Filed: October 4, 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. IPR2018-01711 Patent No. 9,884,907

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. | Clair | Claim Construction | | | | |
| III. | II. Teva Fails to Rebut the Petition's Strong Case of Obviousness | | | | | |
| | A. | | a's Purported Concerns about the Blood-Brain Barrier Are rrect | | | |
| | B. | | anized Anti-CGRP Antibodies Were Expected To Access Site of Action | | | |
| | C. | | a's Unfounded Safety Concerns Do Not Support ntability12 | | | |
| | | 1. | Clinical Studies Demonstrated that the CGRP Pathway Could Be Safely Antagonized To Treat Migraine12 | | | |
| | | 2. | Long-Acting Ligand Antagonists Had Desirable Benefits and Did Not Raise Safety Concerns14 | | | |
| | | 3. | The Prior Art Would Not Have Dissuaded a POSA from Pursuing a Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody for Treating Migraine | | | |
| | D. | | a's Hypothetical "Spare Receptor Theory" and Ligand s-Binding Concerns Are Incorrect19 | | | |
| | E. | Nova | artis Is Inapposite | | | |
| IV. | Teva's Alleged Secondary Considerations Do Not Support Nonobviousness | | | | | |
| | A. | | a's Evidence Is Not Commensurate with the Scope of the lenged Claims | | | |
| | B. | Teva | 's Secondary Considerations Lack Nexus to the Claims23 | | | |
| | C. | Teva | 's Reliance on Industry Acclaim Is Misplaced24 | | | |

| D. | Teva Failed to Establish Unexpected Results or Industry Skepticism | 25 |
|------|--|----|
| E. | Teva's Purported Evidence of Commercial Success, Licensing, and Long-Felt Need Do Not Support Patentability | 26 |
| Conc | lusion | 27 |

V.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

| <i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.,</i> 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012) |
|---|
| <i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014) |
| Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc., 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) |
| Cole Kepro Int'l, LLC v. VSR Indus., Inc., 695 F. App'x 566 (Fed. Cir. 2017)27 |
| Equistar Chemicals, LP v. ExxonMobil Chemical Patents Inc., IPR2017-01534, Paper 64 (PTAB Dec. 7, 2018)4 |
| Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics, Inc., 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011) |
| <i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)23 |
| <i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)4 |
| Novartis Pharm. Corp. v. West-Ward Pharm. Int'l Ltd., 923 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2019)20 |
| Paint Point Med. Sys., Inc. v. Blephex, LLC, IPR2016-01670, Paper 44 (PTAB Feb. 28, 2018) |
| <i>S. Ala. Med. Sci. Found. v. Gnosis S.P.A.</i> , 808 F.3d 823 (Fed. Cir. 2015)24 |

IPR2018-01711 Patent No. 9,884,907

GLOSSARY

| BBB | Blood-brain barrier |
|-------------------------|---|
| CGRP | Calcitonin gene-related peptide |
| FDA | U.S. Food and Drug Administration |
| IPR | Inter partes review |
| Italicized text | Emphasis added unless otherwise indicated |
| Lilly or Petitioner | Eli Lilly and Company |
| MAb | Monoclonal antibody |
| МАР | Mean arterial pressure |
| POSA | Person of ordinary skill in the art |
| Teva or Patent Owner | Teva Pharmaceuticals International GmbH |
| '907 patent | U.S. Patent No. 9,884,907 |

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.