UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BRECKENRIDGE PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., AND WEST-WARD PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,

Petitioners,

v.

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01592<sup>1</sup> Patent No. 8,410,131

EXPERT DECLARATION OF DR. HOWARD A. BURRIS, III

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> IPR2018-00507 has been joined to this proceeding.

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

#### Contents

I.	Introduction1			1	
II.	Qualifications				
III.	Legal Principles				
IV.	POSA15			15	
V.	Tumor Background				
	A.	Adva	nced Tumors	22	
	B.	Solid	Excretory System Tumors	23	
	C.	Lymp	bhomas	24	
VI.	Summary Of The '131 Patent26			26	
VII.	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Anticipated Because Wasik Disclosed Only Liquid Tumors, Not Solid Tumors				
VIII.	The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Entitled To A February 2001 Priority Date				
IX.	Luan Is Not Prior Art Because The '131 Patent Inventors Previously Invented As Much Of The Claimed Invention As Luan Disclosed				
X.	State Of The Art As Of February 2001				
	A.	Solid	Kidney Tumor And RCC Background	58	
		1.	In February 2001, Advanced RCC Was Associated With A Poor Prognosis	59	
		2.	In February 2001, Advanced RCC Was Notoriously Difficult To Treat	60	

B.	Intracellular Signaling Pathways Background65				
C.	In February 2001, The Role Of mTOR In The Intracellular Signaling Pathways Reportedly Involved In Cell Proliferation Was Not Well Understood Or Reasonably Predictable				
D.	Inhib	bruary 2001, The Development Of An mTOR itor For Cancer Treatment Was In Very Early es			
	1.	In February 2001, The In Vivo Anti-Tumor Activity Of Rapamycin Was Not Reasonably Predictable			
	2.	In February 2001, Only One mTOR Inhibitor Was In Development For Cancer Treatment			
	3.	In February 2001, Everolimus Had Not Demonstrated In Vivo Anti-Tumor Activity Against Any Solid Tumor			
	4.	In February 2001, There Was Only Preliminary Phase I Data For Temsirolimus In Cancer Patients			
	5.	In February 2001, There Were Known Differences Between mTOR Inhibitors103			
	б.	In February 2001, What Role PTEN Played In RCC, If Any, Was Not Well Understood Or Reasonably Predictable			
Devel		OSA Would Not Have Selected Everolimus For The lopment Of A New Treatment For Solid Kidney ors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2001117			
	1.	A POSA Would Not Have Selected Everolimus Over Immunotherapy For The Development Of A New Treatment For Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC			
	2.	A POSA Would Not Have Selected Everolimus Over Temsirolimus For The Development Of A			

		New Treatment For Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC	126	
XI.	State	127		
	A.	In February 2002, The Development Of An mTOR Inhibitor For Cancer Treatment Was Still In Very Early Stages	129	
		<ol> <li>In February 2002, The In Vivo Anti-Tumor Activity Of Rapamycin And Temsirolimus Was Not Reasonably Predictable And There Was Only Preliminary Phase I Data For Temsirolimus In Cancer Patients</li> </ol>	129	
		2. In February 2002, The Preclinical Anti-Tumor Activity Of Everolimus Was Not Reasonably Predictable	137	
		3. In February 2002, What Role PTEN Played In RCC, If Any, Was Not Well Understood Or Reasonably Predictable	141	
	B.	A POSA Would Not Have Selected Everolimus For The Development Of A New Treatment For Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002	143	
XII.	Ground 2: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Obvious Over Wasik Alone Or In Combination With Navarro144			
	<ul> <li>A. A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC In February 2001</li></ul>			
	B.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002	150	
XIII.	. Ground 3: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Obvious Over Wasik, Navarro, Crowe, And Luan			

iii

	A.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2001		
	B.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Luan And The Everolimus References In February 2002154		
	C.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002		
XIV.	Obvio	Ground 4: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Obvious Over Hidalgo, Alexandre, Crowe, Schuler, Neumayer, And Navarro		
	A.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine The Temsirolimus And Everolimus References In February 2001		
	B.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2001		
	C.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002		
XV.	Obvio	Ground 5: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Obvious Over Hidalgo, Alexandre, Crowe, Schuler, Neumayer, Navarro, And Luan		
	A.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Luan And The Everolimus References In February 2002174		
	B.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002		

## DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.