

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS V LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BIOGEN MA INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01136
Patent 8,399,514 B2

BIOGEN'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. The '514 Patent Properly Claims Priority to Its Provisional Application4

III. The Petition Fails to Construe the Term “Therapeutically Effective Amount” or Present Any Evidence Addressing That Claim Element5

IV. The Petition Fails to Address Reasonable Expectation of Success.....8

V. Claims 1-20 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Kappos 2005 in View of ICH Guideline E412

 A. The Petition Does Not Prove That BG00012 in Kappos 2005 Refers to DMF.....12

 B. One Would Not Have Added a Fifth Dose to the Proposed Study of Kappos 200514

 C. One Would Not Have Reasonably Expected from Kappos 2005 in View of ICH Guideline E4 That a Dose of About 480 mg/day Would Be Therapeutically Effective or Useful.....16

 1. Kappos 2005 and ICH Guideline E4 Disclose No Results.....16

VI. Claims 1-20 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over ClinicalTrials NCT00168701 in View of ICH Guideline E420

 A. The Petition Fails to Prove That the ClinicalTrials Document Is Prior Art.....20

 B. One Would Not Have Added a Fifth Dose to the Proposed Study of ClinicalTrials NCT0016870122

 C. One Would Not Have Reasonably Expected from ClinicalTrials NCT00168701 in View of ICH Guideline E4 That a Dose of About 480 mg/day Would Be Therapeutically Effective or Useful23

VII. Claims 1-20 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Alleged Admitted Prior Art in View of ICH Guideline E4.....25

A.	An Alleged Admission Is Not a Patent or Printed Publication	25
B.	The Alleged '514 Patent Admission and ICH Guideline E4 Fail to Disclose or Suggest Each Claim Element.....	28
C.	The Petition Identifies No Reason to Modify the Alleged '514 Patent Admission in View of ICH Guideline E4	29
D.	One Would Not Have Reasonably Expected from the Alleged '514 Patent Admission in View of ICH Guideline E4 That a Dose of About 480 mg/day Would Be Therapeutically Effective or Useful	30
VIII.	The Petition Fails to Rebut the Record Evidence of Unexpected Results.....	31
A.	The Claimed Invention Exhibits Unexpected Results	31
B.	The Petition Disregards the Claimed Invention's Unexpected Efficacy.....	36
IX.	The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Deny Institution	39
X.	The Petition Fails to Name All Real Parties-in-Interest.....	41
XI.	Conclusion	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01126, Paper 22 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2015)	22
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	9
<i>In re Baird</i> , 16 F.3d 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	12
<i>Berk-Tek, LLC v. Belden Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00057, Paper 46 (PTAB Mar. 18, 2014)	28
<i>BioGatekeeper, Inc. v. Kyoto Univ.</i> , IPR2014-01286, Paper 12 (PTAB Feb. 11, 2015).....	11, 20
<i>Biomune Co. v. Merial</i> , IPR2015-00254, Paper 11 (PTAB May 21, 2015)	17, 24
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	9, 11, 20
<i>Bulk Lift Int’l Inc. v. Flexcon & Sys., Inc.</i> , 122 F.R.D. 493 (W.D. La. 1988)	26
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	6
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Techs. L.L.C.</i> , IPR2014-01085, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2015)	20
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs II LLC v. NPS Pharm., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00990, Paper 14 and IPR2015-01093, Paper 13 (PTAB July 2, 2015)	41
<i>Creative Compounds, LLC v. Starmark Labs.</i> , 651 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	38
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , No. 2014-1301, 2015 WL 4097949 (Fed. Cir. July 8, 2015)	6

*In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule
Patent Litig.*,
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)*passim*

Google Inc. v. B.E. Tech., L.L.C.,
IPR2014-00038, Paper 9 (PTAB Apr. 9, 2014)27

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....5, 13

Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.,
802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986)36, 37

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013).....40

Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.,
IPR2014-00309, Paper 15 (PTAB June 10, 2014)27

Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.,
IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2015)26

Johnston v. IVAC Corp.,
885 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1989)38

Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skywork Solutions, Inc.,
IPR 2014-00529, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2014).....10

Knoll Pharm. Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
367 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2004)36

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....9, 15, 29

In re Kubin,
561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)19

LG Elecs., Inc. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.,
IPR2015-00329, Paper 13 (PTAB July 10, 2015)21

Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casual Ins. Co.,
CBM2012-00003, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012)29, 30

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.