

Filed on behalf of: Corcept Therapeutics, Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,  
*Petitioner*

v.

CORCEPT THERAPEUTICS, INC.,  
*Patent Owner*

---

Case PGR2019-00048  
U.S. Patent No. 10,195,214

---

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

**Table of Contents**

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	7
A. Cushing Syndrome Is A Serious Endocrine Disorder.....	7
B. Korlym <sup>®</sup> Treats The Symptoms of Cushing’s Syndrome .....	7
C. Mifepristone, the Active Ingredient in Korlym <sup>®</sup> , Can Cause Serious Side Effects.....	8
D. Mifepristone Is A CYP3A Substrate.....	10
E. Drugs That Are Strong CYP3A Inhibitors Can Dangerously Increase CYP3A Substrate Blood Levels When Co- Administered .....	11
F. Mifepristone Exhibits Complex Pharmacokinetics.....	12
G. Prior to the Claimed Inventions, A POSA Would Not Have Administered More Than 300 mg of Mifepristone in Combination With a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor.....	13
1. The Prior Art Taught Strong CYP3A Inhibitors Would Significantly Increase Mifepristone Exposure.....	13
2. Due to the Potential for an Unsafe Drug Interaction, the Prior Art Warned Against Co-Administration of Strong CYP3A Inhibitors With Greater Than 300 mg Mifepristone .....	14
3. The Only Case Report in the Prior Art of the Co- Administration of a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor With 600 mg Mifepristone Disclosed Unacceptably High Mifepristone Levels And Serious Adverse Events .....	15
4. POSAs Heeded The Warnings In The Prior Art.....	16

H.	Patent Owner Unexpectedly Discovered That 600 mg of Mifepristone Could Be Safely and Effectively Administered in Combination With A Strong CYP3A Inhibitor.....	17
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	20
IV.	PETITIONER’S ASSERTED REFERENCES .....	22
A.	The 2012 Korlym Label .....	22
B.	Lee .....	24
C.	2006 FDA Guidance.....	28
V.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO PROVE BY A PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE THAT THE ’214 PATENT CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....	29
A.	Petitioner Has Failed to Show That a POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success Based on Ground One or Two.....	29
1.	Petitioner’s Declarant Confirmed that a POSA Would Not Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success .....	30
2.	Instead, a POSA Would Have Affirmatively Expected That The Claimed Inventions Would Not Be Successful.....	34
(a)	POSAs Who Treat Cushing’s Syndrome Patients Did Not Expect The Claimed Inventions To Work.....	36
(b)	Based On Pharmacokinetics Alone, A POSA Would Have Expected Clinically Significant Interactions Between Mifepristone And Strong CYP3A Inhibitors .....	41
(i)	Dr. Greenblatt’s Five Part Test Indicated There Would Be A Clinically Significant Interactions Between Mifepristone And Strong CYP3A Inhibitors .....	42

(ii)	The Mathematical Test For DDI Indicated There Would Be A Clinically Significant Interactions Between Mifepristone And Strong CYP3A Inhibitors .....	46
(iii)	Petitioner Fails To Account For Ketoconazole’s Metabolism.....	48
(c)	A POSA Would Also Have Expected A Pharmacodynamic Interaction Between Mifepristone And Certain Strong CYP3A Inhibitors, Including Ketoconazole .....	49
(d)	Petitioner’s Only Evidence To The Contrary Is Based On A Misreading Of The Lee Reference.....	52
B.	Routine Optimization Would Not Have Led to The Claimed Inventions .....	56
1.	It Would Not Have Been “Routine” For a POSA To Use The Dosing Section of the Korlym Label To Arrive At The Claimed Dose.....	58
2.	A POSA Would Not Have Arrived at the Claimed Inventions Via a “Routine” DDI Study .....	60
3.	Petitioner’s Routine Optimization Case Law Is Inapposite .....	65
C.	Secondary Considerations Support the Nonobviousness of the Claims of the ’214 Patent .....	69
1.	The Prior Art Teaches Away from the Claimed Inventions.....	69
2.	The Claimed Inventions Produced Unexpected Results.....	72
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	77

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Amerigen Pharm. Ltd. v. UCB Pharma GmbH</i> , 913 F.3d 1076 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	65
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	66
<i>E.I. Dupont de Nemours &amp; Co. v. Synvina C.V.</i> , 904 F.3d 996 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	65
<i>Endo Pharm. Inc. v. Actavis LLC</i> , 922 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	65-66
<i>Grunenthal GMBH v. Alkem Labs. Ltd.</i> , 919 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	68-69
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Cobalt Pharm. Inc.</i> , No. 07-4539, 2010 WL 4687839 (D.N.J. Nov. 10, 2010).....	34
<i>Honeywell Int’l Inc. v. Mexichem Amanco Holding S.A.</i> , 865 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	60-61
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00804, Paper 83 (PTAB Oct. 3, 2018).....	57, 62
<i>InSite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , No. 11-3080, 2013 WL 5975015 (D.N.J. Oct. 4, 2013).....	34
<i>Institut Pasteur &amp; Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	29-30
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	29
<i>Janssen Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , No. 08-5103, 2012 WL 3990221 (D.N.J. Sept. 11, 2012).....	34-35
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	57
<i>Luye Pharma v. Alkermes Pharma Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-01096, Paper 74 (PTAB Nov. 28, 2017).....	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.