

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,
Petitioner

v.

NOVARTIS AG,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2017-01063
U.S. Patent No. 9,006,224 B2

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
US PATENT NO. 9,006,224
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1-3
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. OVERVIEW	1
II. REQUIREMENTS FOR PETITION FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	2
A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	2
B. Notice of Lead and Backup Counsel and Service Information.....	2
C. Notice of Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	3
D. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	3
E. Fee for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	3
F. Proof of Service	3
III. IDENTIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)).....	4
IV. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	5
V. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	5
VI. OVERVIEW OF the '224 Patent.....	12
VII. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	15
VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
A. Applicable Law.....	16
B. Construction of Claim Terms	18
1. “pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor”	18
2. “advanced tumors”	19
3. “unit dose”	20
4. “islet cell tumor”	21
IX. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART AT THE TIME OF THE PURPORTED INVENTION.....	22
A. Rapamycin was well-known as a potent antitumor agent.....	22
B. Rapamycin derivatives, like everolimus and temsirolimus, were known to have similar biological activity to rapamycin	22
C. The mechanism of action for the immunosuppressant and antitumor activity of rapamycin and its derivatives was well-characterized	26

X.	THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	29
A.	Oberg 2004 taught that humans with advanced pancreatic NETs should be treated with rapamycin as a monotherapy after cytotoxic therapy failed	29
B.	Boulay 2004 taught that everolimus was well-tolerated and effective at treating pancreatic NETs in rat models.....	32
C.	O'Donnell taught that everolimus was well-tolerated and showed promise as an antitumor agent in human patients.....	34
D.	Tabernero taught that an appropriate dosage for humans taking everolimus for the treatment of advanced solid tumors was 10 mg/day	35
E.	Duran taught the use of temsirolimus in the treatment of human patients with advanced neuroendocrine carcinomas.....	37
XI.	CLAIMS 1-3 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER THE PRIOR ART	38
A.	Oberg 2004 taught that humans with advanced pancreatic NETs should be treated with rapamycin as a monotherapy after cytotoxic therapy failed	38
B.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3 would have been obvious in view of Oberg 2004, Boulay 2004, and O'Donnell	41
1.	Claim 1	41
2.	Claim 2	46
3.	Claim 3	48
C.	Ground 2: Claim 2 would have been obvious in view of Oberg 2004, Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, and Tabernero.....	48
D.	Ground 3: Claims 1-3 would have been obvious in view of Boulay 2004, O'Donnell and Duran.....	49
1.	Claim 1	49
2.	Claim 2	51
3.	Claim 3	53
E.	Ground 4: Claim 2 of the '224 patent is invalid as obvious in view of Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, Duran, and Tabernero	53
XII.	Secondary considerations fail to overcome the strong evidence of obviousness	54

XIII. CONCLUSION56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.,
713 F.3d 1369, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2013)56

Boston Sci. Scimed, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.,
554 F.3d 982, 991 (Fed. Cir. 2009)40

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,
No. 15-446, slip op. at 13, 579 U.S.____(2016)16

Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.,
737 F.3d 731, 740 (Fed. Cir. 2013)55

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)38, 54

In re Beattie,
974 F.2d 1309, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 1992)12, 45

In re PepperBall Techs., Inc.,
469 F. App'x 878, 882-83 (Fed. Cir. 2012)55

In re Peterson,
315 F.3d 1325, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2003)47

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398, 421 (2007)12, 38, 39, 40, 45

Leapfrog Enters., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.,
485 F.3d 1157, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2007)55

Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
395 F.3d 1364, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2005)47, 52, 56

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxycorr, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292, 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2015)17

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2007)47, 52

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.