

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 IPR2017-01592¹

Patent No. 8,410,131

**CORRECTED EXPERT DECLARATION OF DR. HOWARD A. BURRIS,
III**

¹ IPR2018-00507 has been joined to this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Qualifications.....	8
III.	Legal Principles	12
IV.	POSA	15
V.	Tumor Background.....	20
	A. Advanced Tumors	22
	B. Solid Excretory System Tumors	23
	C. Lymphomas	24
VI.	Summary Of The '131 Patent.....	26
VII.	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Anticipated Because Wasik Disclosed Only Liquid Tumors, Not Solid Tumors	31
VIII.	The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Entitled To A February 2001 Priority Date	50
IX.	Luan Is Not Prior Art Because The '131 Patent Inventors Previously Invented As Much Of The Claimed Invention As Luan Disclosed	57
X.	State Of The Art As Of February 2001	58
	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 Background	65
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	68
D.	In February 2001, The Development Of An mTOR Inhibitor For Cancer Treatment Was In Very Early Stages.....	72
1.	In February 2001, The In Vivo Anti-Tumor Activity Of Rapamycin Was Not Reasonably Predictable.....	74
2.	In February 2001, Only One mTOR Inhibitor Was In Development For Cancer Treatment	80
3.	In February 2001, Everolimus Had Not Demonstrated In Vivo Anti-Tumor Activity Against Any Solid Tumor	81
4.	In February 2001, There Was Only Preliminary Phase I Data For Temsirolimus In Cancer Patients	93
5.	In February 2001, There Were Known Differences Between mTOR Inhibitors.....	103
6.	In February 2001, What Role PTEN Played In RCC, If Any, Was Not Well Understood Or Reasonably Predictable.....	110
E.	A POSA Would Not Have Selected Everolimus For The Development Of A New Treatment For Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2001	117
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	120
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 Of The Art As Of February 2002	127
	A. In February 2002, The Development Of An mTOR Inhibitor For Cancer Treatment Was Still In Very Early Stages.....	129
	1. 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.....	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 Navarro.....	144
	A. A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC In February 2001.....	145
	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	152

A.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2001.....	153
B.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Luan And The Everolimus References In February 2002	154
C.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002.....	155
XIV.	Ground 4: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Obvious Over Hidalgo, Alexandre, Crowe, Schuler, Neumayer, And Navarro	159
A.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine The Temsirolimus And Everolimus References In February 2001.....	160
B.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2001.....	164
C.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002.....	172
XV.	Ground 5: The Challenged Claims Of The '131 Patent Are Not Obvious Over Hidalgo, Alexandre, Crowe, Schuler, Neumayer, Navarro, And Luan	173
A.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Luan And The Everolimus References In February 2002	174
B.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Such As Advanced RCC, In February 2002.....	175

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.