## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

### SLAYBACK PHARMA LLC

Petitioner

V.

### SUMITOMO DAINIPPON PHARMA CO., LTD

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2020-01053 U.S. Patent 9,815,827

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

			$\underline{\mathbf{Pa}}$	ige	
TAB	LE OF	AUTH	HORITIES	4	
LIST	ING C	F EXF	HIBITS	5	
I.	Introd	duction	L	.10	
II.	Patent Owner Failed to Show Priority for the Manic Depressive Claims12				
	A.	Paten	t Owner Had to Show Priority	.12	
	В.		t Owner Did Not Show Written Description '927 Provisional	.13	
		1.	There Is No Association in the '927 Provisional Between Lurasidone and Manic Depressive Psychosis	.13	
		2.	The '927 Provisional Does Not "Describe" Treating Manic Depressive Psychosis with Lurasidone	.15	
		3.	There is No Written Description of a Method with All Limitations of the Manic Depressive Claims	.16	
		4.	Obviousness Is Not Written Description	.17	
		5.	Grounds 1 and 2 Are Not Improper	.18	
III.	Clain	ns 1-75	Are Obvious Over Saji Patent (Ground 3)	.20	
	A.		t Owner's Expert Supports the Obviousness aims 1-75 Over Saji Patent	.20	
		1.	"Everyone" Knew Lurasidone Could Treat Schizophrenia	.20	
		2.	Lurasidone Is a Preferred Compound of the Saji Patent	.21	
		3.	The '872 Patent Is a "Logical Outcome" of the Saji Patent	.22	
		4.	The Preferred Dose Range of Saji Patent Falls Within the "Broader" Range of the '827 Patent	22	



7. Dr. Kosten Did Not "Recant" 32  71. Conclusion 33			5.	Was Not Difficult	23
8. Prior Art Studies Reported at Least Half the Patients on other Antipsychotic Medication Did not Gain Weight24  9. Dr. Stahl Confirmed the Significance of Saji Amendment25  B. Conceded Prior Art Explicitly "Suggested" Lurasidone's Cardiovascular and Weight Gain Side Effects Would Be "Weak"26  C. Reciting Inherent Result of Obvious Method Does Not Make a Claim Non-Obvious			6.	Lurasidone's Half-Life Suggested Once-a-Day	23
on other Antipsychotic Medication Did not Gain Weight24  9. Dr. Stahl Confirmed the Significance of Saji Amendment25  B. Conceded Prior Art Explicitly "Suggested" Lurasidone's Cardiovascular and Weight Gain Side Effects Would Be "Weak"26  C. Reciting Inherent Result of Obvious Method Does Not Make a Claim Non-Obvious			7.	"Everybody" Was Motivated Towards Monotherapy	23
B. Conceded Prior Art Explicitly "Suggested" Lurasidone's Cardiovascular and Weight Gain Side Effects Would Be "Weak"26  C. Reciting Inherent Result of Obvious Method Does Not Make a Claim Non-Obvious			8.	1	24
Cardiovascular and Weight Gain Side Effects Would Be "Weak"			9.	Dr. Stahl Confirmed the Significance of Saji Amendment	25
Does Not Make a Claim Non-Obvious		В.			26
the <i>Prima Facie</i> Case of Obviousness		C.			27
Objective Indicia and Anything Novel in the Claims		D.			27
In the Claims of the '827 Patent			1.	<u> </u>	27
E. "The Patient" of the '827 Patent Is Not a "Patient Population"			2.		
V. Settlements in the District Court Litigations Are Not Relevant			3.	The Prior Art Did Not Teach Away From Claims 40-75	29
7. Dr. Kosten Did Not "Recant"       32         7I. Conclusion       33         7II. Certification Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c)(1)       33		E.	"The	Patient" of the '827 Patent Is Not a "Patient Population"	31
/I. Conclusion	IV.	Settle	ments	in the District Court Litigations Are Not Relevant	32
/II. Certification Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c)(1)	V.	Dr. K	osten ]	Did Not "Recant"	32
	VI.	Conc	lusion		33
Certificate of Service34	VII.	Certif	fication	n Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c)(1)	.33
	Certif	ficate o	of Serv	ice	34



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
Braintree Laboratories Inc. v. Novel Laboratories,, 749 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	31
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir 2011)	28
Knowles Electronics LLC v. Cirrus Logic, Inc., 883 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	14
Leapfrog Enter., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc., 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	27
Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	18
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	13
Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	27
Propel Orthodontics, LLC v. Orthoaccel Technologies, Inc. Case IPR2018-00296, slip op. (PTAB June 10, 2019)	12
Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc., 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	14
Research Corp. Techs., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 627 F.3d 859 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	19
Stored Value v. Card Activation, 796 F. Supp. 2d 520 (Dist. Del. 2011), aff'd, 499 Fed. Appx 5 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	16
Statutes and Rules	
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c)(1)	33



## **LISTING OF EXHIBITS**

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 9,815,827, Agent for Treatment of Schizophrenia (filed Aug. 28, 2014) (issued Nov. 14, 2017) (the "827 Patent")
1002	Expert Declaration of Dr. Thomas R. Kosten, M.D. ("Kosten")
1003	U.S. Patent Application 14/471,919 (filed Aug. 28, 2014) ("the '827 Patent Application")
1004	U.S. Patent Application 10/525,021 (filed Aug. 20, 2003) ("Priority Application")
1005	U.S. Application 60/404,927 (filed Aug. 22, 2002) ("Provisional Application" or "the '927 Provisional") with translation from Japanese to English)
1006	Preliminary Amendment in the '827 Patent Application (October 5, 2015) ("Second Preliminary Amendment")
1007	Information published in <i>American Journal of Psychiatry</i> , Vol. 170, No. 8, August 2013, regarding approval of "Latuda® (lurasidone HCl) tablets" for "treatment of major depressive episodes associated with bipolar I disorder (bipolar depression) as monotherapy and as adjunctive therapy with lithium or valproate in adults" ("Latuda® Information") (Stamped "AUG 06 2013")
1008	Neuropsychopharmacology, Vol. 38 (2012), pp. S314–S446, including, Loebel, Antony, et al. "Lurasidone Monotherapy for the Treatment of Bipolar Depression: Results of the 6-Week, Double-blind, Placebo-controlled PREVAIL-2 Study," Neuropsychopharmacology, Vol 38 (2012), W183, pp. S422–423 ("Loebel")
1009	U.S. Patent No. 5,532,372, <i>Imide Derivatives, and Their Production and Use</i> (filed Aug. 30, 1993) (issued Jul. 2, 1996) ("Saji Patent")
1010	Preliminary Amendment in Priority Application (Feb. 18,



# DOCKET

# 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.

