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. IPR2018-01710
Patent No. 8,586,045

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....2

A. Grounds for Standing....2

B. Identification of Challenge....3

III. The '045 Patent and Its Provisional Application....4

A. The Challenged Claims....5

B. Patent Owner Admissions in the Specification....6

1. CGRP and Its Role in Migraine Was Known....7

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

C. Prosecution of the '045 Patent....9

IV. Background and Asserted Prior Art....9

A. CGRP Structure and Its Isoforms....9

B. Migraine and CGRP....11

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

D. Humanization of Antibodies....13

E. The Asserted Prior Art....14

1. Olesen....14

2. Tan....16

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

3. Queen 17

V. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art 18

VI. Claim Construction 19

A. "reducing incidence of or treating" 20

B. "effective amount" 21

C. "anti-CGRP antagonist antibody" and "humanized monoclonal antibody" 23

VII. Claim 17 Is Obvious over Olesen, Tan, and Queen 24

A. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Treat Migraine With a Humanized Monoclonal Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody 25

1. The Prior Art Would Have Motivated a POSA to Use a CGRP Antagonist to Treat Migraine 25

2. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Use an Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody to Treat Migraine 29

3. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Use a *Humanized* Monoclonal Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody for Treating Migraine 33

B. The Prior Art Provided a Reasonable Expectation of Success 35

1. A POSA Would Have Reasonably Expected that a Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody Would Successfully Reduce Incidence of or Treat Migraine 37

a) Blocking the CGRP Pathway Had Been Clinically Proven to Treat Migraine 37

b) Immunoblockade with Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies Had Been Confirmed *In Vivo*, and Was a Known "Alternative" Technique for Blocking the CGRP Pathway 38

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

2. A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Making a Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody for Therapeutic Use in Humans 40

C. The Prior Art Did Not Teach Away from Using a Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody, as Teva Incorrectly Argued During Prosecution 43

D. The Claimed Methods for Treating Migraine Would Have Been Obvious 48

VIII. The Prior Art Likewise Demonstrates the Obviousness of Claim 1 49

IX. The Challenged Dependent Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over Olesen, Tan, and Queen 50

A. Claims 3, 9, 19, and 24 51

B. Claims 4 and 20 51

C. Claim 8 54

D. Claims 10 and 25 54

E. Claims 11 and 26 56

F. Claims 12 and 27 57

G. Claims 13 and 28 58

H. Claims 14 and 29 60

I. Claims 15 and 30 61

J. Claims 16 and 31 61

X. There Is No Objective Evidence of Nonobviousness 62

A. Teva Cannot Establish Nexus to the Full Scope of the Challenged Claims 62

B. There Are No Unexpected Results 63

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

C. Lilly's and Others' Near-Simultaneous Development Preclude a Holding of Nonobviousness 63

XI. The Evidence Submitted in this Petition Was Not Previously Considered by the Office 65

XII. Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8 66

A. Real Parties-in-Interest 66

B. Related Matters 66

C. Lead and Backup Counsel 67

D. Service Information 68

XIII. Payment of Fees 68

XIV. Conclusion 69

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE 70

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 71

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.