

Paper No. _
Date Filed: December 23, 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

PATENT OWNER'S CONTINGENT MOTION TO AMEND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Claim Listing	1
III.	Written Description Support For Substitute Claims.....	2
	A. Claim 31	3
	B. Claim 32	5
	C. Claim 33	5
	D. Claim 34	6
IV.	Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	6
V.	Claim Construction.....	6
	A. The Preamble of Claim 31 Is Limiting	6
	1. Claim Language Shows that the Preamble Is Limiting.....	7
	2. Patent Owner Is Relying on Increased Survival to Distinguish Prior Art.....	8
	B. “A method of increasing survival”	8
	C. “antihistamine,” “corticoid,” and “H ₂ antagonist”.....	9
VI.	The Substitute Claims Are Patentable Over The Prior Art	10
	A. The Substitute Claims Are Novel	10
	B. The Substitute Claims Are Nonobvious.....	10
	1. No Prior Art Disclosed or Suggested 20-25 mg/m ² of Cabazitaxel in Combination with Prednisone or Prednisolone Would Increase Overall Survival.....	10
	a. There Is No Cabazitaxel Survival Data in the Prior Art.....	11

b.	Partial Responses in Tumor Size and Changes in PSA Levels Do Not Provide Evidence of Increased Survival	13
c.	Docetaxel’s Survival Benefit in Chemotherapy- Naïve Patients Is of Little Relevance to Whether Claims 31-34 Were Obvious.....	17
2.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Use the Claimed Premedication Regimen with Cabazitaxel.....	18
a.	The Prior Art Teaches Away from the Claimed Premedication Regimen Prior to Cabazitaxel	18
b.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Employ the Claimed Premedication Based on Docetaxel and Paclitaxel.....	20
c.	The Prior Art Teaches Away from the Use of H ₂ Antagonists with Cabazitaxel.....	23
3.	Objective Indicia Support Nonobviousness.....	24
VII.	Conclusion.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litig.</i> , 536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	19
<i>Jansen v. Rexall Sundown Inc.</i> , 342 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	7
<i>MBO Labs., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 474 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	8
<i>Rapoport v. Dement</i> , 254 F.3d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	7
<i>Sanofi v. Glenmark Pharms. Inc.</i> , No. 14-264, 2015 WL 5092631 (D. Del. Aug. 28, 2015)	7
<i>Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar</i> , 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	3

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 316(d)	1
--------------------------	---

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.121	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)	1

I. Introduction

Aventis Pharma, S.A. moves pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.121 to amend U.S. Patent No. 8,927,592 contingent upon the outcome of the instituted Grounds of IPR2016-00712. If original Claim 27 is found unpatentable, the Board is requested to replace it with proposed substitute Claim 31. If original Claim 28 is found unpatentable, the Board is requested replace it with proposed substitute Claim 32. If original Claim 29 is found unpatentable, the Board is requested to replace it with proposed substitute Claim 33. If original Claim 30 is found unpatentable, the Board is requested to replace it with proposed substitute Claim 34. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2); 35 U.S.C. § 316(d).

II. Claim Listing

A complete listing of the proposed claim amendments is provided in Appendix 1 hereto. No more than one substitute claim is proposed for each canceled claim. 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3). The proposed substitute claims add elements to the claims and do not remove any limitations; therefore they are not broader than the original claims. 35 U.S.C. § 316(d)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2).

Claim 31 has been amended so that the preamble (now a “method of increasing survival”) is a limitation of the claim. Claim 31 still requires administering a dose of 20-25 mg/m² of cabazitaxel, or hydrate or solvate thereof, in combination with prednisone or prednisolone to a patient with hormone-

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.