IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re *Inter Partes Review* of:	)
U.S. Patent No. 9,006,224	)
Issued: Apr. 14, 2015	)
Application No.: 12/094,173	)
PCT Filing Date: Nov. 20, 2006	)

For: **Neuroendocrine Tumor Treatment**

FILED VIA E2E

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,006,224

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv
I. OVERVIEW 1
II. REQUIREMENTS FOR PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW 2
A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)) 2
B. Notice of Lead and Backup Counsel and Service Information 3
C. Notice of Real-Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(l)) 3
D. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)) 4
E. Fee for *Inter Partes* Review 5
F. Proof of Service 5
III. IDENTIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)) 6
IV. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT 6
V. OVERVIEW OF THE ’224 PATENT 15
VI. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 18
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 19
A. Applicable Law 19
B. Construction of Claim Terms 21
1. “pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor” 22
2. “advanced tumors” 23
3. “unit dose” 24
4. “islet cell tumor” 25
VIII. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART AT THE TIME OF THE PURPORTED INVENTION 26
A. Rapamycin was well-known as a potent antitumor agent 26
B. Rapamycin derivatives, like everolimus and temsirolimus, were known to have similar biological activity to rapamycin 26

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

C. The mechanism of action for the immunosuppressant and antitumor activity of rapamycin and its derivatives was well-characterized 31

IX. THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART 34

A. Öberg 2004 taught that humans with advanced pancreatic NETs should be treated with rapamycin as a monotherapy after cytotoxic therapy failed 34

B. Boulay 2004 taught that everolimus was well-tolerated and effective at treating pancreatic NETs in rat models 37

C. O'Donnell taught that everolimus was well-tolerated and showed promise as an antitumor agent in human patients 40

D. Tabernero taught that an appropriate dosage for humans taking everolimus for the treatment of advanced solid tumors was 10 mg/day 41

E. Duran taught the use of temsirolimus in the treatment of human patients with advanced neuroendocrine carcinomas 42

X. CLAIMS 1-3 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER THE PRIOR ART 43

A. Legal Background 43

B. Ground 1: Claims 1-3 would have been obvious in view of Öberg 2004, Boulay 2004, and O'Donnell 46

1. Claim 1 46

2. Claim 2 53

3. Claim 3 55

C. Ground 2: Claim 2 would have been obvious in view of Öberg 2004, Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, and Tabernero 55

D. Ground 3: Claims 1-3 would have been obvious in view of Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, and Duran 56

1. Claim 1 56

2. Claim 2 58

3. Claim 3 60

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

E. Ground 4: Claim 2 of the ’224 patent is invalid as obvious in view of Boulay 2004, O’Donnell, Duran, and Tabernero 61

XI. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS FAIL TO OVERCOME THE STRONG EVIDENCE OF OBVIOUSNESS 62

XII. CONCLUSION 64

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.,
713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 63

In re Beattie,
974 F.2d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 1992) 14, 52

Boston Sci. Scimed, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.,
554 F.3d 982 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 46

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,
136 S.Ct. 2131,2142 (2016).....19

Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.,
737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 63

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....44, 62

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....*passim*

Leapfrog Enters., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.,
485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 62

Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 53-54, 59, 63

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 20

In re PepperBall Techs., Inc.,
469 F. App'x 878 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 63

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.