

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

Petitioner,

v.

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.

Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 7,326,708 to Cypes et al.

Issue Date: February 5, 2008

Title: Phosphoric acid salt of a dipeptidyl peptidase-IV inhibitor

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2020-00040

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,326,708
Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123**

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. INTRODUCTION1

II. OVERVIEW1

III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS5

IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1)).....6

 A. Each Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))6

 B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....6

 1. Judicial Matters Involving the '708 Patent.....6

 2. Administrative Matters7

 C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3), 42.8(b)(4)).....7

V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(A))8

VI. THE '708 PATENT.....8

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION10

VIII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”).....11

IX. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B))11

X. INVALIDITY ANALYSIS12

 A. Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Are Anticipated by WO '49812

 1. Disclosure of WO '49814

 2. Claim 116

 3. Claim 224

 4. Claim 325

5.	Claim 17.....	26
	a) A pharmaceutical composition comprising.....	26
	b) a therapeutically effective amount of the salt according to claim 2	26
	c) in association with one or more pharmaceutically acceptable carriers.	27
6.	Claim 19.....	27
	a) A method for the treatment of type 2 diabetes comprising	27
	b) administering to a patient in need of such treatment a therapeutically effective amount of the salt according to claim 2 or a hydrate thereof.....	27
7.	Claims 21-22	28
8.	Claim 23	30
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-3, 17, 19 and 21-23 Are Anticipated by the '871 Patent.....	31
	1. Disclosure of the '871 Patent.....	31
	2. Claims 1 and 2.....	33
	3. Claim 3	34
	4. Claims 17 and 19.....	35
	5. Claims 21-23	37
C.	Ground 3: Claims 3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498	38
	1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	39
	2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	39
	a) WO '498 (EX1004)	39

b)	Claim 3.....	39
c)	Claim 17.....	41
	(1) A pharmaceutical composition comprising.....	41
	(2) a therapeutically effective amount of the salt according to claim 2	42
	(3) in association with one or more pharmaceutically acceptable carriers.	42
d)	Claim 19.....	42
	(1) A method for the treatment of type 2 diabetes comprising	42
	(2) administering to a patient in need of such treatment a therapeutically effective amount of the salt according to claim 2 or a hydrate thereof.....	43
e)	Claims 21-23.....	43
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1-3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498 and Bastin	46
1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	46
2.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	46
	a) WO '498 (EX1004)	46
	b) Bastin (EX1006).....	46
3.	The Differences Between the Claims and Prior Art	48
	a) Claim 1.....	48
	(1) There Is No Requirement to Select a Lead Compound in Salt Selection Cases	48
	(2) WO '498 and Bastin Would Have Rendered the Phosphoric Acid Salt Obvious	51
	b) Claims 2 and 3	56
	c) Claims 17 and 19	57

d)	Claims 21-23.....	57
E.	Ground 5: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498, Bastin and Brittain	59
1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	59
2.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	59
a)	WO '498 (EX1004) and Bastin (EX1006)	59
b)	Brittain (EX1005)	59
3.	The Differences Between the Claim and Prior Art.....	61
A.	Ground 6: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498 and Brittain.....	62
1.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art.....	62
2.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art	62
a)	WO '498 (EX1004) and Brittain (EX1005)	62
3.	The Differences Between the Claim and Prior Art.....	62
B.	Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness	63
XI.	THE BOARD SHOULD INSTITUTE TRIAL BASED ON MYLAN'S PETITION (35 U.S.C. § 325(D) OR § 314(A)).....	66
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	69

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.