UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/739,180	04/24/2007	Thomas Kelleher	C062-02/03 US	8837

34103 7590 11/30/2010

Intellectual Property Department
Cubist Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
65 Hayden Avenue
Lexington, MA 02421

EXAMINER	
KAM, CHIH MIN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1656	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/30/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	11/739,180	KELLEHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHIH-MIN KAM	1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 September 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29,31-36,38-44,47-52,54-56 and 58-160* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *2-7 and 115* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,8-29,31-36,38-44,47-52,54-56,58-114 and 116-160* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 April 2007* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/22/10*
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. Claims 1-29, 31-36, 38-44, 47-52, 54-56 and 58-160 are pending.

Applicants' amendment filed September 22, 2010 is acknowledged. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 38, 47-52, 58, 59 and 61 have been amended, claims 46 and 57 have been cancelled, and new claims 64-160 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-29, 31-36, 38-44, 47-52, 54-56 and 58-160 are examined.

Withdrawn Claim Objections

2. The previous objection to claims 2-7, 31-36, 39-44, 47-52, 59 and 61-63 is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment to the claims in the amendment filed September 22, 2010.

Withdrawn Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The previous rejection of claims 8-29, 38, 46, 55-56, 58 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being as anticipated by Baker *et al.* (US RE39,071 E) is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment to the claims, applicants' cancellation of the claims, and applicants' response at pages 23-24 in the amendment filed September 22, 2010.

Withdrawn Claim Rejections - Obviousness Type Double Patenting

4. The previous rejection of claims 8-9, 46, 55, 57, 58 and 60 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-20, 26, 28 and 29 of U.S. Patent RE39,071 E is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment to the claims, and applicants' cancellation of the claims in the amendment filed September 22, 2010.

New Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 8-29, 31-36, 38-44, 47-52, 55-56, 58-114 and 116-160 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 8-29, 31-36, 38-44, 47-52, 55-56, 58-114 and 116-160 are indefinite because of the use of the term "impurities 1-14". The term cited renders the claim indefinite, it is not clear what these impurities are, and how they are defined. Claims 8-29, 31-36, 38-44, 47-52, 55-56, 59-61, 63-114 and 116-160 are included in this rejection for being dependent on a rejected claim and not correcting the deficiency of the claims from which they depend.

7. Claims 8-29, 31-36, 38-44, 47-52, 55-56, 95-113 and 116-160 are indefinite because of the use of the term "The composition" or "the composition", while the independent claim (i.e., claim 62) recites the term "Daptomycin", not "A composition".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Baker *et al.* (US RE39,071 E, reissue of U.S. Patent 5,912,226, filed December 16, 1991).

Baker *et al.* teach an antibacterial composition comprising daptomycin (LY146032) obtained in substantially pure form, which refers to daptomycin that contains less than 2.5% of a combined total of anhydro-daptomycin and beta-isomer of daptomycin (column 8, lines 50-60; Examples 4 and 5; claim 1(g), 54), where daptomycin is purified by a procedure using Diaion HP-20 resin column, followed by HPLC and another HP-20 resin column (Examples 1-5). Baker *et al.* also teach the preparation of a pharmaceutical formulation comprising the purified daptomycin (LY146032) with pharmaceutical carriers or excipients (column 9, lines 47-59), and an antibiotic composition comprised of a combination of a compound of formula 1 (i.e., anhydro-A21978C; column 1, lines 14-21), a compound of formula 2 (isomer of A21978C) and a compound of formula 3 (the parent cyclic peptide of A21978C; LY146032) or pharmaceutically acceptable salts (Reissue: claim 18).

Response to Arguments

Applicants indicate that the purity of daptomycin in Baker can only be interpreted as defined by Baker, thus Baker can be interpreted to read that there is 97.5% of daptomycin over a daptomycin plus anhydro-daptomycin ("A") plus beta isomer daptomycin ("B") composition. The present application describes daptomycin purity relative to daptomycin plus anhydro-daptomycin (impurity No. 13) plus beta isomer daptomycin (impurity No. 8) plus 12 other impurities (impurities 1-7, 9-12 and 14) as described in Table 3 of the specification. Thus, Baker

DOCKET ALARM

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.