

Filed on behalf of Petitioner COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS IV LLC

By: Jeffrey S. Ward (Reg. No. 32,774)
MERCHANT & GOULD, P.C.
10 E. Doty Street
Suite 600
Madison, WI 53703-3376
Telephone: (608) 280-6751
Facsimile: (612) 332-9081

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS IV LLC
Petitioner

v.

PHARMACYCLICS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. To Be Assigned
Patent No. 8,754,090

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,754,090
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.8.....	3
	A. Real Party-In-Interest.....	3
	B. Notice of Related Matters	4
	C. Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel.....	5
	D. Notice of Service Information	6
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES.....	6
IV.	REQUIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.104	6
	A. Grounds for Standing.....	6
	B. Identification of Challenge and Precise Relief Requested.....	7
	1. Specific Art and Statutory Ground on Which the Challenge is Based	7
	a. Anticipation.....	7
	b. Obviousness	8
	2. Evidence Relied Upon to Support the Challenge	10
V.	OVERVIEW	10
	A. Overview of the '090 Patent	10
	B. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	13
	C. State of the Prior Art.....	13
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	20
	A. “Treating”	20
	B. “About”	21
	C. “Mantle Cell Lymphoma”.....	22

VII.	CLAIMS 1 AND 2 ARE ANTICIPATED BY NCT00849645	22
A.	A method for treating mantle cell lymphoma in an individual who has already received at least one prior therapy for mantle cell lymphoma.....	23
B.	An inhibitor of Bruton’s tyrosine kinase (Btk) having the Structure	24
C.	Administering to the individual once per day between about 420 mg to about 840 mg of an oral dose.....	26
D.	Wherein the once per day oral dose is about 560 mg	27
VII.	CLAIMS 1 AND 2 ARE INVALID AS OBVIOUS	28
A.	A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine the Prior Art	28
B.	The Prior Art Discloses the Elements of Claims 1 and 2	30
1.	A method for treating mantle cell lymphoma in an individual who has already received at least one prior therapy for mantle cell lymphoma	30
2.	An inhibitor of Bruton’s tyrosine kinase (Btk) having the Structure	31
3.	Administering to the individual once per day between about 420 mg to about 840 mg of an oral dose.....	33
4.	Wherein the once per day oral dose is about 560 mg.....	35
C.	A POSA Would Have Had Reasonable Expectation of Success	36
D.	The Claimed Method Would Have Been Obvious to Try	37
E.	No Secondary Considerations Rebut Obviousness.....	39
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	38
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	40-41
<i>ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	35
<i>Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.</i> , 543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	21
<i>Emi Group N. Am. V. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , 268 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	42
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	34-35
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	28
<i>Hoffman La Roche, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	36
<i>In re Alford</i> , 300 F.2d 929 (C.C.P.A. 1962)	41
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	39-40
<i>In re O'Farrell</i> , 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	36-37
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	42
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	38
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	34

<i>King Pharms., Inc. v. Econ Labs., Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	41
<i>MEHL/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum</i> , 192 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	42
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	21-22, 28
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm. Inc. v. Caraco Pharm Labs., Ltd.</i> , 476 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	21
<i>Pall Corp. v. Micron Separations, Inc.</i> , 66 F.3d 1211 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	21
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	37, 40, 43

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.