

Paper No. 110
Date Filed: June 7, 2019

Filed on behalf of: Sanofi Mature IP

By:

Daniel J. Minion
dminion@venable.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 RESPONSIVE BRIEF ON THE EFFECT OF
THE CAFC DECISION ON PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO AMEND**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Petitioner Must Prove That a POSA Would Have Had a Motivation to Practice the Claimed Invention with a Reasonable Expectation of Increased Survival2

III. The Prior Art Did Not Provide a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....5

 A. Anti-cancer Activity Does Not Provide a Reasonable Expectation of Success of Increasing Survival6

 B. The Results of TROPIC Were Unexpected9

 C. It Was Not Obvious to Practice the Methods of the Proposed Claims with the Intended Purpose of Increasing Survival.....11

 D. Petitioner Has Not Presented Evidence That a POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Administer a 20 mg/m² Dose of Cabazitaxel with the Intent of Increasing Survival.....15

IV. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Use the Claimed Premedication Regimen with Cabazitaxel.....17

V. The Proposed Claims Are Patentable Subject Matter25

VI. Conclusion25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , No. 13-1506-(GMS), 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 62056 (D. Del. May 11, 2016).....	12
<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , Nos. 2016-2206, 2016-2207, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 25454 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 18, 2017).....	13
<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	20
<i>Sanofi v. Glenmark Pharms. Inc.</i> , 204 F. Supp. 3d 665 (D. Del. 2016)	12
<i>Sanofi v. Glenmark Pharms. Inc.</i> , C.A. No. 14-264, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114406 (D. Del. Aug. 28, 2015)	3
<i>Sanofi v. Watson Labs. Inc.</i> , 875 F.3d 636 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	3, 4
<i>Vanda Pharms., Inc. v. West-Ward Pharms. Int'l Ltd.</i> , 887 F.3d 1117 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	25

I. Introduction

Under the proper claim construction and burden of persuasion, there can be little dispute that the proposed claims were not obvious. Petitioner's expert Dr. Seth admitted that the TROPIC study was performed to determine ultimately whether cabazitaxel and prednisone increased survival over the standard of care and that a person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSA") would have merely "hoped" at the time that the TROPIC study would be successful. The mere fact that the TROPIC study was ongoing would not have provided a reasonable expectation that the cabazitaxel therapy would increase survival in patients with docetaxel-resistant mCRPC ("DRmCRPC"), particularly in light of the minimal data regarding cabazitaxel (none regarding survival) and the numerous failures of other prostate cancer therapies, which despite having anti-cancer activity, did not increase survival in patients with mCRPC. As to proposed Claim 34, Petitioner's expert testified that a POSA at the time would not have even thought of administering a dose of 20 mg/m² to a patient with DRmCRPC. Thus a POSA could not have had a reasonable expectation that such a dose would prolong patients' lives.

Petitioner's argument that the premedication limitations of the proposed claims were obvious rests largely on Petitioner's mischaracterizations of expert testimony, unsupported conclusions about the prior art, and incorrect legal theories. Petitioner fails to credibly explain why a POSA would have been motivated to

employ a more complicated premedication regimen for cabazitaxel (three drugs) as compared to docetaxel (dexamethasone alone), and thereby forego the “significant administration and convenience advantages” of avoiding it. In fact, both parties’ *experts* testified that when it comes to hypersensitivity reactions (“HSRs”) they “err on the side of caution,” yet would still not have been motivated to use the claimed three-component premedication regimen prior to knowing the results and full protocol of the TROPIC study. Because the evidence shows that the same would be true for a *POSA*, the proposed method claims would not have been obvious.

II. Petitioner Must Prove That a POSA Would Have Had a Motivation to Practice the Claimed Invention with a Reasonable Expectation of Increased Survival

Contrary to the Federal Circuit’s holding that the preamble of Claim 31 is limiting (C.A. No. 18-1203, D.I. 63 (“Slip Op.”) at 8), Petitioner continues to assert that it need not establish that a POSA would have reasonably expected increased survival with the claimed methods. In doing so, Petitioner reverts to its strawman argument that the proposed claims “do not require survival data, a successful trial, or FDA approval” (Paper 109 (“Br.”) at 18), a standard that Patent Owner has never

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.