

Paper No. 7  
Date Filed: June 24, 2016

Filed on behalf of: Aventis Pharma S.A.

By:

Dominick A. Conde  
dconde@fchs.com  
(212) 218-2100

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**MYLAN LABORATORIES LIMITED**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**AVENTIS PHARMA S.A.**

**Patent Owner.**

---

Case IPR2016-00712  
U.S. Patent No. 8,927,592

---

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY PATENT OWNER PURSUANT TO 37  
C.F.R. § 42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION .....	3
	A. The Need for New Prostate Cancer Therapies .....	3
	B. Difficulties in Obtaining Efficacious Treatments .....	4
	C. Failures in CRPC .....	6
	D. Little Was Known About the Use of Cabazitaxel for Prostate Cancer Post-Docetaxel Therapy .....	7
	E. Prosecution History .....	8
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL .....	11
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	11
	A. “dose” and “CV” .....	12
	B. The Full Preambles of Claim 1 and Claim 27 Are Limiting .....	12
	1. Claim Language Shows that the Preambles Are Limiting .....	12
	2. The Specification Shows that Treating and Increasing the Survival of the Claimed Patients Are Fundamental Characteristics of the Claimed Invention .....	13
	3. The Preambles Were Critical During Prosecution .....	14
	C. “A method for treating a patient” .....	15
	1. The Specification Shows that Therapeutic Efficacy Is a Fundamental Feature of the Invention .....	16
	2. Applicants Relied on Therapeutic Efficacy During Prosecution .....	17

D.	“A method of increasing the survival of a patient” .....	19
1.	The Specification Describes a Method that Provides a Statistically Significant Increase in Overall Survival .....	19
2.	Applicants Relied on Overall Survival Data to Distinguish Prior Art.....	20
V.	LEGAL STANDARD .....	21
VI.	MYLAN’S ALLEGED INVALIDITY GROUNDS.....	22
A.	All Grounds Fail Because Mylan Does Not Address the Surprise in the Field .....	22
B.	Ground 1: The Board Should Not Institute Review Based on Alleged Obviousness over Winquist and the TROPIC Listing.....	23
1.	Ground 1 Does Not Establish <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness of Claims 1 and 27.....	23
2.	Ground 1 Plus the Background Knowledge in the Art Do Not Establish Obviousness of Claims 1 or 27 .....	26
a.	Mylan Fails to Rebut Prosecution Evidence Showing the Single Response in Attard Is Insufficient.....	27
b.	Mylan’s Reliance on Activity in Breast Cancer to Predict Activity in Prostate Cancer Is Unsupported .....	33
c.	Mylan’s Reliance on Similarities with Docetaxel to Predict Activity in Patients No Longer Responding to Docetaxel Is Unsupported.....	38
d.	Mylan’s Reliance on the Mere Existence of the Phase III Trial Is Speculative.....	42

e.	Mylan Cites No Information Regarding a Survival Benefit.....	43
3.	Mylan Fails to Show that the Pharmacokinetic Properties of Claims 7-9 Are Inherent.....	44
C.	Ground 7: The Board Should Not Institute Review Based on Alleged Obviousness over Winquist and Pivot.....	45
1.	Ground 7 Does Not Establish <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness of Claims 1 and 27.....	46
2.	Ground 7 Plus the Background Knowledge in the Art Do Not Establish Obviousness of Claims 1 and 27.....	47
3.	Mylan Fails to Show that the Pharmacokinetic Properties of Claims 7-9 Are Inherent.....	49
D.	Grounds 2 and 8: The Board Should Not Institute Review Based on Alleged Obviousness over Winquist, TROPIC Listing, Pivot, and Didier.....	49
E.	Grounds 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10: The Board Should Not Institute Review Based on Alleged Obviousness over Winquist, the TROPIC Listing, Pivot, Mita, and Tannock.....	52
VII.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	52
VIII.	MYLAN’S INHERENCY ARGUMENTS SHOULD BE DISREGARDED.....	53
IX.	MYLAN FAILS TO REBUT OJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	55
A.	Long-Felt Need.....	56
B.	Failure of Others.....	56
C.	Unexpected Properties.....	57

1.	It Was Unexpected that Cabazitaxel Would Increase Survival.....	57
2.	Aventis Did Not Disclaim Unexpected Properties .....	58
D.	The Pharmaceutical Industry Has Praised Jevtana <sup>®</sup> .....	59
E.	At Least Nine Companies have Copied Jevtana <sup>®</sup> .....	60
F.	Jevtana <sup>®</sup> Is a Commercial Success.....	60
X.	CONCLUSION.....	60

# 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.