

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BENITEC BIOPHARMA LIMITED,
Petitioner,
v.

COLD SPRING HARBOR LABORATORY,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00016
Patent No. 8,153,776

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,153,776 UNDER 35
U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.1 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. | OVERVIEW OF DR. HANNON’S PIONEERING SHORT HAIRPIN RNA INVENTION | 2 |
| III. | THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE GROUNDS RECYCLE ARGUMENTS THE PTO CONSIDERED IN DETAIL AND REJECTED | 5 |
| | A. The Hannon shRNA Patents Were Extensively Examined by the PTO | 5 |
| | B. Grounds 1 to 3 Were Previously Considered by the Office | 7 |
| IV. | THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING AS TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM | 8 |
| | A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 8 |
| | B. Claim Construction | 9 |
| | C. Petitioner Offers No Testimony Regarding the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 9 |
| | D. Ground 1: Claims 1-10 Are Not Anticipated by Graham..... | 14 |
| | 1. Overview of Graham..... | 14 |
| | 2. Graham Does Not Disclose All the Features of Claims 1-10..... | 15 |
| | a. Graham Does Not Disclose Any Activity in a Mammalian Cell..... | 16 |
| | b. Graham Also Does Not Disclose a Sequence Encoding a Short Hairpin RNA Molecule for Attenuating Expression of a Target Gene in a Mammalian Cell | 18 |
| | c. Graham Does Not Disclose “a Sequence Encoding a Short Hairpin RNA Molecule Comprising a Double Stranded Region, Wherein the Double-Stranded Region Consists of at Least 20 Nucleotides but Not More Than 29 Nucleotides” | 21 |
| | E. Ground 2: Claims 1-10 Are Not Anticipated by the Zamore Patent | 23 |
| | 1. The Zamore Patent Is Not Available as a Prior Art Reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Because Its Issued Claims Are Not Supported by The Zamore ‘185 Provisional | 24 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| a. | Independent Claim 1 and Independent Claim 41 of the Zamore Patent Are Not Supported by the Zamore ‘185 Provisional..... | 25 |
| b. | The Dependent Claims of the Zamore Patent Are Also Not Supported by the Zamore ‘185 Provisional Application | 26 |
| 2. | On the Merits, the Zamore ‘185 Provisional Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims of the ‘776 Patent..... | 28 |
| a. | The ‘185 Provisional Does Not Disclose Use of a Short Hairpin RNA Molecule Comprising a Double-Stranded Region of 20-29 Nucleotides for Avoiding PK Response and Attenuating Expression of a Target Gene in a Mammalian Cell. | 29 |
| b. | The Critical Disclosure in the Zamore Patent Was Added after Patent Owner’s Intervening Paddison Publication | 31 |
| F. | Ground 3: Claims 1-10 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Graham and/or the Zamore Patent, in View of a Combination of Tuschl, Fire, Harborth, Parrish, Sijen, Green, Tian, Waterhouse and/or Symonds | 34 |
| 1. | Petitioner Ignores Evidence Establishing a Lack of Reasonable Expectation of Success..... | 35 |
| 2. | Claims 1-10 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Graham | 38 |
| 3. | Claims 1-10 Are Not Rendered Obvious by the Zamore Patent, Alone or in Combination with Graham | 39 |
| 4. | Claims 1-10 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Graham and/or the Zamore Patent in view of Tuschl | 39 |
| a. | Overview of Tuschl | 40 |
| b. | Tuschl Does Not Remedy the Deficiencies of Graham | 41 |
| 5. | Claims 1-10 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Graham and/or the Zamore Patent Alone or in view of Tuschl and Further in view of Fire | 42 |
| a. | Overview of Fire | 43 |
| b. | Fire Does Not Remedy the Deficiencies of Graham and/or the Zamore Patent Alone or in view of Tuschl | 43 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| c. | Petitioner Conceded that Fire Is Not Enabling for Decreasing Gene Expression in Mammalian Cells | 45 |
| 6. | “Gene Silencing References”: Parrish, Sijen and Harborth Do Not Remedy the Deficiencies of Graham and/or the Zamore Patent Alone or in view of Tuschl and/or Fire | 46 |
| a. | Parrish | 47 |
| b. | Sijen | 48 |
| c. | Harborth | 48 |
| 7. | “PKR Trigger References”: Tian and Green Do Not Remedy the Deficiencies of Graham and/or the Zamore Patent Alone or in view of Tuschl and/or Fire and or Parrish and/or Sijen and/or Harborth | 49 |
| a. | Tian | 49 |
| b. | Green | 51 |
| 8. | “Expression of Transgene References”: Waterhouse and Symonds Do Not Remedy the Deficiencies of Graham and/or the Zamore Patent Alone or in view of Tuschl and/or Fire and or Parrish and/or Sijen and/or Harborth and/or Green and/or Tian | 52 |
| V. | OBJECTIVE INDICIA DEMONSTRATE THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE | 54 |
| A. | Using Short Hairpin RNA To Attenuate Gene Expression in Mammalian Cells Satisfied a Long-Felt and Unmet Need | 55 |
| B. | Patent Owner’s Invention Has Been Widely Praised | 56 |
| C. | Commercial Success of shRNA | 58 |
| VI. | CONCLUSION | 60 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Alexsam, Inc. v. IDT Corp.</i> , 715 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 13 |
| <i>Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco, Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999) | 12, 22 |
| <i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chemical Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006) | 21 |
| <i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 11 |
| <i>Bilstad v. Wakalopulos</i> , 386 F.3d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004) | 26 |
| <i>Creative Compounds, LLC v. Starmark Labs.</i> , 651 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 12 |
| <i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 23, 24, 53 |
| <i>Eiselstein v. Frank</i> , 52 F.3d 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1995) | 25, 27 |
| <i>Ex Parte Takako Yamaguchi</i> , Appeal 2007-4412, 2008 WL 4233306, at *5 (BPAI Aug. 29, 2008) | 13, 24 |
| <i>Excelsior Medical Corp. v. Lake</i> , IPR2013-00494, Slip op. (Feb. 6, 2014) (Paper 10) | 7 |
| <i>In re Giacomini</i> , 612 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2010) | 24 |
| <i>In re Napier</i> , 55 F.3d 610 (Fed. Cir. 1995) | 22 |
| <i>In re Piasecki</i> , 745 F.2d 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1984) | 55 |
| <i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013) | 57 |
| <i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01402, Slip op. (Oct. 21, 2015) (Paper 18) | 17 |

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.