Paper No. 54
Filed: May 27, 2016

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.: IPR2015-01103
Patent No. 6,315,720

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE TESTIMONY OF CELGENE'S EXPERTS IS ENTITLED TO NO WEIGHT 2

III. CELGENE'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION IS UNSUPPORTED 6

IV. THE CLAIMS OF THE '720 PATENT ARE OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE COMBINATION OF THE GROUND 1 REFERENCES 10

A. Celgene's Argument that the Only Motivation to Improve Upon the Prior Art Was Contained in Confidential Celgene Documents Is Artificial 10

B. The Disclosures of the Ground 1 References Render the Claims Obvious 15

1. Motivation to Combine *Mitchell*, *Dishman*, and *Cunningham* 16

2. Independent Claims 1 and 28 Are Obvious in View of the Combination of *Mitchell*, *Dishman*, and *Cunningham* 18

3. Dependent Claims 5, 6, 10, and 17 Are Obvious in View of the Ground 1 References 21

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Alza Corp. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.,
464 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2006)....................19

Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus.,
807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986)....................6

Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Apotex, Inc.,
501 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2007)....................7, 8

Edmund Optics, Inc. v. Semrock, Inc.,
IPR2014-00583, Paper No. 50 (PTAB Sep. 9, 2015)....................18

InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.,
751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)....................20

Martinez v. Porta,
601 F. Supp. 2d 865 (N.D. Tex. 2009)....................20

NHK Seating of America, Inc. v. Lear Corp.,
IPR2014-01079, Paper No. 30 (PTAB Jan. 12, 2016)....................11

United States v. 319.88 Acres of Land,
498 F. Supp. 763 (D. Nev. 1980)....................20

ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,
No. IPR2013-00133, Paper 61 (PTAB July 1, 2014)....................12

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Statutes and Regulations

35 U.S.C. § 103 19

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) 1

37 C.F.R. 42.100(b) 9

37 CFR § 42.24(c)(1) 29

37 CFR § 42.24(d) 29

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board instituted this IPR proceeding because Petitioner established a reasonable likelihood in prevailing on its assertions that Claims 1–32 of U.S. Patent 6,315,720 ("'720 patent") (Ex. 1001) are invalid as obvious. Patent Owner Celgene Corporation's ("Celgene") Response (Paper No. 42; "POR") has failed to rebut Petitioner's strong case of obviousness that the claims of the '720 patent (Ex. 1001) are obvious over *Mitchell* and *Dishman* in view of *Cunningham* and further in view of *Mundt*, *Mann, Vanchieri*, *Shinn*, *Linnarsson*, *Grönroos*, *Soyka*, *Hamera*, *Kosten*, and *Menill* (collectively, the "Ground 1 references").

In their responses to the Petition, Celgene and its experts applied the wrong analysis at every step. *First*, it is clear from the testimony of their experts that Celgene failed to offer any testimony from an appropriate POSA—***both*** experts testified that the person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSA") each used in their analysis would be unable to design the claimed methods of the '720 patent.

Second, Celgene and its experts applied the wrong standard for claim construction, ignoring the plain disclosures of the specification in favor of misconstruing arguments in the file history.

Third, Celgene proceeds through its obviousness analysis as if each prior art reference must literally disclose each and every limitation of the claims—ignoring the teachings, suggestions, and motivations in the art that render those claims

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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.

WHAT WILL YOU BUILD? | sales@docketalarm.com | 1-866-77-FASTCASE

fastcase®
Smarter legal research.