

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS VIII, LLC

Petitioner,

v.

THE TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Patent Owner

Case: IPR2015-01835

Patent No. 8,618,135

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND FACTS.....	4
	A. Hypercholesterolemia and Hyperlipidemia.....	4
	B. Treatment of Hypercholesterolemia and Hyperlipidemia.....	5
	C. The Development of Lomitapide	6
	1. BMS Abandons Lomitapide	6
	2. The Rader Study.....	7
	3. U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/550,915	9
	4. Prosecution of U.S. Appl. No. 13/046,118 and Issuance of the '135 Patent	9
	5. Juxtapid®	11
III.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY CFAD'S PETITION AS STATUTORILY DEFICIENT FOR FAILURE TO IDENTIFY ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST	11
IV.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE IPR BECAUSE CFAD HAS NOT CARRIED ITS BURDEN OF DEMONSTRATING A LIKELIHOOD THAT THE '135 PATENT CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	13
	A. All of the Asserted Prior Art Was Before the Patent Office During Prosecution.....	14
	B. The Provisional Application Fully Supports the '135 Patent Claims, and Thus CFAD's Stein 2004 and Pink Sheet 2004 References Qualify as Prior Art (if At All) Under Only 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).....	16
	C. Neither the Stein Presentation Nor the Stein Slides Qualify As Prior Art Under Either 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) or 102(b)	22

1.	The Stein Presentation Is Not a “Printed Publication” and is Thus Not Prior Art.....	23
2.	The Stein Slides Are Not a “Printed Publication”	30
D.	To the Extent Stein 2004 and Pink Sheet 2004 Qualify As Prior Art Under Only 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), They Are Not Prior Art Because They Published After Dr. Rader’s Invention	36
E.	Ground 1 is Deficient Because the Combination of Pink Sheet 2004 and Chang is Redundant of the Art Relied on in Ground 2, and Nevertheless Fails to Render the Claims Obvious	37
1.	Ground 1 (Pink Sheet 2004 plus Chang) Should be Rejected Because it Adds Nothing Over Ground 2 (Stein plus Chang)	37
2.	Pink Sheet 2004 and Chang Do Not Render the Claims Unpatentable	39
a.	The References Fail to Teach or Suggest Both the Claimed Method of Step-Wise Administration of Increasing Doses of Lomitapide and the Specific Claimed Dosage Ranges.....	39
b.	CFAD Fails to Articulate a Motivation to Substitute Lomitapide for Implitapide in Dr. Stein’s Protocol.....	41
c.	CFAD Fails to Articulate a Reasonable Expectation of Success of Arriving at the Claimed Subject Matter.....	44
F.	Ground 2 is Deficient Because the Combination of Stein 2004 and Chang Fails to Render the Claims Obvious	48
G.	Secondary Considerations Support the Patentability of the ’135 Patent Claims.....	52
1.	Unexpected Results Support the Patentability of the ’135 Patent’s Claims	52

2.	Commercial Success Supports the Patentability of the '135 Patent	53
3.	The Claimed Invention Met a Long-Felt, Unmet Need.....	55
V.	IF IPR IS INSTITUTED, IT SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED FOR ALL CLAIMS.....	56
VI.	CONCLUSION	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Air Liquide Large Indus. U.S. LP v. Praxair Tech., Inc.,
IPR2015-01074 (P.T.A.B.).....26

Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015)52

Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.,
IPR2013-00453 (P.T.A.B.).....13

Bayer AG v. Carlsbad Tech., Inc.,
2001 WL 34125673 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2001).....42

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs (ADROCA) LLC v. Acorda
Therapeutics, Inc.*, IPR2015-00817 (P.T.A.B.)..... 25, 30

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs (ADROCA) LLC v. Acorda
Therapeutics, Inc.*, IPR2015-00720 (P.T.A.B.).....12

Coalition for Affordable Drugs III LLC v. Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
IPR2015-01018 (P.T.A.B.)..... 12, 22, 35

Coalition for Affordable Drugs IV LLC et al. v. Pharmacyclics, Inc.,
IPR2015-01076 (P.T.A.B.)..... 12, 24

Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC et al. v. Biogen MA Inc.,
IPR2015-01993 (P.T.A.B.).....13

Coalition for Affordable Drugs VI LLC et al. v. Celgene Corp.,
IPR2015-01169 (P.T.A.B.).....12

Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.,
IPR2013-00053 (P.T.A.B.).....14

Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees of Columbia Univ.,
IPR2012-00006 (P.T.A.B.).....38

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.