Filed: February 8, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ACTAVIS LABORATORIES FL, INC., AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC, AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS OF NEW YORK, LLC, DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC., DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD., SUN PHARMACEUTICALS INDUSTRIES, LTD., SUN PHARMACEUTICALS INDUSTRIES, INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., WEST-WARD PHARMACEUTICAL CORP., and HIKMA PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC

Petitioners

v.

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.,

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,822,438 to Auerbach et al.

Inter Partes Review IPR2017-00853

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,822,438



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | | | rage | | | |
|------|--|--|---------|---|------|--|--|--|
| I. | INT | RODU | JCTIO: | N | 1 | | | |
| II. | MANDATORY NOTICES | | | | | | | |
| | A. | Real Parties-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) | | | | | | |
| | B. | Rela | ited Ma | atters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) | 2 | | | |
| | C. | Lead And Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) | | | | | | |
| | D. | Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4) | | | | | | |
| III. | GRO | OUNDS FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101 AND 42.104) | | | | | | |
| IV. | PRE | DENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND STATEMENT OF THE RECISE RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(A) AND 37 L.F.R. § 42.104(B)) | | | | | | |
| V. | THR | RESHO | OLD R | EQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW | 5 | | | |
| VI. | STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED5 | | | | | | | |
| | A. | Sum | mary o | of the Argument | 5 | | | |
| | B. | Leve | el of O | ordinary Skill in the Art | 7 | | | |
| | C. | U.S. | Paten | t No. 8,822,438 and Its File History | 8 | | | |
| | | 1. | Spec | cification of the '438 Patent | 8 | | | |
| | | 2. | File | History of the '438 Patent | 11 | | | |
| | D. | Clai | m Con | astruction (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100(b), 42.104(b)(3)) | 18 | | | |
| | E. | E. Scope and Content of the Prior Art | | | | | | |
| | | 1. | Ove | rview | 20 | | | |
| | | 2. | Bacl | kground of Prostate Cancer and Its Treatment | 24 | | | |
| | | 3. | Prio | r Art References | 29 | | | |
| | | | a. | In 2004, O'Donnell Described the Administration of Abiraterone Acetate as More Effective for Treating Metastatic Refractory Prostate Cancer than Ketoconazole, and Possibly Requiring Concomitant Glucocorticoid Replacement Therap | | | | |



| | | b. | In 1990, Gerber Disclosed the Use of Ketoconazole with Prednisone, a Glucocorticoid, in Patients with Hormone Refractory Metastatic Prostate Cancer | 33 |
|----|-------|--------|---|----|
| | | c. | In 1997, the '213 Patent Disclosed Abiraterone Acetate and Its Superiority over Ketoconazole in Treating Prostate Cancer | 35 |
| F. | Expla | nation | of Grounds for Unpatentability | 38 |
| | 1. | O'Do | Method of Claim 1 was Obvious over Either onnell in view of Gerber (Ground 1) or the '213 t in View of Gerber (Ground 2) | 38 |
| | | a. | O'Donnell and the '213 Patent Disclosed the Use of Abiraterone Acetate to Treat Prostate Cancer | 38 |
| | | b. | Gerber Disclosed Co-Administering Prednisone with a CYP17 Inhibitor, like Abiraterone Acetate | 39 |
| | 2. | | onnell and the '213 Disclosed the Dosing ations Recited in Claims 2 and 3 | 42 |
| | 3. | | Oose Recited in Claim 4 was Disclosed to One of in the Art by either O'Donnell or the '213 Patent | 43 |
| | 4. | | Oose Recited in Claim 5 was Disclosed to One of in the Art by O'Donnell | 44 |
| | 5. | | ns 6–9 were Obvious over O'Donnell or the '213 t in View of Gerber | 45 |
| | 6. | | n 10 was Obvious over O'Donnell or the '213 Patent ew of Gerber | 46 |
| | 7. | | n 11 was Obvious over O'Donnell or the '213 Patent ew of Gerber | 47 |
| | 8. | | ns 12–16 were Obvious over O'Donnell in View of | 47 |
| | 9. | | Oocetaxel Treatment in Claim 17 was Part of the ground Knowledge of One of Skill in the Art | 49 |
| | 10. | Clain | n 18 was Obvious over O'Donnell in View of | 70 |



| | 11. | Claim 19 was Obvious over O'Donnell in View of Gerber | 50 | |
|----|--|--|----|--|
| | 12. | Claim 20 was Obvious over O'Donnell in View of Gerber | 50 | |
| G. | Secondary Considerations do not Indicate that the Claims of the '438 Patent were Non-Obvious | | | |
| | 1. | Applicants did not Offer Relevant Evidence of Commercial Success and the Examiner Issued the '438 Patent Based on the Erroneous Conclusion that the Asserted Commercial Success of Zytiga Overcame the Obviousness of the Claimed Invention. | 51 | |
| | 2. | One of Skill in the Art would not Anticipate Unexpected Benefits from the Claimed Invention and Applicants did not Offer Any Evidence of Relevant Unexpected Results | 54 | |
| | 3. | The '438 Patent Satisfied No Long-Felt but Unmet Need | 58 | |
| | 4. | The '213 is a Blocking Patent that Limits the Applicability of Commercial Success | 59 | |
| | 5. | Copying by Generic Drug Makers is Irrelevant | 60 | |
| H. | Conc | clusion | 61 | |



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| Page |
|---|
| Federal Cases Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985) |
| Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc., 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) |
| BTG Int'l Ltd. v. Actavis Labs. FL, Inc., No. 15-cv-5909-KM-JBC (D.N.J.)19 |
| Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc., 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)60 |
| In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)19 |
| Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc., 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)59 |
| Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)51 |
| Smith & Nephew, Inc. v. ConvaTec Techs., Inc., Case No. IPR2013-00097 (PTAB May 29, 2014) |
| Smith & Nephew, Inc. v. ConvaTec Techs., Inc., Case No. IPR2013-00102 (PTAB May 29, 2014). 52 |
| Federal Statutes 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) |
| 35 U.S.C. § 103 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)5 |
| 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–3191 |
| Federal Regulations 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b) |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.101 |



DOCKET

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.

