

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS V LLC;
HAYMAN CREDES MASTER FUND, L.P.;
HAYMAN ORANGE FUND SPC – PORTFOLIO A;
HAYMAN CAPITAL MASTER FUND, L.P.;
HAYMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.;
HAYMAN OFFSHORE MANAGEMENT, INC.;
HAYMAN INVESTMENTS, LLC;
NXN PARTNERS, LLC;
IP NAVIGATION GROUP, LLC;
J KYLE BASS; and ERICH SPANGENBERG,
Petitioner,

v.

BIOGEN MA INC.,
Patent Owner.

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

BIOGEN'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO ANTEDATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. The Provisional Application Provides Written-Description Support for the '514 Patent Claims.....1

III. The Provisional Application Enables the '514 Patent Claims5

IV. Petitioner Does Not Challenge Biogen's Evidence of Conception.....7

V. Biogen Was Diligent Throughout the Critical Period.....7

 A. There Was No Gap in Biogen's Diligence.....8

 B. Biogen's Evidence of Diligence Is Specific and Thorough.....10

 C. Biogen's Animal Studies Constitute Diligence11

VI. Conclusion12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	3
<i>In re Brana</i> , 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	11
<i>Brown v. Barbacid</i> , 436 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	12
<i>Cottrell v. Shafer</i> , 97 F.2d 121 (C.C.P.A. 1938)	9
<i>In re Hartop</i> , 311 F.2d 249 (C.C.P.A. 1962)	12
<i>Hunter v. Beissbarth</i> , 230 U.S.P.Q. 365 (B.P.A.I. 1986)	10, 11
<i>Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.</i> , 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	6
<i>In re Jolley</i> , 308 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	12
<i>In re Krimmel</i> , 292 F.2d 948 (C.C.P.A. 1961)	12
<i>Moore v. Harris</i> , 92 U.S.P.Q. 187 (Bd. Pat. Int. 1951)	9
<i>In re Ruschig</i> , 379 F.2d 990 (C.C.P.A. 1967)	4
<i>Scott v. Koyama</i> , 281 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	8-9, 12

Streck, Inc. v. Research & Diagnostic Sys., Inc.,
665 F.3d 1269 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 2-3

TRW Auto. US LLC v. Magna Elecs., Inc.,
IPR2014-00258, Paper 18 (PTAB Aug. 27, 2014).....2

Vogt v. Neuschotz,
154 U.S.P.Q. 376 (B.P.A.I. 1966)8, 11

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....2

I. Introduction

Petitioner's reply to Biogen's Motion to Antedate rests on incorrect legal standards and thinly supported rebuttal testimony. The Board should conclude that Biogen is entitled to its priority date and has antedated Kappos 2006.

II. The Provisional Application Provides Written-Description Support for the '514 Patent Claims

Beginning in its first paragraph, the '921 provisional application states unequivocally that the invention relates in part to the "use of therapeutic compounds . . . for treating neurological diseases, including . . . multiple sclerosis." (Ex. 1012 at ¶ [0001]; Ex. 2046 ¶ 29; Ex. 2384 at 103:25-104:16, 105:2-5.) The application further states that fumaric acid derivatives have been proposed for the treatment of MS and that, in some embodiments, the inventive treatment method involves administering a therapeutically effective amount of "a fumaric acid derivative (e.g., DMF or MMF)." (Ex. 1012 at ¶¶ [0020], [0031], [0066].) The application then discloses that "an effective dose of DMF or MMR [sic, MMF] to be administered to a subject orally can be . . . from about 480 mg to about 720 mg per day." (*Id.* at ¶ [0116].) Dr. Wynn, an MS clinician with decades of experience, explains in his declaration why these and other disclosures in the provisional application provide written-description support for the claimed subject matter relating to a method of treating MS with a dose of about 480 mg/day of DMF,

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.