

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS IV LLC

Petitioner,

v.

PHARMACYCLICS LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01076

Patent No. 8,754,090

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,754,090**

Table of Contents

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	5
A. Overview of the '090 Patent.....	7
B. Prosecution History	8
C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	12
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
A. “administering to the individual once per day between about 420 mg to about 840 mg of an oral dose” (claim 1), “wherein the once per day oral dose is about 560 mg” (claim 2).....	15
B. “mantle cell lymphoma”.....	17
IV. THE PETITION’S PROCEDURAL DEFECTS PRECLUDE INSTITUTION ON BOTH GROUNDS	18
A. Petitioner Fails To Meet Its Threshold Burden To Prove Its Primary Reference, Exhibit 1002, Is A Printed Publication	19
B. Petitioner Did Not Make The Cited April 2009 Press Release Prior Art Of Record, Which Warrants Denial Of the Second Ground.....	21
C. Petitioner Fails To Name All Real Parties-in-Interest	23
V. PETITIONER IS NOT REASONABLY LIKELY TO PREVAIL ON GROUND 1—ANTICIPATION OVER EXHIBIT 1002.....	26
A. Petitioner Cannot Legally Establish That Exhibit 1002 Discloses All Limitations of Claims 1 and 2	27
1. “A method for treating mantle cell lymphoma in an individual who has already received at least one prior therapy for mantle cell lymphoma”	29

2.	“administering to the individual once per day between about 420 mg to about 840 mg” (claim 1) or “wherein the once per day oral dose is about 560 mg” (claim 2)	32
3.	“administering...an inhibitor of Bruton’s tyrosine kinase (Btk) having the structure:	34
B.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because The Patent Office Already Considered Petitioner’s Art And Arguments Regarding Ground 1	35
VI.	PETITIONER IS NOT REASONABLY LIKELY TO PREVAIL ON GROUND 2—OBVIOUSNESS BY EXHIBIT 1002 IN VIEW OF THE ’582 PUBLICATION (EXHIBIT 1003) AND THE PRESS RELEASE (EXHIBIT 1004).....	38
A.	Petitioner’s Obviousness Analysis Fails To Consider The Claimed Methods As A Whole And Is Grounded In Impermissible Hindsight	39
1.	Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden To Establish A Motivation To Combine Or Obviousness To Try.....	40
2.	Petitioner Has Not Established A Reasonable Expectation of Success	44
B.	The Combination of The Exhibits Do Not Teach or Suggest The Dosing Limitations of Claims 1 and 2	48
C.	Petitioner Improperly Dismisses Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness.....	49
1.	Petitioner Improperly Dismisses The Evidence of Secondary Considerations Pharmacocyclics Provided To The Patent Office	50
2.	Additional Secondary Considerations Are Strong Evidence of Nonobviousness.....	54
D.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because The Patent Office Already Considered The Art and Arguments Regarding Ground 2	56

VII. AT MINIMUM, THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE
REDUNDANT GROUND57

VIII. CONCLUSION.....59

Table of Authorities

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Am. Hosp. Supply Corp. v. Travenol Labs., Inc.</i> , 745 F.2d 1 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	42
<i>Amneal Pharms., LLC v. Endo Pharms., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00360, 2015 WL 4500654 (July 22, 2015)	48, 49
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	50
<i>Cepheid v. Roche Molecular Sys., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2015-00255, Paper No. 8 (June 11, 2015).....	27
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Tech. L.L.C.</i> , IPR2014-00871, 2014 WL 7325813 (Dec. 19, 2014)	21
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2014-00914, Paper No. 11, 2015 WL 66520 (Jan. 2, 2015)	19
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Custom Media Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-01272, 2015 WL 430117 (Jan. 30, 2015)	3, 22
<i>Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus., Inc.</i> , 807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	12, 13
<i>Daicel Corp. v. Celanese Int'l Corp.</i> , IPR2014-01515, Paper No. 11, at 17 (Mar. 30, 2015)	41
<i>Dell, Inc. v. Selene Comm'n Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-01411, Paper No. 23, 2015 WL 834148 (Feb. 26, 2015).....	20, 21
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personalweb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00087, 2013 WL 5970178 (June 5, 2013)	58
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs, Inc.</i> , 764 F.3d 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16, 55
<i>Hulu, LLC v. Intertainer, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-01456, Paper No. 8 (Mar. 6, 2015).....	36

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.