

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL

Paper No. ____
Filed: July 30, 2015

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS VI LLC

Petitioner,

v.

CELGENE CORPORATION

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01096

Patent 6,315,720

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL

Patent Owner Preliminary Response

IPR2015-01096
Patent 6,315,720

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. The Challenge of Protecting A Fetus From A Teratogenic Drug While Allowing A Patient Access to Its Efficacy.....	5
B. Previous Attempts to Control Access to Other Drugs Were Unsuccessful	11
C. The '720 Patent	14
III. ARGUMENT.....	18
A. The Petition Should Be Denied Because CFAD Has Failed To Show A Reasonable Likelihood That The Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable	19
1. CFAD’s Expert Declaration Is Entitled to “little or no weight”	19
(a) Dr. Fudin Is Not A POSA.....	19
(b) Dr. Fudin’s Opinions Are Unsupported, Verbatim Recitations of CFAD’s Conclusory Arguments	21
2. Ground 1: Claims 1-32 Are Not Anticipated by the July 1998 Thalomid PI.....	22
(a) Legal Standards	22
(b) The July 1998 Thalomid PI Does Not Disclose Each Claim Limitation, Either Expressly Or Inherently	23
i. Claim 1	24
1) Element 1(b) – “defining a set of information to be obtained from said	

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL

Patent Owner Preliminary Response

IPR2015-01096
Patent 6,315,720

patient, which information is probative of the risk that said adverse side effect is likely to occur if said drug is taken by said patient”24

2) Element 1(c) – “in response to said information set, assigning said patient to at least one of said risk groups and entering said risk group assignment in said medium”25

3) Element 1(d) – “based upon said information and said risk group assignment, determining whether the risk that said adverse side effect is likely to occur is acceptable.”27

4) Element 1(e) – “upon a determination that said risk is acceptable, generating a prescription approval code to be retrieved by said pharmacy before said prescription is filled.”28

ii. Dependent Claims 2-2729

1) Claim 5 – “Wherein said risk group assignment and said informed consent is verified by said prescriber at the time that said patient is registered in said computer readable storage medium.”30

2) Claim 6 – “wherein said risk group assignment and said informed consent is transmitted to said computer readable storage medium by facsimile and interpreted by optical character recognition software.”32

3) Claim 9 – “Wherein said diagnostic testing is probative of the

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL

Patent Owner Preliminary Response

IPR2015-01096
Patent 6,315,720

concentration of said drug in a tissue of said patient.”33

4) Claim 10 – “wherein said diagnostic testing comprises genetic testing”35

5) Claim 15(h) – “entering said second set of information in said medium before said patient is approved to receive said drug”36

6) Claim 17 – “Wherein said survey is conducted telephonically using an integrated voice response system.”37

iii. Independent Claim 28 and Dependent Claims 29-3237

3. Ground 2: Claims 1-32 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over The July 1998 Thalomid PI, Cunningham, and the Knowledge of a POSA39

(a) The Petition Fails To Address The Redundancy With The 2015-01102 and 2015-01103 Petitions.....39

(b) CFAD Fails to Consider the Claim Language as a Whole or to Perform a Proper *Graham* Analysis41

(c) CFAD Has Not Provided A Motivation To Combine the July 1998 Thalomid PI and Cunningham.....43

(d) The July 1998 Thalomid PI, Cunningham, And The Knowledge Of A POSA Fail To Disclose, Teach, Or Suggest Key Elements Of The Claimed Inventions.....46

i. Claim 1(e) and 28(e) – “approval code”46

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL

Patent Owner Preliminary Response

IPR2015-01096
Patent 6,315,720

- ii. Claim 5 – “Wherein said risk group assignment and said informed consent is verified by said prescriber at the time that said patient is registered in said computer readable storage medium.”47
- iii. Claim 17 – “Wherein said survey is conducted telephonically using an integrated voice response system.”49
- 4. CFAD Fails To Address The Objective Evidence of Nonobviousness Regarding the ’720 Patent50
 - (a) Long-felt Need Further Supports The Nonobviousness Of The Claimed Inventions.....50
 - (b) Commercial Success Further Supports The Nonobviousness Of The Claimed Inventions.....52
 - (c) Third-Party Praise And Awards Further Supports The Nonobviousness Of The Claimed Inventions53
 - (d) Licensing by Others Further Supports The Nonobviousness Of The Claimed Inventions.....53
 - (e) Unexpected Results Further Supports The Nonobviousness Of The Claimed Inventions.....54
- B. The Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 316(b)55
- C. The Petition Should Be Denied For Failing To Name All Real Parties-In-Interest58
- IV. CONCLUSION.....60

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.