

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

---

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO STRIKE IMPROPER REPLY  
ARGUMENTS AND EVIDENCE**

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

## I. Introduction

Pursuant to the Board's October 15, 2019 Order, Patent Owner Teva moves to strike the following arguments and evidence from Lilly's Reply:

- Reply arguments on pages 6, 10-11, and 15;
- Exhibit 1287; and
- Paragraphs 22, 24-25, and 30-33 of Exhibit 1337.

These are not rebuttal arguments and evidence; rather, they represent Lilly's impermissible attempt to present new evidence and theories of invalidity. "[A] reply that raises a new issue or *belatedly presents evidence may not be considered.*" Trial Practice Guide at 40 (emphasis added). Permitting Lilly to introduce these new arguments and evidence on Reply would prejudice Teva.

Petitioners are required to provide "[a] full statement of the reasons for the relief requested, including a detailed explanation of the significance of the evidence including material facts," *in the Petition*, in the first instance, not in the Reply. 37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2); *see also Tietex Int'l v. Precision Fabrics Group*, IPR2014-01248, Paper 39 at 14-15 (PTAB Feb. 27, 2016). A Reply is for rebuttal, not to rehabilitate flawed theories in a Petition, as Lilly attempts here by introducing new arguments and evidence—including the declaration of an entirely new expert to proffer the same opinions as its first, and since discredited, expert. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 ("A reply may only respond to arguments raised in the

corresponding opposition.”); Trial Practice Guide at 40; *see also Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC*, No. 2018-1596, slip. op. at \*9 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 12, 2019). Because Lilly failed to rely upon these new arguments and evidence in its Petition, Teva respectfully requests that the Board strike them.

**II. Lilly improperly puts forth a new theory and evidence related to Exhibit 1287.**

Teva’s Response exposed a hole in Lilly’s Petition: Tan 1995 is a basic science pharmacology paper that draws no therapeutic or clinical conclusions. POR, 14-15. The authors intended simply “to investigate immunoblockade as an alternative strategy for probing the role of CGRP as a vasodilator in vivo.” EX1022, Abstract. Thus, Tan 1995 was trying to elucidate CGRP’s role in vasodilation in an experimental animal; not whether an anti-CGRP antibody could be safely developed for human therapeutic use. EX2265, ¶¶83, 121; EX2268, ¶137.

Facing this hole in its primary case, Lilly improperly puts forth new Exhibit 1287 for the first time on Reply to supplement its deficient motivation argument to humanize the claimed anti-CGRP antagonist antibodies. This exhibit should have been filed with Lilly’s Petition. Exhibit 1287 is an entirely new 275-page dissertation, which was not cited previously, was not relied upon by any of Lilly’s experts, and, importantly, was not even shown to be a publicly-available printed publication prior to November 14, 2005.

Lilly relies on EX1287 in Reply to allege that “there [was] ‘no reason’ why

*humanized* anti-CGRP antagonist antibodies should not be developed and used for treating migraine.” Reply at 6, citing EX1287, 247; *see also* Reply, 15. By citing to this dissertation by Tan, who was a student and not a POSA as of his writing, Lilly aims to insert new evidence necessary to its original invalidity theories. But any arguments and evidence as to motivation must have been made in the Petition, not newly advanced for the first time on Reply. *Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*, 821 F.3d 1359, 1369-70 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (indicating that a reply or reply evidence may be excluded if it introduces new evidence that is necessary to make out a *prima facie* case of unpatentability).

Exhibit 1287 is not used to rebut an argument, but instead to plug a deficiency in Lilly’s original evidence on purported motivation. Lilly has given no reason why it could not have included Exhibit 1287 in its Petition. Permitting Lilly to introduce it now to cure flaws in the Petition would be improper. Thus, the Board should strike Lilly’s Reply arguments relating to Exhibit 1287 (pp. 6 and 15) and the entirety of Exhibit 1287.

**III. Lilly improperly presents a new expert (Dr. Balthasar) to rehabilitate the discredited testimony of its first expert (Dr. Charles).**

In the Petition, Lilly relied on Dr. Charles’s expert testimony to support its allegations regarding the effectiveness of Tan 1995’s full-length antibody.

EX1014, e.g., ¶¶56-59, 70-71, 135-136. This argument was central to Lilly’s *prima facie* obviousness case because Lilly relies on efficacy of Tan’s antibody to argue

motivation to combine. Petition at e.g., 16-17, 24, 26-27, 30-32, 38-40.

But on cross examination, Dr. Charles was shown to be unqualified to proffer these opinions, and his testimony was discredited. POR, 4. Lilly's other expert, Dr. Vasserot, undermined Dr. Charles' opinions, testifying that certain data in Tan 1995 are "something that [he] would take with caution and would need to repeat." POR, 3-4, 15-17; EX2191, 118:21- 119:1. Thus, Lilly's Petition Declarants did not support Lilly's Petition arguments. And Teva's experts fully explained that Tan 1995's data does not demonstrate efficacy. EX2265, ¶¶84-85; EX2268, ¶91.

Faced with this vital failure in its Petition, Lilly on Reply seeks to introduce the testimony of a brand new expert, Dr. Balthasar, on the same efficacy issue Dr. Charles failed to support in its Petition. Reply, 10-11; EX1337, ¶¶22, 24-25, 30-33; EX1014, ¶¶56-59. This clearly evidences Lilly's attempt to shore up the same arguments that Lilly relied on in its Petition through new expert testimony on Reply.

Lilly's belated introduction of Dr. Balthasar's declaration to further support its original argument that there was motivation to arrive at the claimed methods based on Exhibit 1022 is impermissible at this stage. Dr. Balthasar's declaration testimony on this point (EX1337, ¶¶22, 24-25, 30-33) and Lilly's arguments based on the same (Reply, 10-11) should be stricken.

# 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.