

Paper No. \_\_\_\_  
Date Filed: March 10, 2016

Filed on behalf of Janssen Oncology, Inc.  
By: Dianne B. Elderkin  
Barbara L. Mullin  
Ruben H. Munoz  
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER  
& FELD LLP  
Two Commerce Square  
2001 Market Street, Suite 4100  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel: (215) 965-1200  
Fax: (215) 965-1210  
JANS-ZYTIGA@akingump.com

David T. Pritikin  
Bindu Donovan  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
787 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel.: (212) 839-5300  
Fax: (212) 839-5599  
ZytigaIPRTeam@sidley.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AMERIGEN PHARMACEUTICALS LIMITED,  
Petitioner

v.

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

CASE No. IPR2016-00286  
U.S. Patent No. 8,822,438 B2

---

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.'S PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	7
A. Prostate Cancer Treatment Prior to the Discovery of the ‘438 Patent Invention .....	7
B. The Initial Failed Efforts to Develop Abiraterone Acetate .....	10
C. The Discovery of the ‘438 Patent Invention .....	11
1. The Inventors’ Unexpected Discovery That Treatment with Abiraterone Acetate and Prednisone Has Therapeutic Effects .....	11
2. The ‘438 Patent .....	16
D. ZYTIGA® .....	17
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	18
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	18
A. Amerigen’s Proposed Constructions .....	18
B. “Therapeutically Effective Amount of Prednisone” .....	18
V. THE PRIOR ART CITED BY AMERIGEN .....	19
A. O’Donnell (2004) .....	19
B. Gerber et al (1990) .....	23
C. The ‘213 Patent .....	25
VI. AMERIGEN FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CLAIM OF THE ‘438 PATENT WAS OBVIOUS .....	27
A. Standard for Granting <i>Inter Partes</i> Review .....	28
B. Amerigen’s Petition Should be Denied Because it Ignores the Claim Element “Therapeutically Effective Amount of Prednisone” .....	29
C. Amerigen’s Petition Should Be Denied Because It Admits that the Claimed Method of Treatment is Not Obvious .....	30
D. Amerigen’s Petition Should Be Denied Because Ground 1 Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1-20 of the ‘438 Patent .....	32
1. The Prior Art Relied On by Amerigen Does Not Teach the Problem of Mineralocorticoid Excess .....	32
2. Dr. Serels’s Conclusory Assertion That Mineralocorticoid Excess Would Be Expected Is Factually Unsupported .....	33
3. There Is Nothing In Amerigen’s Petition That Might Establish That Mineralocorticoid Excess Would Be A Problem With Abiraterone Acetate .....	35

4.	Amerigen Has Not Shown a Motivation to Combine O'Donnell (2004) with Gerber (1990) .....	37
a.	The prior art demonstrated that abiraterone acetate does not cause side effects relating to cortisol suppression....	38
b.	It is only with hindsight that Amerigen can argue that the prior art taught that prednisone should be administered with abiraterone acetate. ....	39
E.	Ground 2 Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1-4 and 6-11 of the '438 Patent .....	44
VII.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA SUPPORT THE NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE '438 PATENT .....	46
A.	Unexpected Results Of The '438 Patent Method.....	47
B.	Long-Felt Need For The '438 Patent Method.....	48
C.	Commercial Success Of The '438 Patent Method .....	48
VIII.	ADDITIONAL FLAWS IN AMERIGEN'S PETITION WARRANT DENYING INSTITUTION OF <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW .....	52
A.	Amerigen Fails to Meet the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 311(b).....	52
B.	Amerigen's Obviousness Arguments Are Redundant.....	52
C.	The Petition Should be Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	54
D.	The Petition Is an Improper Use of the IPR Proceeding and/or an Abuse of Process Under AIA, §§ 316(a)(6) & 316(b) .....	55
IX.	CONCLUSION .....	56

**LISTING OF EXHIBITS PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(e) AND TABLE  
OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
JSN 2003	Remington – The Science and Practice of Pharmacy, 20 <sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 1363-1370 (2000)
JSN 2004	Rumohr and Chang, “Current chemotherapeutic approaches for androgen-independent prostate cancer,” <i>Current Opinion in Investigational Drugs</i> , 7(6):529-533 (2006)
JSN 2005	Declaration of Professor Ian Judson, dated June 29, 2015, cited in the Opposition of European Patent 2 061 561
JSN 2006	Clinical Cancer Research Peer Review letter to Judson, dated May 12, 2003
JSN 2007	Burgess and Roth, “Changing Perspectives of the Role of Chemotherapy in Advanced Prostate Cancer,” <i>Urol. Clin. N. Am.</i> , 33:227-236 (2006)
JSN 2008	Strother et al., “Novel cytotoxic and biological agents for prostate cancer: Where will the money be in 2005?,” <i>European Journal of Cancer</i> , 41:954-964 (2005)
JSN 2009	Hadaschik et al., “Novel targets and approaches in advanced

Exhibit	Description
	prostate cancer,” <i>Current Opinions Urology</i> , 17:182-187 (2007)
JSN 2010	Papatsoris et al., Novel Biological Agents for the Treatment of Hormone-Refractory Prostate Cancer (HRPC), <i>Current Medicinal Chemistry</i> , 12:277-296 (2005)
JSN 2011	Armstrong and Carducci, “New drugs in prostate cancer,” <i>Current Opinions Urology</i> , 16:138-145 (2006)
JSN 2012	Duc et al., “In vitro and in vivo models for the evaluation of potent inhibitors of male rat 17 $\alpha$ -hydroxylase/C <sub>17,20</sub> -lyase,” <i>Journal of Steroid Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</i> , 84:537-542 (2003)
JSN 2013	Boehringer-Ingelheim-BTG Press Release – “NEW TREATMENT FOR PROSTATE CANCER UNDER DEVELOPMENT,” dated May 22, 1996
JSN 2014	Attard et al., “Phase I Clinical Trial of a Selective Inhibitor of CYP17, Abiraterone Acetate, Confirms That Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer Commonly Remains Hormone Driven,” <i>Journal of Clinical Oncology</i> , 26(28):4563-4571 (2008)
JSN 2015	Attard et al., “Selective Inhibition of CYP17 With Abiraterone Acetate Is Highly Active in the Treatment of Castration-Resistant

# 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.