

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC  
*Petitioner,*

v.

CEPHALON, INC.  
*Patent Owner.*

---

Case IPR2016-00098  
Patent No. 8,791,270 B2

---

**CEPHALON, INC.'S PRELIMINARY PATENT OWNER RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>II. BACKGROUND</b> .....	6
A. The Inventors Identified a Problem Not Recognized in the Art .....	6
B. The Inventions of the '270 Patent .....	9
C. FDA Approval and Market Response .....	10
D. The ANDA Filing by Petitioner's Contractual Partner.....	11
<b>III. PETITIONER'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITION OF AN ORDINARY ARTISAN</b> .....	11
<b>IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO MAKE THE SHOWING REQUIRED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)</b> .....	12
A. <b>Ground 1:</b> Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated a Reasonable Likelihood that It Would Prove that Claims 1-20 Are Obvious over Maas and Teagarden. ....	12
1. Petitioner Fails to Establish That an Ordinary Artisan Would Have Targeted the Claimed Degradant Profiles with a Reasonable Likelihood of Success.....	13
2. Petitioner's Post-Hoc Estimates of Bendamustine Degradants in Maas are Unreliable.....	17
3. Petitioner Dramatically Overstates Teagarden's Teaching .....	26
4. Claim-by-Claim Analysis .....	32
a. Claim 1 .....	32
b. Claim 2.....	34
c. Claims 3-12, 14-18 and 20 .....	34
d. Claims 13 and 19 .....	38

B. **Ground 1 (Petitioner’s Alternate Argument):** Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that Table 13 of the ’270 Patent Reflects the Inherent Characteristics of the Ribomustin Tested by Maas or that Claims 1-20 Are Obvious over Table 13 and Teagarden. ....40

    1. Claim 1 .....40

    2. Claims 2-20 .....46

C. **Ground 2:** Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated a Reasonable Likelihood that It Will Prove that Claims 13 and 19 Are Obvious over Maas, Teagarden and Gust. ....47

D. **Ground 3:** Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated a Reasonable Likelihood that It Will Prove that Claims 20-23 Are Obvious over Maas, Teagarden and the Ribomustin Product Monograph. ....50

E. **Ground 4:** Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated a Reasonable Likelihood that It Will Prove that Claims 1-23 Are Obvious over Allegedly Admitted Prior Art in View of Teagarden. ....51

V. **PETITIONER’S GROUNDS ARE REDUNDANT AND VIOLATE THE BOARD’S RULES** .....55

VI. **CONCLUSION** .....59

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Agila Specialties Inc. v. Cephalon, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00503, Paper 10 (PTAB July 20, 2015) .....	17
<i>Agila Specialties Inc. v. Cephalon, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00026, Paper 3 (PTAB Oct. 9, 2014) .....	11
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	44
<i>Cadence Pharm. Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	29
<i>Ex Parte Fyke</i> , 2015 WL 4126808 (PTAB June 22, 2015) .....	53
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Tr. of Columbia Univ.</i> , IPR2012-0006, Paper 43 (PTAB May 10, 2013) .....	56
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	35
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB Mar. 23, 2014) .....	53
<i>Kingbright Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Cree, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00746, Paper 8 (PTAB Aug. 20, 2015) .....	52
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-0003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) .....	56
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. NuVasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 11, 2014) .....	58
<i>Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00075, Paper 15 (PTAB June 13, 2013) .....	55, 56
<i>PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	45

*Reading & Bates Constr. Co. v. Baker Energy Res. Corp.*,  
748 F.2d 645 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....54

*Riverwood Int’l Corp. v. R.A. Jones & Co., Inc.*,  
324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....53, 54

*Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra, LLC*,  
178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....44

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102 .....5, 51

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....52

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....5, 51

35 U.S.C. § 311(b) .....6, 52

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....58

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b) .....55, 56

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....6, 52

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b) .....55

# 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.