

IPR2017-00904
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INNOPHARMA LICENSING, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00904
Patent No. 6,774,122

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,774,122
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

Mail Stop: Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. NOTICES, STATEMENTS AND PAYMENT OF FEES..... 4

 A. Real Party In Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) 4

 B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) 4

 C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) 6

 D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4) 7

 E. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)..... 7

 F. Fees Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.103..... 7

III. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B) 7

IV. INNOPHARMA’S GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY ARE
DISTINCT FROM THOSE PRESENTED BY MYLAN..... 9

V. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘122 PATENT AND PROSECUTION HISTORY . 12

 A. The ‘122 Patent 12

 B. The Prosecution History 14

 1. The Prosecution History of the ‘122 Patent 14

 2. The Prosecution History of Related Applications 15

VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 17

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 17

 A. “Attained” 18

 B. “Therapeutically Significant” 18

 C. “Whereby a therapeutically significant blood plasma fulvestrant
concentration of at least 2.5 ngml⁻¹ is attained for at least 2 weeks after
injection” 18

VIII. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	19
A. The Prior Art Discloses All Limitations of the Challenged Claims.....	19
1. Howell Closely Matches the Claimed Invention	19
2. McLeskey Discloses the Claimed Formulation and Was Not a “Treatment Failure”	22
3. O’Regan Confirms the Route of Administration.....	26
B. AstraZeneca’s Attempts to Detract From These Prior Art Teachings Fail	26
1. AstraZeneca’s Purported “Lead Compound” Analysis is Inapplicable	27
2. AstraZeneca’s Efficacy Arguments Are Contrary to Law.....	29
3. AstraZeneca’s Claims of Unpredictability Are Specious	30
a. The Pharmacokinetic Limitations Are Expressly Disclosed in the Prior Art.....	30
b. It Was Well-Known That Fulvestrant Was Administered Intramuscularly.....	32
c. The Claimed Combination of Excipients Were Neither Unexpected Nor Surprising	33
IX. DETAILED EXPLANATION AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.....	36
A. Ground 1: Claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 Are Obvious Over Howell	36
1. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Develop a Formulation to Achieve the Results Reported in Howell.....	36
2. A POSA Would Have A Reasonable Expectation of Success in Developing a Formulation to Achieve the Howell Results.	39
3. Every Limitation Is Disclosed By Howell And The Knowledge of a POSA.....	41

- B. Ground 2: Claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 Are Obvious Over Howell and McLeskey.....44
 - 1. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Howell and McLeskey 44
 - a. The Target Fulvestrant Concentration in Howell Would Have Led a Skilled Formulator to McLeskey.....44
 - b. The Record Confirms the Motivation to Combine Howell and McLeskey.47
 - 2. A POSA Would Have A Reasonable Expectation of Success in Administering the McLeskey Formulation Intramuscularly to Achieve the Results Reported in Howell51
 - 3. Each and Every Limitation Is Disclosed By the Combination of Howell and McLeskey57
- C. Ground 3: Claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 Are Obvious Over Howell, McLeskey, and O’Regan58
 - 1. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Howell, McLeskey, and O’Regan.....59
 - 2. A POSA Would Have A Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Howell, McLeskey, and O’Regan.....59
 - 3. Each and Every Limitation Is Disclosed By the Combination of Howell, McLeskey, and O’Regan.....60
- X. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS, FAIL TO OVERCOME THE EVIDENCE OF OBVIOUSNESS.62
 - A. There Is No Nexus to the Claimed Invention62
 - B. AstraZeneca’s Secondary Considerations Arguments Fail64
 - 1. AstraZeneca Cannot Show Long-Felt Need64
 - 2. The Results Were Not Unexpected.....65
 - a. Dr. Robertson’s Arguments Are Contradicted By His Own

IPR2017-00904

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review

Published Work	65
b. The Release Profile and Effect of Benzyl Benzoate Were Expected	66
XI. CONCLUSION.....	66

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.