

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

WOCKHARDT BIO AG,  
Petitioner,

v.

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01582  
Patent 8,822,438 B2

---

Before LORA M. GREEN, RAMA G. ELLURU, and  
KRISTINA M. KALAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KALAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION  
*35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Wockhardt Bio AG (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 4, “Pet.”) to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 of U.S. Patent No. 8,822,438 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’438 patent”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319. Janssen Oncology, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 13, “Prelim. Resp.”). We instituted an *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 on certain grounds of unpatentability alleged in the Petition (Paper 28, “Dec.”).

After institution of trial, Patent Owner filed a Patent Owner Response (Paper 43, “PO Resp.”). Petitioner filed a Reply (Paper 54, “Reply”). An oral hearing was held on May 24, 2017. A transcript of the hearing has been entered into the record. Paper 71 (“Tr.”).

The Board has jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6. In this Final Written Decision, issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that all claims of the ’438 patent for which trial was instituted, namely, claims 1–20, are unpatentable.

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. Related Matters

The parties indicate that the ’438 patent is being asserted in a number of district court proceedings, some of which have been terminated. Pet. 66; Paper 8, 2–4. Patent Owner represents that the following proceedings have not been terminated: *BTG Int’l Ltd. v. Actavis Labs. FL, Inc.*, C.A. No. 2:15-cv-05909-KM-JBC (D.N.J.), *Janssen Biotech, Inc. v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.*, C.A. No. 1:15-cv-00130-IMK (N.D. W. Va.), *BTG Int’l Ltd. v. Amerigen Pharms., Inc.*, C.A. No. 2:16-cv-02449-KM-JBC (D.N.J.), and *BTG Int’l Ltd.*

*v. Glenmark Pharms. Inc., USA*, C.A. No. 2:16-cv-05909 (D.N.J). Paper 32, 3.

Patent Owner also states that the '438 patent was the subject of *ex parte* reexamination request No. 90/020,096, but “will not be granted a filing date for failure to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.501(a).” *Id.* at 2.

*B. The '438 Patent*

The '438 patent, titled “Methods and Compositions for Treating Cancer,” describes methods that comprise “administering a  $17\alpha$ -hydroxylase/ $C_{17,20}$ -lyase inhibitor, such as abiraterone acetate (i.e.,  $3\beta$ -acetoxy-17-(3-pyridyl)androsta-5,16-diene), in combination with at least one additional therapeutic agent such as an anti-cancer agent or a steroid.”

Ex. 1001, at [54], [57]. As described in the '438 patent, it is believed that testosterone and dihydrotestosterone promote the growth of prostate cancer. *Id.* at 1:49–51. Hormone therapy can be used to suppress the production or block the effects of hormones such as testosterone. *Id.* at 1:43–51.

The enzyme  $17\alpha$ -hydroxylase/ $C_{17,20}$ -lyase (“CYP17”) is involved in testosterone synthesis. *Id.* at 3:66–4:1. CYP17 inhibitors have been shown to be useful in the treatment of cancer, specifically, androgen-dependent disorders like prostate cancer. *Id.* at 5:23–27. Abiraterone acetate, a prodrug of abiraterone, is a CYP17 inhibitor. *Id.* at 2:10–12.

The '438 patent describes administration of a therapeutically effective amount of a CYP17 inhibitor, such as abiraterone acetate, with a therapeutically effective amount of at least one additional therapeutic agent including, but not limited to, an anti-cancer agent, such as mitoxantrone, paclitaxel, docetaxel, leuprolide, goserelin, triptorelin, seocalcitol,

bicalutamide, or flutamide, or a steroid, such as hydrocortisone, prednisone, or dexamethasone. *Id.* at 2:9–3:20.

*C. Challenged Claims*

Claim 1 of the '438 patent is reproduced below:

1. A method for the treatment of a prostate cancer in a human comprising administering to said human a therapeutically effective amount of abiraterone acetate or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof and a therapeutically effective amount of prednisone.

Ex. 1001, 16:16–20. Dependent claims 2–20 of the '438 patent describe additional limitations of the method, including the amount of abiraterone acetate and the amount of prednisone used and the type of prostate cancer being treated. *Id.* at 16:21–17:14.

*D. Prior Art References Relied Upon by Petitioner*

Petitioner relies on the following prior art:

1. Gerber, G.S. & Chodak, G.W., *Prostate specific antigen for assessing response to ketoconazole and prednisone in patients with hormone refractory metastatic prostate cancer*, 144 J. Urol. 1177–79 (1990) (“Gerber”) (Ex. 1004);
2. O’Donnell, A. et al., *Hormonal impact of the 17 $\alpha$ -hydroxylase/C<sub>17,20</sub>-lyase inhibitor abiraterone acetate (CB7630) in patients with prostate cancer*, 90 British Journal of Cancer 2317–25 (2004) (“O’Donnell”) (Ex. 1005); and
3. Sartor, O. et al., *Effect of prednisone on prostate-specific antigen in patients with hormone-refractory prostate cancer*, 52 Urology 252–256 (1998) (“Sartor”) (Ex. 1006).

*E. Instituted Grounds of Unpatentability*

We instituted *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 of the '438 patent on the following grounds:

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Gerber, O'Donnell, and Sartor	§ 103(a)	1–20

In support of its challenges, Petitioner relies on the declarations of Paul A. Godley, M.D., Ph.D., MPP (Ex. 1002; Ex. 1104; Ex. 1123; Ex. 1129), Robert Stoner, Ph.D. (Ex. 1077; Ex. 1103; Ex. 1122; Ex. 1130), and Ian McKeague, Ph.D. (Ex. 1106). Patent Owner relies on the declarations of Ian Judson, M.D. (Ex. 2028), Matthew Rettig, M.D. (Ex. 2038), Richard Auchus, M.D., Ph.D. (Ex. 2040), and Christopher A. Velluro, Ph.D. (Ex. 2044).

### III. ANALYSIS

*A. Claim Interpretation*

The Board interprets claim terms in an unexpired patent according to the broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which they appear. *See Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, 136 S. Ct. 2131, 2144–46 (2016) (upholding the use of the broadest reasonable interpretation standard); 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). Under that standard, and absent any special definitions, we give claim terms their ordinary and customary meaning as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. *See In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Any special definitions for claim terms must be set forth with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision. *See In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Only those terms which are in controversy need to be construed, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy.

# 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.