

Filed: March 15, 2016

Filed on behalf of: AbbVie Biotechnology Ltd.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COHERUS BIOSCIENCES INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ABBVIE BIOTECHNOLOGY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00188
Patent No. 9,017,680

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL STATEMENT	5
A. State of the Art	5
B. Preliminary D2E7 Clinical Trial Data.....	10
C. The '680 Patent	14
D. Prosecution of the '135 Patent	15
E. Prosecution of the '680 Patent	17
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	18
A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	18
B. Claim Construction.....	18
1. "A method of reducing signs and symptoms"	18
2. "once every 13-15 days"	20
3. "40 mg dosage unit form"	20
IV. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER VAN DE PUTTE IN VIEW OF KEMPENI	20
A. A POSA Would Not Have Been Drawn Toward a Subcutaneously-Administered Fixed Dose with MTX.....	21
B. A POSA Would Not Have Been Drawn Toward the 20 mg Weekly Dose in van de Putte	24
C. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Stretch the 20 mg Weekly van de Putte Dose into a 40 mg Every-Other-Week Dose.....	29
1. Petitioner ignores the prior art reports of up-dosing.....	29

2. Petitioner’s “dose-stretching” arguments are flawed32

D. Petitioner Cannot Establish that a POSA Would Have Reasonably Expected Success.....36

1. The known data on D2E7 half-life would not have led to a reasonable expectation of success.....36

2. Petitioner’s analysis of the available half-life data is wrong.....40

E. *Boehringer* and *BioMarin* Are Inapposite.....43

F. Secondary Considerations Support the Nonobviousness of the Challenged Claims44

G. The Petition Is Particularly Deficient with Respect to Dependent Claims 3 and 447

V. 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) SUPPORTS DENIAL OF THE PETITION48

VI. CONCLUSION.....52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Avanir Pharms., Inc. v. Actavis S. Atl., LLC</i> , 36 F. Supp. 3d 475 (D. Del. 2014).....	39
<i>Avanir Pharms. Inc. v. Par Pharm, Inc.</i> , 612 F. App'x 613 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	39
<i>BioMarin Pharm. Inc. v. Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00534, Paper 81 (Feb. 23, 2015).....	43
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Int'l GmbH v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00417, Paper 11 (July 14, 2015)	43
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs XI LLC v. Insys Pharma, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01799, Paper 9 (Mar. 10, 2016)	23
<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	46
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	21, 39
<i>Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd. v. Galderma Labs., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01782, Paper 10 (Feb. 16, 2016).....	39
<i>Funai Elec. Co. v. Gold Charm Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01491, Paper 15 (Dec. 28, 2015)	48, 49, 52
<i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	47
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Tas Energy Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163, Paper 11 (May 13, 2014).....	40
<i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01027, Paper 16 (Dec. 22, 2014)	40, 49, 52

<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	47
<i>Merial Ltd. v. Virbac</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper 13 (Jan. 22, 2015).....	49
<i>Microboards Tech., LLC v. Stratasy Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00287, Paper 13 (May 28, 2015).....	49
<i>Neil Ziegman, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens</i> , IPR2015-01860, Paper 11 (Feb. 24, 2016).....	48
<i>Omron Oilfield & Marine, Inc. v. MD/Totco, L.P.</i> , IPR2013-00265, Paper 11 (Oct. 31, 2013)	47
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States</i> , 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	21
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC</i> , No. 2015-1361, 2016 WL 692368 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 22, 2016).....	45
<i>Tiffany & Co. v. Lazare Kaplan Int'l, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00024, Paper 7 (Apr. 20, 2015).....	49
<i>Yamanouchi Pharm. Co. v. Danbury Pharmacal, Inc.</i> , 231 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	27
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	1, 48

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.