

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AFFORDABLE DRUGS V LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BIOGEN MA INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case: IPR2015-01993
U.S. Patent No. 8,399,514

BIOGEN'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. The Board Should Deny This Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....3

 A. This Second Petition Raises the Same or Substantially the Same
 Prior Art and Arguments as the First Petition.....5

 B. No Circumstances Justify a Repetitive Challenge to the '514
 Patent15

III. The Petition Does Not Establish a Likelihood That Any Claim Is
Unpatentable19

 A. The Petition Does Not Establish That One of Ordinary Skill
 Would Have Selected a Dose of About 480 mg/day of DMF or
 Have Reasonably Expected From the Asserted Prior Art That
 Such Dose Would Be Therapeutically Effective or Useful20

 1. ICH Guideline E4 Would Have Provided No Reason to
 Select a Dose of About 480 mg/day21

 2. Gastrointestinal Side Effects Would Have Provided No
 Reason to Select a Dose of About 480 mg/day22

 3. The Petition Fails to Establish Any Reasonable
 Expectation That a Dose of About 480 mg/day of DMF
 Would Be Therapeutically Effective or Useful25

 4. The Cited Cases Are Distinguishable28

 B. The Petition Fails to Rebut the Record Evidence of Unexpected
 Results30

IV. Conclusion38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	25
<i>BioGatekeeper, Inc. v. Kyoto Univ.</i> , IPR2014-01286, Paper 12 (PTAB Feb. 11, 2015).....	27
<i>BioMarin Pharm. Inc. v. Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00537, Paper 79 (PTAB Feb. 23, 2015).....	28
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	25, 27
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels, LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014).....	4
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Biogen MA Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01136, Paper 23 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2015).....	5
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper 25 (PTAB Dec. 10, 2014)	3
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2014).....	5, 15
<i>Creative Compounds, LLC v. Starmark Labs.</i> , 651 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	18, 37
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	27
<i>HTC Corp. v. NFC Tech., LLC</i> , IPR2015-00384, Paper 11 (PTAB July 6, 2015).....	4

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

Johnston v. IVAC Corp.,
885 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1989)18, 37

Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.,
IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2014).....26

Knoll Pharm. Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
367 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2004)35

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....25

Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.,
IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 11, 2014).....18

Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.,
679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)25

In re Montgomery,
677 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2012)29

Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)25

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)30

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP,
IPR2015-00114, Paper 14 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015)4

In re Soni,
54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995)18, 36, 38

TRW Auto. US LLC v. Magna Elecs., Inc.,
IPR2014-00258, Paper 18 (PTAB Aug. 27, 2014).....27

Unilever, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (PTAB July 7, 2014)13, 14, 15, 16, 19

ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings Inc.,
IPR2013-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2013).....15

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 1023, 16
35 U.S.C. § 1031, 5, 20
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)4
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)*passim*

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.13231
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)4
37 C.F.R. § 42.1048
37 C.F.R. § 42.1071

Other Authorities

H.R. REP. NO. 112-98, pt. 1, at 48 (2011).....4, 15
MPEP § 2107.0330

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.