

Date Filed: November 20, 2020

Filed On Behalf Of:
Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation

By:
Nicholas N. Kallas
nkallas@Venable.com
(212) 218-2243

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BIOCON PHARMA LIMITED,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01263
Patent 8,101,659

**NOVARTIS'S PATENT OWNER
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. The Prior Art	4
1. EP '072: Biocon improperly compares the heart failure model of EP '072 Example 1(b) with the hypertension models in the Webb Declaration and ignores the failed hypertension model results of EP '072 Example 2.....	4
2. Gomez-Monterrey	14
B. The Claimed Invention.....	15
1. The '659 Patent specification discloses the antihypertensive activity of sacubitril and valsartan and cites EP '072.....	15
2. The '659 Patent's parent application was allowed based on the Webb Declaration.	16
3. The '659 Patent was allowed based on the Webb Declaration.	19
C. Claim Construction And The Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art ...	21
III. BIOCON'S PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM IS UNPATENTABLE.....	22
A. The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d); Biocon Fails To Show The Examiner Erred In A Manner Material To Patentability In Finding Unexpected Results.....	22
1. The Examiner considered substantially the same art and/or arguments during prosecution (<i>Becton</i> factors (a), (b), (d)).	23
2. Biocon has not established the Office erred in a manner material to patentability in finding unexpected results (<i>Becton</i> factors (c), (e), (f)).	27

a.	Biocon does not challenge that the Webb Declaration reported synergistic antihypertensive results.	28
b.	Biocon’s argument, that EP ’072 Example 1(b) reports a synergistic antihypertensive effect, lacks support and is factually incorrect.	28
c.	EP ’072 Example 2’s failed hypertension results further confirm the unexpectedness of the Webb Declaration data.	32
d.	Biocon’s remaining arguments similarly lack merit.	35
B.	In Both Grounds 1 And 2, Biocon Fails To Show A Motivation To Combine	38
1.	Biocon’s motivation analysis based on Gomez-Monterrey is deficient.	39
a.	Gomez-Monterrey explores NEP’s active site.	40
b.	Gomez-Monterrey concludes that non-thiol inhibitors may be preferred to explore the structure of NEP (not for treatment) using distinct compounds (not SQ 28603 or sacubitril).	41
c.	Gomez-Monterrey expressly contradicts Biocon’s assertion that thiol inhibitors would not be ideal for optimal recognition of the zinc ligand.	43
d.	The prior art, including Gomez-Monterrey, reports thiol inhibitors that are more potent than carboxylate inhibitors.	44
e.	Biocon selects Ksander and the ’996 Patent without credible explanation.	45
2.	Biocon’s remaining Ground 2 motivation arguments are legally insufficient.	47
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	50
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	51

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>3Shape A/S v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00173, Paper 14 (PTAB June 12, 2020)	39, 40
<i>Actavis LLC v. Abraxis Bioscience, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01103, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 10, 2017)	35
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR 2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	23, 26, 27
<i>Amneal Pharm., LLC v. Supernus Pharm., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00368, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 17, 2013)	37
<i>Apotex Inc. v. Celgene Corp.</i> , IPR2018-00685, Paper 8 (PTAB Sep. 27, 2018).....	35
<i>Argentum Pharm. LLC v. Novartis AG</i> , IPR2016-01479, Paper 61 (PTAB Oct. 5, 2020).....	30, 31
<i>Ayla Pharma LLC v. Novartis AG</i> , IPR2020-00295, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 6, 2020).....	47
<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	49
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017)	23, 27, 31, 37
<i>Boragen, Inc. v. Syngenta Participations AG</i> , IPR2020-00124, Paper 18 (PTAB Aug. 10, 2020).....	36
<i>Cosmax Co. v. AmorePacific Corp.</i> , IPR2018-01516, Paper 8 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2019).....	31, 37
<i>CSL Behring GmbH v. Bioverativ Therapeutics Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01313, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2019)	31, 34, 37
<i>Dorco Co. v. Gillette Co.</i> , IPR 2017-00500, Paper 7 (PTAB June 21, 2017)	25

<i>Fujian Sanan Grp. Co. v. Epistar Corp.</i> , IPR2018-00963, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 20, 2018).....	49
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Regents of the Univ. of Minnesota</i> , IPR2017-01753, Paper 42 at 25 (PTAB Apr. 22, 2020)	34, 36
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. United States</i> , IPR2019-01453, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 20, 2020).....	37
<i>GlaxoSmithKline LLC v. Fibrogen, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01315, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 11, 2017)	30, 31
<i>I-MAK, Inc. v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC</i> , IPR2018-00122, Paper 10 (PTAB May 21, 2018)	48
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	48
<i>In re Huellmantal</i> , 324 F.2d 998 (C.C.P.A. 1963).....	33
<i>In re Wesslau</i> , 353 F.2d 238 (CCPA 1965)	34, 36
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00827, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2018).....	39
<i>Koios Pharm. LLC v. medac Gesellschaft für klinische Spezialpräparate mbH</i> , IPR2016-01370, Paper 13 (PTAB Feb. 8, 2017).....	37
<i>LG Electronics, Inc. v. Wi-Lan Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00704, Paper 14 (PTAB Sep. 5, 2018).....	36
<i>Milwaukee Elec. Tool Corp. v. Irwin Indus. Tool Co.</i> , IPR2015-01461, Paper 39 (PTAB Sept. 29, 2016).....	36
<i>Mylan Pharm Inc. v. AstraZeneca AB</i> , IPR2016-01325, Paper 11 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016)	37
<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	46, 47, 49
<i>Quanergy Sys., Inc. v. Velodyne LiDAR, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00256, Paper 14 (PTAB May 25, 2018)	38

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.