

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PHIGENIX, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

IMMUNOGEN, INC.  
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00676  
Patent 8,337,856 B2

**PETITIONER PHIGENIX, INC.'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER  
IMMUNOGEN, INC'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE TO THE PETITION**

**Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"**  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Patent Owner (“PO”)’s Response Fails To Overcome The Strong Prima Facie Case Of Obviousness .....	1
II.	All Limitations Of Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 8,337,856 Are Disclosed In Chari 1992 In View Of The HERCEPTIN® Label And The Combination Renders The Claims Obvious .....	3
A.	HERCEPTIN® Had Acceptable Toxicity Contrary To PO’s Arguments.....	4
B.	Pai-Scherf 1999 Is Not Relevant As It Discloses A Fusion Protein Not An Antibody-Drug Conjugate .....	4
C.	Mouse Xenograft Models Can Be Used Effectively To Study Antigen-Specific Drug Targeting .....	6
D.	Herceptin Resistance Would Not Discourage Use Of An Anti-HER2 Immunoconjugate .....	8
E.	Reasonable Expectation Of Success For An Additive Effect Between huMAB4D5-8 And Maytansinoids .....	11
F.	POSA Knows That A Maytansinoid Linked To Herceptin Via A Non-Cleavable Linker Is Highly Cytotoxic to ErbB2-Expressing Breast Cancer Cells As Shown In Chari 1992 .....	12
G.	Motivation Existed To Humanize The Antibody In The Conjugate Of Chari 1992 To Reduce Immunogenicity As Chari 1992 Expressly Teaches And PO’s Expert Admits.....	17
III.	Alleged Secondary Considerations Of Non-Obviousness Lack A Nexus To The Claimed Features Of Claims 1-8 Of The ‘856 Patent.....	17
A.	No Unexpected Results .....	18
B.	The Alleged Unexpected Results Are Not Commensurate With The Scope Of The Claims .....	19
C.	The Alleged Unexpected Results Do Not Inherently Flow From The Original Disclosure.....	20
D.	No Long-Felt, Unmet Need.....	20
E.	No Nexus Between Industry Praise And The Claimed Features .....	21
F.	No Nexus Between Commercial Success And The Claimed Features.....	22

**PETITIONER PHIGENIX, INC.'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER IMMUNOGEN, INC.'S PATENT  
OWNER RESPONSE TO THE PETITION  
CASE IPR2014-00676**

G. The Alleged Secondary Considerations Have No Nexus To The  
Claimed Invention Which PO Admitted Was Not Even Conceived  
As Of The Priority Date Of The '856 Patent..... 23

IV. Conclusion ..... 24

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	19
<i>In re Grasselli</i> , 713 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	19
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	13
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	22
<i>In re Khelghatian</i> , 364 F.2d 870 (1966).....	20
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	3
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	22
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	21
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	19
<i>Power-One, Inc. v. Artesyn Techs., Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	21
<i>Proctor &amp; Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms, USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	2
<i>Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters., Inc.</i> , 632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	22

**I. Patent Owner (“PO”)’s Response Fails To Overcome The Strong *Prima Facie* Case Of Obviousness**

The combination of Chari 1992 (Ex. 1012) and the HERCEPTIN<sup>®</sup> Label (Ex. 1008) teaches or suggests each and every limitation recited in Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 8,337,856 (“the ‘856 Patent”). Chari 1992 discloses an immunoconjugate comprising a maytansinoid conjugated to an anti-ErbB2-antibody (Ex. 1012, Fig. 2) as recited in Claim 1. Chari 1992 also discloses that the maytansinoid is DM1 and that the antibody is chemically linked to the maytansinoid *via* a disulfide or thioether group (Ex. 1012, Fig. 2), as recited in Claim 2 of the ‘856 Patent. The immunoconjugate of Chari 1992 may comprise from 3-5 maytansinoid molecules per antibody molecule (Ex. 1012, p. 129, bottom right col., Table 2), as recited in Claim 3 of the ‘856 patent. The antibody and the maytansinoid were conjugated by a chemical linker selected from SPDP or SMCC (Ex. 1012, p. 128, bottom right col., Fig. 2), as recited in Claims 4 and 6-8 of the ‘856 Patent.

While Chari 1992 expressly suggests humanizing the murine antibody, Chari 1992 does not explicitly disclose huMAB4D5-8 (recited in Claim 1 of the ‘856 Patent) or a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (recited in Claim 5 of the ‘856 Patent). However, the HERCEPTIN<sup>®</sup> Label describes the clinical use of huMAB4D5-8 (*i.e.*, HERCEPTIN<sup>®</sup>), which is described as being indicated for the

# 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.