

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 22-cv-00615 (MN)
	)	
LUPIN LTD., LAURUS LABS LIMITED, AND	)	
CIPLA LIMITED,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

**DEFENDANTS LAURUS LABS LIMITED, CIPLA LIMITED, AND LUPIN LIMITED'S
AMENDED FINAL INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS REGARDING U.S. PATENT NOS.
10,548,846, 10,385,067, 9,708,342 AND 11,744,802**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS AND RESERVATION OF RIGHTS	1
A.	Plaintiff’s Infringement Contentions	4
B.	Claim Construction	5
C.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	7
D.	Prior Art Identification and Citation	7
II.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART	18
1.	Gilead’s U.S. Patent No. 9,216,996 (“the ’996 patent”).....	18
2.	U.S. 2014/0221356 (“US ’356”).....	22
3.	Berge et al., <i>J. Pharma Sci.</i> , (1977), 66(1), 1-19 (“Berge”).....	27
4.	Remington: The Science and Practice of Pharmacy, R. Hendrickson, ed., 21st edition, Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia, Pa., (2005) (“Remington 21 st ”).....	28
5.	Serajuddin, <i>Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev.</i> , (2007), 59, 603-616 (“Serajuddin”).	31
6.	Paulekuhn et al., <i>J. Med. Chem.</i> (2007), 50, 6665-6672 (“Paulekuhn”)...	32
7.	Wells, J., “Pharmaceutical preformulation: the physiochemical properties of drug substances,” <i>Pharmaceutics, The Science of Dosage Form Design</i> , 2nd edition, Chapter 8 (Aulton, M.E., ed., 2002) (“Wells”).....	34
8.	WO 2006/116764 (“WO ’764”).....	35
9.	WO 2010/068253 (“WO ’253”).....	36
10.	EP 2465580 to Johns et al., (“EP ’580”).....	39
11.	2013 Prescribing Information for Tivicay (Dolutegravir Sodium) Tablets (“2013 Tivicay Label”).....	40
12.	Assessment Report from European Medicine Agency for Tivicay/Dolutegravir, Nov. 21, 2013 (“Tivicay Assessment”).....	41
13.	Bastin et al., <i>Org. Process Res. Dev.</i> , (2000) 4, 427-435 (“Bastin”).....	42
14.	Handbook of Pharmaceutical Salts, Selection, and Use, Editors P.H. Stahl, C.G. Wermuth, Chapter 7, Eds. 2002, ISBN 3-906390, 26-8, (“Bowker”).	43

15.	Guidelines for Submitting Supporting Documentation in Drug Applications for the Manufacture of Drug Substances, February 1987 (“1987 FDA Guideline”).....	45
16.	“Crystallization,” ed. by J.W. Mullin (2001) (“Mullin”).	45
17.	Byrn et al., <i>Pharm. Res.</i> , 12(7): 945-954 (1995) (“Byrn”).....	46
18.	Guillory et al., in “Polymorphism in Pharmaceutical Solids” Editor Harry G. Brittain, Chapter 5, Eds. 1999 (“Guillory”).....	48
19.	Brittain, in “Polymorphism in Pharmaceutical Solids” Editor Harry G. Brittain, Chapter 8, Eds. 1999 (“Brittain”).....	49
20.	Hilfiker et al. in “Polymorphism” Editor R. Hilfiker, Chapter 11, Eds. 2006 (“Hilfiker”).....	50
21.	Miller, et al., <i>Pharmaceutical Development and Technology</i> , (2005) 10, 291-297 (“Miller”).....	51
22.	Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in HIV-1 Infected Adults and Adolescents (“HIV Guidelines”).....	52
23.	Gilead's Label for Stribild® (2012) (“Stribild Label”).....	55
24.	Assessment Report from European Medicine Agency for Stribild (“Stribild Assessment”).....	55
25.	Gilead’s US 2010/0285122 (“US ’122”).....	56
26.	Gilead's Label for Atripla® (2012) (“Atripla Label”).....	58
27.	Scientific Discussion from European Medicine Agency for Atripla (“Atripla Assessment”).....	59
28.	Gilead’s US 2007/0099902 (“US ’902”).....	60
29.	Label for Complera® (2011) (“Complera Label”).....	61
30.	Assessment Report from European Medicine Agency for Eviplera (“Eviplera Assessment”).....	62
31.	US 2013/0243857 (“US ’857”).....	63
32.	Gilead’s Label for Genvoya® (2015) (“Genvoya Label”).....	64
33.	Assessment Report from European Medicine Agency for Genvoya (“Genvoya Assessment”).....	65

34.	Shah et al. <i>Pharmacotherapy</i> , 34(5), 506-520 (“Shah”).....	66
35.	Dow et al., <i>Infect. Dis. Ther.</i> , 3:83-102 (“Dow”).	69
36.	Label for Triumeq® (2014) (“Triumeq Label”).	70
37.	Assessment Report from European Medicine Agency for Triumeq (“Triumeq Assessment”).....	71
38.	Gilead, Janssen Expand HIV Combo Collaborations, December 29, 2014 (“Gilead/Janssen”).	72
39.	Gilead’s U.S. Patent No. 7,390,791 (“the ’791 patent”).....	73
40.	Lee et al., <i>Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy</i> , May 2005, Vol. 49, No. 5, pp. 1898-1906 (“Lee”).	75
41.	Gilead’s U.S. 2013/0065856 (“US ’856”).....	77
42.	WO 2014100323 to Jin et al. (“WO ’323”).....	78
43.	Gilead’s WO 2004/064846 (“WO ’846”).....	79
44.	Abebe et al., “Review of bilayer tablet technology,” <i>International Journal of Pharmaceutics</i> , 461(1-2):549-558 (January 2014) (“Abebe”).....	81
45.	Shende et al., “Multi-layer Tablet: Current scenario and recent advances,” <i>International Journal of Drug Delivery</i> , 4:418-426 (2012) (“Shende”)....	82
46.	Chen et al., <i>J. Phys. Chem. Lett.</i> (2012), 3, 2980-2985 (“Chen”).....	82
47.	US 2014/0255426 (“US ’426”).....	83
48.	US 2016/0030353 (“US ’353”).....	84
49.	US 2016/0095850 (“US ’850”).....	85
50.	US 2016/0184332 (“US ’332”).....	87
51.	WO 2015/059466 (“WO ’466”).....	91
52.	US 2018/0194799 (“US ’799”).....	92
53.	U.S. Patent No. 8,129,385 (“’385 patent”).	92
54.	Eron, et al., <i>J. Infect. Dis.</i> (2013), 207(5), 740-48 (“Eron”).....	94
55.	Gilead's U.S. Patent No. 9,708,342 (“the ’342 patent”).	94

56.	Gilead's U.S. Patent No. 10,385,067 ("the '067 patent").	95
57.	Havele et al., <i>Scientific World Journal</i> (2012), Article ID 894136, 1-6 ("Havele").	96
58.	Venkatasan et al., <i>Int'l Scholarly Research Notices</i> (2014), Article ID 894149, 1-9 ("Venkatasan").	97
59.	Kurmi et al., <i>RCS Advances</i> (2015), 5, 96117-96129 ("Kurmi").	98
60.	Product Information for Tivicay (Dolutegravir) Tablets for AUSPAR ("Tivicay Information").	99
61.	US 2015/0231079 ("US '079").	99
62.	Study NCT02121795 on FTC/TAF Fixed Dose Combinations ("FTC/TAF Study").	102
63.	British HIV Association guidelines for the treatment of HIV-1-positive adults with antiretroviral therapy 2015 ("British HIV Guidelines").	102
64.	Ruane et al., "Antiviral Activity, Safety, and Pharmacokinetics/Pharmacodynamics of Tenofovir Alafenamide as 10-Day Monotherapy in HIV-1-Positive Adults," <i>J. Acquir Immune Defic. Syndr</i> , 63(4):449-455 (August 1, 2013) ("Ruane").	103
65.	Sax et al., "Tenofovir Alafenamide Vs. Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate in Single Tablet Regimens for Initial HIV-1 Therapy: A Randomized Phase 2 Study," <i>J. Acquir Immune Defic. Syndr</i> , 67(1):52-58 (September 1, 2014) ("Sax").	104
66.	WO 2013/116720 ("WO '720").	105
67.	Astuti et al., <i>Infect. Dis. Ther.</i> (2014), 3:1-17 ("Astuti").	107
68.	Llibre et al., <i>AIDS Reviews</i> , (2012), 14:168-78 ("Llibre").	109
69.	Osterholzer et al., <i>Clic. Infect. Dis.</i> , (2014), 15:265-271 ("Osterholzer").	111
70.	Study NCT02275065 on BIC ("BIC Safety Study").	112
71.	Study NCT02397694 ("NCT '694").	113
72.	WO 2015/169116 ("WO '116").	114
73.	Tsiang et al., Antiviral Activity of Bictegravir (GS-9883), a Potent Next Generation HIV-1 Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor, Poster #416, 2016 ("Poster 416").	117

74.	Lazerwith et al., Discovery of Bictegravir (GS-9883), a Novel, Unboosted, Once-Daily HIV-1 Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor (INSTI) with Improved Pharmacokinetics and In Vitro Resistance Profile, Poster #414, 2016 (“Poster 414”).	118
75.	Jones et al., Bictegravir (GS-9883), a Novel HIV-1 Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor (INSTI) with Optimized In Vitro Resistance Profile, Poster #413, 2016 (“Poster 413”).	120
76.	BICANDA01157927 (“BICANDA01157927”).	121
77.	Hare et al., Structural and Functional Analyses of the Second-Generation Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor Dolutegravir (S/GSK1349572), Mol. Pharmacol. 80:565–572, 2011 (“Hare”).	124
78.	Walmsley et al., Dolutegravir plus Abacavir–Lamivudine for the Treatment of HIV-1 Infection, N Engl J Med 369:19, 2013 (“Walmsley”).	126
79.	Acosta et al., Novel Method To Assess Antiretroviral Target Trough Concentrations Using In Vitro Susceptibility Data, Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy p. 5938–5945, 2012 (“Acosta”).	127
80.	Allen et al., Research applications of the Cambridge Structural Database (CSD), Chem. Soc. Rev., 33, 463–475, 2004 (“Allen”).	128
81.	White et al., Potent Activity of Bictegravir (BIC; GS-9883), a Novel Unboosted HIV-1 Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor (INSTI), Against with INSTI-Resistance, ASM/ICAAC, 2016 (“White”).	129
82.	Weller et al., Bioequivalence of a Dolutegravir, Abacavir, and Lamivudine Fixed-Dose Combination Tablet and the Effect of Food, J. Acquir. Immune Defic. Syndr. 66:393–398, 2014 (“Weller”).	130
83.	Castagna et al., Dolutegravir in Antiretroviral-Experienced Patients With Raltegravir- and/or Elvitegravir-Resistant HIV-1: 24-Week Results of the Phase III VIKING-3 Study, Journal of Infectious Diseases 210:354–62, 2014 (“Castagna”).	131
84.	Tsiang et al., Antiviral Activity of Bictegravir (GS-9883), a Potent Next Generation HIV-1 Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor, ASM Microbe, 2016 (“Tsiang”).	132
85.	Johns et al., Carbamoyl Pyridone HIV-1 Integrase Inhibitors 3. A Diastereomeric Approach to Chiral Nonracemic Tricyclic Ring Systems and the Discovery of Dolutegravir (S/GSK1349572) and (S/GSK1265744), J. Med. Chem. 56, 5901–5916, 2013 (“Johns”).	132

86.	Juday et al., Factors Associated with Complete Adherence to HIV Combination Antiretroviral Therapy, HIV Clinical Trials, 12:2, 71-78, 2015 (“Juday”).	134
87.	Gilead Presents Preliminary Data on Bictegravir, an Investigational Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor for the Treatment of HIV - Bictegravir Now Being Evaluated in Phase 3 Studies as Part of a Single Tablet HIV Regimen in Combination with Other Antiretroviral Agents -, Gilead Press Release, 2016 (“PR”).	134
88.	Jones et al., Bictegravir (GS-9883), a Novel HIV-1 Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor (INSTI) with Optimized In Vitro Resistance Profile, ASM Microbe, June 16-20, 2016 (“Jones”).	136
89.	Mathias et al., Bioequivalence of the Emtricitabine / Rilpivirine / Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate Single Tablet Regimen, J. Bioequiv. Availab. 4:7, 2012 (“Mathias”).	136
90.	Min et al., Antiviral activity, safety, and pharmacokinetics/ pharmacodynamics of dolutegravir as 10-day monotherapy in HIV-1-infected adults, Wolters Kluwer Health, 2011 (“Min”).	137
91.	Clinical Study Synopsis NCT02607956, 2015 (“NCT02607956-1”).	138
92.	Clinical Study Synopsis NCT02607956, 2016 (“NCT02607956-2”).	139
93.	Highleyman, New integrase inhibitor bictegravir looks promising in early studies, aidsmap.com, 2016 (“Highleyman”).	140
94.	Lunzen et al., Once daily dolutegravir (S/GSK1349572) in combination therapy in antiretroviral-naïve adults with HIV: planned interim 48 week results from SPRING-1, a dose-ranging, randomised, phase 2b trial, thelancet.com 2011 (“Lunzen”).	141
95.	Thomas et al., <i>WebCSD: the online portal to the Cambridge Structural Database</i> , J. Appl. Cryst. 43, 362–366, 2010 (“Thomas”).	142
96.	Brameld et al., Small Molecule Conformational Preferences Derived from Crystal Structure Data. A Medicinal Chemistry Focused Analysis, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 48, 1-24, 2008 (“Brameld”).	143
III.	LEGAL PRINCIPLES	144
A.	Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (AIA)	144
B.	Anticipation	145
C.	Obviousness	145

D.	Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	148
E.	Enablement	150
F.	Written Description.....	152
G.	Indefiniteness	153
IV.	INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NOS. 9,708,342 AND 10,385,067	154
A.	Background Information for the '342 and '067 Patents	154
1.	Common Specification of the '342 and '067 Patents	155
2.	Asserted Claims of the '342 Patent.....	162
3.	Selected Excerpts from the Prosecution History of the '342 Patent.....	164
4.	Asserted Claims of the '067 Patent.....	165
5.	Selected Excerpts for the Prosecution History of the '067 Patent	167
6.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art for the '342 and '067 Patents ..	168
B.	The Asserted Claims of the '342 Patent are Invalid	169
1.	The Parties' Claim Construction Dispute on Terms Relevant to the '342 Claims	169
2.	The Asserted Claims are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	169
a.	Claim 1	172
i.	Claim 1 of the '996 patent in view of US '356 and common knowledge in the art	176
ii.	Claim 1 of the '996 patent in view of prior art in Section II disclosing sodium as a preferred pharmaceutically acceptable salt, optionally in view of other references from Section II and common knowledge in the art.....	178
iii.	Claim 1 of the '996 patent in view of prior art in Section II disclosing dolutegravir sodium and/or cabotegravir sodium and common knowledge in the art, optionally in view other references from Section II.	185
b.	Claim 2.....	195

c.	Claim 3.....	198
d.	Claim 7.....	205
e.	Claims 10-11 (when depending from claims 1-3 and 7).....	211
f.	Claims 12-16, and 18-25 (when depending from claims 1-3 and 7)	214
i.	Double Patenting over Claim 1 of the '996 patent.....	214
ii.	Double Patenting over Claim 2 of the '996 patent.....	226
g.	Motivation to Combine References for Purposes of Obviousness- Type Double Patenting	230
3.	The Asserted Claims are Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	232
4.	The Asserted Claims Are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	235
a.	Motivation to Combine References	240
5.	No Secondary Considerations Sufficient to Overcome Obviousness and Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	242
6.	If the Asserted Claims Are Not Invalid for Anticipation, Obviousness or Obviousness-Type Double Patenting, Then They Are Invalid for Lack of Enablement	247
a.	Breadth of the Claims	248
i.	Form Claims.....	248
ii.	Composition Claims.....	249
b.	Nature of the Invention, Level of Predictability of the Art and State of the Prior Art.....	258
c.	Level of Direction Provided and Working Examples.....	262
d.	Quantity of Experimentation Required.....	264
7.	If the Asserted Claims Are Not Invalid for Anticipation, Obviousness or Obviousness-Type Double Patenting, Then They Are Invalid for Lack of Written Description.....	265
a.	Form Claims.....	266
b.	Composition Claims.....	269

i.	Lack of Representative Species.....	270
ii.	No Structural Features Common to the Genus Allowing a POSA to Visualize or Recognize the Members of the Genus 271	
8.	Certain Claims Are Invalid for Indefiniteness	272
a.	Claim 7.....	272
b.	Claims 10-26.....	273
c.	Claims 10 and 11	274
d.	Claim 12 and Its Dependent Claims	275
C.	The Asserted Claims of the '067 Patent are Invalid	276
1.	The Parties' Claim Construction Dispute on Terms Relevant to the '067 Claims	276
2.	The Asserted Claims are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	277
a.	Claims 8-9 (depending from claim 1).....	282
b.	Claims 10-18 (depending from claims 10-13), and 19 (depending from claims 10-13).....	283
c.	Claim 18 (depending from claims 14 and 16) and 19 (depending from claims 14 and 16)	290
d.	Motivation to Combine References for Purposes of Obviousness- Type Double Patenting	292
1.	The Asserted Claims are Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	292
e.	Claims 1, 8-16, 18 (depending from claims 10-13), and 19 (dependence from claims 10-13).....	296
i.	Claim 1	296
2.	The Asserted Claims are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	304
a.	Motivation to Combine References	310
3.	No Secondary Considerations Sufficient to Overcome Obviousness and Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	311

4.	If the Asserted Claims Are Not Invalid for Anticipation, Obviousness or Obviousness-Type Double Patenting, Then They Are Invalid for Lack of Enablement and Lack of Written Description	318
5.	Certain Claims Are Invalid for Indefiniteness	319
V.	INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,548,846	321
A.	Background Information for the '846 Patent	321
1.	Specification of the '846 Patent	322
2.	Asserted Claims of the '846 Patent	330
3.	Selected Excerpts for the Prosecution History of the '846 Patent	331
4.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art for the '846 Patent	335
B.	The Asserted Claims of the '846 Patent Are Invalid	336
1.	The Parties' Claim Construction Dispute on Terms Relevant to the '067 Claims	336
2.	The Asserted Claims are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting over Gilead's '067 Patent	336
a.	Double Patenting over Claim 19 (depending from claim 16)	340
i.	Claim 1	340
	(a) Analysis when Preamble Is Non-Limiting	343
	(b) Analysis When Preamble Is Limiting	362
ii.	Claims 2-3	370
iii.	Claims 4-5	373
iv.	Claims 6-7	376
v.	Claim 8	377
b.	Double Patenting over Claim 19 (depending from claim 17)	378
i.	Claims 1-2	378
ii.	Claim 3	382
i.	Claims 4-5	385

ii.	Claims 6-8	388
c.	Motivation to Combine References for Purposes of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	388
3.	The Asserted Claims are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting over Gilead’s ’342 Patent.....	389
a.	Claim 1	392
b.	Claim 2.....	420
c.	Claim 3.....	423
d.	Claims 4-5	433
e.	Claims 6-7	438
f.	Claim 8.....	440
g.	Motivation to Combine References for Purposes of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	441
4.	The Asserted Claims Are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	444
a.	Claim 1	446
b.	Claim 2.....	471
c.	Claims 6-7	474
d.	Claim 8.....	476
5.	Obviousness over WO ’116	476
a.	Motivation to Combine References	482
6.	No Secondary Considerations Sufficient to Overcome Obviousness and Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	485
7.	If the Asserted Claims Are Not Invalid for Anticipation, Obviousness or Obviousness-Type Double Patenting, Then They Are Invalid for Lack of Enablement and Written Description.....	490
a.	Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 assuming Gilead’s construction of “multilayer tablet.”	491
i.	Indefinite under Gilead’s Construction of “a multilayer tablet.”	492

b.	Lack of Enablement under Gilead’s Construction of “a multilayer tablet”	493
i.	Breadth of the Claims	493
ii.	Nature of the Invention, Level of Predictability of the Art and State of the Prior Art.....	493
iii.	Level of Direction Provided and Working Examples	494
iv.	Quantity of Experimentation Required	494
VI.	INVALIDITY OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,744,802.....	495
A.	Background Information for the ’802 Patent.....	495
1.	Specification of the ’802 Patent.....	495
2.	Asserted Claims of the ’802 Patent.....	502
3.	Selected Excerpts for the Prosecution History of the ’802 Patent	503
4.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art for the ’802 Patent.....	505
B.	The Asserted Claims of the ’802 Patent Are Invalid	505
1.	The Parties’ Claim Construction Dispute on Terms Relevant to the ’802 Claims	505
2.	Anticipation over WO ’116	506
3.	The Asserted Claims of the ’802 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	508
a.	Claim 1	511
b.	Claims 2-8.....	531
c.	Claims 9-11	543
d.	Claims 12-13	548
4.	The Asserted Claims are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting over Gilead’s ’067 Patent.....	550
a.	Claim 1	554
b.	Claims 2-8.....	572
c.	Claims 9-11	575

d.	Claims 12-13	581
e.	Motivation to Combine References for Purposes of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	583
f.	Claims 1-13 Are Also Invalid For Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Over Claim 19 of the '067 Patent (when Depending from Claim 17)	586
5.	The Asserted Claims are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting over Gilead's '342 Patent.....	589
a.	Claim 1	593
b.	Claims 2-8.....	610
c.	Claims 9-11	614
d.	Claims 12-13	620
6.	No Secondary Considerations Sufficient to Overcome Obviousness and Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	621
7.	If the Asserted Claims Are Not Invalid for Anticipation, Obviousness or Obviousness-Type Double Patenting, Then They Are Invalid for Lack of Enablement and Written Description.....	623
VII.	RESERVATION OF RIGHTS	624