

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FRONTIER THERAPEUTICS, LLC
Petitioner

v.

MEDAC GESELLSCHAFT FÜR KLINISCHE
SPEZIALPRÄPARATE MBH
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-00649
Patent Number 8,664,231

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
A.	The PO And Its Experts	1
B.	The Petitioner And Its Experts	2
C.	The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion And Not Institute Trial	3
D.	The Petition And PO’s Preliminary Response	4
II.	The Petition Is Defective Because It Fails To Name All Real Parties-In-Interest	11
III.	Petitioner’s Experts Are Not Credible And Their Opinions Lack Foundation: The Board Should Afford Their Opinions No Weight	14
A.	Dr. Gershwin’s Opinions Should Be Accorded No Weight	15
B.	Mr. Gammon’s Opinions Should Be Accorded No Weight	16
C.	Dr. Gershwin’s And Mr. Gammon’s Assertion About FDA And <i>Mexate</i> Misses The Point: It Is What The Skilled Artisan Would Understand From <i>Mexate</i> , Not Its FDA Approval.....	18
IV.	Authentication: Petitioner Has Ignored Its Threshold Duty To Qualify The Non-Patent Documents On Which It Relies As Prior Art, Printed Publications.....	19
V.	Overview Of ‘231	20
VI.	MTX And The Treatment Of Inflammatory Autoimmune Diseases With MTX	20
VII.	The Disclosure Of Claimed Method Of ‘231	24
VIII.	Claim Construction.....	26
IX.	Anticipation (Ground 1) – A Failure of Proof: Petitioner Has Not Met Its Reasonable Likelihood Burden Of Establishing That <i>Grint</i> Anticipates Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 17, and 22.....	27
A.	Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That <i>Grint</i> Discloses The Features Of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 17, And 20 And Their Arrangement Identically As In Those Claims	29
B.	Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That Subcutaneous Administration Of Above 30mg/ml MTX Was Conventional At The Relevant Date	32

C.	Petitioner Failed To Demonstrate That There Is No Reasonable Difference In How The Claimed Invention Operates Over <i>Grint</i> 's Concentration Range	34
X.	Obviousness (Grounds 2-5)—Failures of Proof: Petitioner Has Not Met Its Reasonable Likelihood Burden Of Establishing That The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious In July 2006	36
A.	Obviousness (Ground 2)—A Failure of Proof: Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Establishing A Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Its Argument That <i>Grint</i> Renders Claims 7-10, 14-16, And 19-21 Obvious In View Of <i>Insulin Admin</i>	39
B.	Obviousness (Ground 3)—A Failure of Proof: Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Establishing A Reasonable Likelihood That <i>Grint</i> Renders Claim 18 Obvious In View Of <i>Alsufyani</i>	40
C.	Obviousness (Ground 4)—A Failure of Proof: Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden Of Establishing A Reasonable Likelihood That <i>Mexate</i> Or <i>Hospira</i> Renders Claims 1-5, 11, 12, 13, 17, And 22 Obvious In View Of <i>Brooks</i>	41
(a)	Petitioner Failed To Address The Correlation Between Dose And Vial Selection	45
(b)	Petitioner Failed To Establish Why The Skilled Artisan Would Make A Wasteful Choice.....	47
(c)	Petitioner Failed To Address The Full Range Of Concentrations Disclosed By <i>Mexate</i> Or Why The Skilled Artisan Would Be Motivated To Use High Concentration MTX For Subcutaneous Or Intramuscular Injection Based On The Disclosure Of <i>Mexate</i>	49
(a)	Petitioner Failed To Establish That The Skilled Artisan Would Use <i>Hospira</i> For The Treatment Of Psoriasis In the Method of The Challenged Claims	52
(b)	The Petitioner Failed To Establish Why The Skilled Artisan Would Make A Wasteful Choice	55
(c)	The Petitioner Failed To Address Why The Skilled Artisan Would Be Motivated To Use High Concentration Methotrexate To Treat Psoriasis Based On The Disclosure Of <i>Hospira</i>	57

D.	Obviousness (Ground 5)—A Failure of Proof: Petitioner Has Failed To Meet Its Burden Of Establishing A Reasonable Likelihood That <i>Mexate</i> Or <i>Hospira</i> Renders Claims 7-10, 14-16, And 19-21 Obvious In View Of <i>Brooks</i> And <i>Insulin Admin</i>	60
XI.	Obviousness An Incomplete Analysis: Secondary Considerations.....	61
XII.	Conclusion	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chemical Corp.</i> , 441 F. 3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	34
<i>Clearvalue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	34
<i>Dennison Mfg. Co. v. Panduit Corp.</i> , 475 U.S. 809 (1986).....	passim
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	61
<i>In re Arkley</i> , 455 F.2d 586 (CCPA 1972).....	28
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	52
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	26
<i>Ineos USA LLC v. Berry Plastics Corp.</i> , 783 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	34
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	43
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	61
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	29, 32
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	26

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.