

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 NO.: UNASSIGNED

PATENT NO. 6,315,720

FILED: OCTOBER 23, 2000

ISSUED: NOVEMBER 13, 2001

INVENTORS: BRUCE A. WILLIAMS, JOSEPH K. KAMINSKI

TITLE: METHODS FOR DELIVERING A DRUG TO A PATIENT WHILE  
AVOIDING THE OCCURRENCE OF AN ADVERSE SIDE EFFECT KNOWN  
OR SUSPECTED OF BEING CAUSED BY THE DRUG

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,315,720**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	GROUND FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A)).....	1
III.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8).....	1
	A. Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)) .....	1
	B. Related Judicial and Administrative Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
	C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	3
IV.	PAYMENT OF FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(A) AND § 42.103) .....	3
V.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE.....	3
	A. Overview of U.S. Patent No. 6,315,720 .....	3
	1. The '720 Patent Specification .....	4
	2. The '720 Claims .....	5
	3. The '720 Prosecution History .....	6
	B. Claim Construction of Challenged Claims.....	9
	1. “Consulted”.....	10
	2. “Teratogenic effect”.....	10
	3. “Adverse side effect” .....	11
	C. Statement of Precise Relief Requested for Each Claim Challenged .....	11
	1. Claims for Which Review is Requested.....	11
	2. Statutory Grounds of Challenge.....	11
	D. Overview of the State of the Art and Motivation to Combine .....	11
	1. Summary of the Petition’s Prior Art References .....	14
	E. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	17
VI.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE CHALLENGE.....	17
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1–32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,315,720 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over <i>Powell</i> in view of <i>Dishman</i> and in	

further view of *Cunningham* and the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art..... 17

1. Claim 1 is obvious over *Powell* in view of *Dishman* and in further view of *Cunningham*. ..... 17
2. Dependent Claims 2–6 are obvious over the prior art of Ground 1, and more specifically over *Powell* in view of *Dishman* and in further view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. .... 24
3. Dependent Claims 7–10 are obvious over the prior art of Ground 1, and more specifically over *Powell* in view of *Dishman* and in further view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. .... 28
4. Dependent Claims 11–14 and 20–25 are obvious over the prior art of Ground 1, and more specifically over *Powell* in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art..... 30
5. Dependent Claim 15 is obvious over the prior art of Ground 1, and more specifically over *Powell* in view of *Dishman* and in further view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art..... 34
6. Dependent Claims 16–17 are obvious over the prior art of Ground 1, and more specifically over *Powell* in view of *Dishman* and in further view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. .... 35
7. Dependent Claims 18–19 and 26–27 are obvious over the prior art of Ground 1, and more specifically over *Powell* in view of *Dishman* and in further view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. .... 37
8. The added limitations of independent Claim 28 and dependent Claims 29–32 are obvious over *Powell* in view of *Dishman* and in further view of *Cunningham* and knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. .... 40
9. Claim chart for Ground 1 showing exemplary citations in *Powell*, *Dishman*, and *Cunningham*..... 44

VII. CONCLUSION..... 60

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Abbott Labs v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	24
<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	22
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Sumitomo Chem. Co.</i> , 257 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	17
<i>Dystar Textilfarben GmbH v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	24
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	10
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	9
<i>In re Glatt Air Techniques, Inc.</i> , 630 F.3d 1026 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	18
<i>In re Icon Health &amp; Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	18
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	42
<i>In re Venner</i> , 262 F.2d 91 (C.C.P.A. 1958).....	37
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	23, 24, 34, 37, 39
<i>Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Int'l, Inc.</i> , 778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharms., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (2014).....	22, 43
<i>Pentec, Inc. v. Graphic Controls Corp.</i> , 776 F.2d 309 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	18
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	27, 32, 35, 41
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	20

*Rogers v. Desa Int’l, Inc.*,  
 198 Fed. Appx. 918 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ..... 21

*Sciele Pharma, Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.*,  
 684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....33, 39, 44

*Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.*,  
 774 F.3d 968 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 21, 29

*Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*,  
 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 30

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.103 ..... 3

37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a)..... 3

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)..... 1

# 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.