

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES LTD.  
Petitioner,

v.

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-01072  
Patent No. 7,326,708

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
*Submitted Electronically via the PTAB E2E System*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. OVERVIEW .....	1
III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A)); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS .....	5
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 Matters.....	7
C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3), 42.8(b)(4)) .....	8
V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(A)).....	9
VI. THE '708 PATENT.....	9
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	11
VIII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”).....	11
IX. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)) .....	12
X. INVALIDITY ANALYSIS.....	13
A. Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Are Anticipated by WO '498 .....	13
1. Disclosure of WO '498 .....	14
2. Claim 1 .....	17
3. Claim 2 .....	25

4. Claim 3 .....25

5. Claim 17 .....26

    a) A pharmaceutical composition comprising .....26

    b) a therapeutically effective amount of the salt according to claim 2.....27

    c) in association with one or more pharmaceutically acceptable carriers. ....27

6. Claim 19 .....28

    a) A method for the treatment of type 2 diabetes comprising .....28

    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.....28

7. Claims 21-22 .....28

8. Claim 23 .....31

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 .....39

    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 .....	40
c) Claim 17 .....	42
(1) A pharmaceutical composition comprising .....	42
(2) a therapeutically effective amount of the salt according to claim 2 .....	42
(3) in association with one or more pharmaceutically acceptable carriers. ....	43
d) Claim 19 .....	43
(1) A method for the treatment of type 2 diabetes comprising .....	43
(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 .....	44
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.....	47
a) WO '498 (EX1004).....	47
b) Bastin (EX1006) .....	47
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.....57

c) Claims 17 and 19.....57

d) Claims 21-23 .....58

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.....60

a) WO '498 (EX1004) and Bastin (EX1006) .....60

b) Brittain (EX1005) .....60

3. The Differences Between the Claim and Prior Art.....61

F. 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

G. Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness .....64

XI. THE BOARD SHOULD INSTITUTE TRIAL BASED ON SUN'S PETITION (35 U.S.C. § 325(D) OR § 314(A)).....67

XII. CONCLUSION.....70

# 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.