POSA in November 2005 would not have viewed an anti-CGRP antibody as sufficiently safe or effective for reducing incidence of or treating migraine.

Lilly cherry-picks aspects of the art, ignoring important uncertainties and complexities in the field that negate obviousness. Lilly starts by arguing that CGRP was proven to be involved in migraine, citing Goadsby’s papers (EX1043, EX1044), while ignoring contradictory data that arose after Goadsby and before

---

<sup>3</sup> Teva adopts the Board’s definition of a POSA. *See* Decision, 7-9.

# 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.