

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00040
U.S. Patent 7,326,708

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND4

ARGUMENT.....6

I. WO '498 and the '871 Patent Do Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims (Grounds 1 and 2).6

 A. The POSA Would Not Immediately Envisage a Phosphate Salt of Sitagliptin (Claims 1-3, 17, 19, 21-23).....7

 1. WO '498 Does Not Teach a Well-Defined Genus of Salts that the POSA Would “At Once Envisage.”9

 2. Mylan Improperly Narrows the Genus of Combinations.12

 B. Petitioners Do Not Establish that the Claimed Stoichiometry (1:1 Sitagliptin to Phosphoric Acid) is Inherently Anticipated (Claims 1-3, 17, 19, 21-23).14

 C. The (S)-Configuration is Not Anticipated (Claim 3).19

 D. The “Therapeutically Effective Amount” Claims Are Not Anticipated (Claims 17, 19).19

 E. The Process Claims Are Not Anticipated (Claims 21-23).20

II. The 1:1 Sitagliptin DHP Salt Would Not Have Been Obvious.22

 A. WO '498 is Disqualified as Prior Art to the Salt Claims For the Obviousness Inquiry.22

 1. Merck Reduced Claims 1-2, 17, 19, and 21-23 to Practice Prior to January 16, 2003.23

 2. WO '498 is Disqualified as Obviousness Prior Art Because its Subject Matter was Subject to a Common Obligation of Assignment to Merck.27

 B. WO '498 Does Not Render Claims 3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Obvious (Ground 3).28

 C. WO '498 and Bastin Do Not Render Claims 1-3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Obvious (Ground 4).29

 1. The POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Pursue a Sitagliptin-Phosphoric Acid Salt, Much Less 1:1 Sitagliptin DHP.....30

2.	The POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success of Obtaining 1:1 Sitagliptin DHP.	37
3.	Claim 3.	38
4.	Claims 21-23.....	38
III.	The Crystalline Monohydrate Claim Would Not Have Been Obvious.	39
A.	There Are Substantial Differences Between the Scope and Content of the Prior Art and the Claimed Invention.	40
B.	The POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success of Obtaining a Crystalline Monohydrate.....	44
1.	The POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected a Crystalline Monohydrate of 1:1 Sitagliptin DHP to Exist.....	45
2.	The POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Obtaining a Crystalline Monohydrate.....	49
C.	The POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Pursue a Crystalline Monohydrate.....	53
1.	Selecting Sitagliptin or Sitagliptin HCl as a Lead Compound.	54
2.	Selecting 1:1 Sitagliptin <i>Dihydrogenphosphate</i>	55
3.	Selecting <i>Crystalline</i> 1:1 Sitagliptin DHP.....	55
4.	Selecting a Crystalline <i>Hydrate</i> of 1:1 Sitagliptin DHP.....	56
5.	Selecting a Crystalline <i>Monohydrate</i> of 1:1 Sitagliptin DHP.....	59
IV.	The Claimed Salt and Crystalline Hydrate Exhibit Unexpected Properties.....	60
	CONCLUSION	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.</i> , 927 F.2d 1200 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	49
<i>Bayer Pharma AG v. Watson Laboratories, Inc.</i> , 874 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	31
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	23
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	42
<i>Eisai Co. Ltd. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	42
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	13, 14
<i>Grunenthal GmbH v. Alkem Labs. Ltd.</i> , 919 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	passim
<i>Impax Labs., Inc. v. Aventis Pharm. Inc.</i> , 468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	14
<i>In re Armodafinil Patent Litig. Inc.</i> , 939 F. Supp. 2d 456 (D. Del. 2013)	passim
<i>In re Depomed Patent Litig.</i> , 2016 WL 7163647 (D.N.J. Sept. 30, 2016)	55
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	12
<i>In re Kumar</i> , 418 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	51, 52
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	18
<i>In re Steed</i> , 802 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	23

<i>Janssen Prods. L.P. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , 109 F. Supp. 3d 650 (D.N.J. 2014).....	41, 42, 46, 55
<i>Kowa Co., Ltd. v. Amneal Pharm.</i> , 2017 WL 10667089 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 19, 2017	41, 43, 54
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	40
<i>Merck & Cie v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 125 F. Supp. 3d 503 (D. Del. 2015), <i>rev'd on other grounds</i> , 822 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	43
<i>Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Hospira Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 5872620 (D. Del. July 10, 2016)	18
<i>Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 5089543 (D.N.J. Aug. 27. 2015)	32
<i>Millennium Pharms., Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	53
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	7, 20, 21
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.</i> , 851 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	18, 19
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	54
<i>Perricone v. Medicis Pharm. Corp.</i> , 432 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 71 F. Supp. 3d 458 (D. Del. 2014)	10, 32, 34
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	32, 60
<i>Sanofi-Synethelabo v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10, 36, 37

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.