

Paper No. _____

Date Original Version Filed: April 4, 2018

Date Corrected Version Filed: April 24, 2018

Filed On Behalf Of:

Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation

By:

Nicholas N. Kallas

NKallas@fchs.com; ZortressAfinitorIPR@fchs.com

(212) 218-2100

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 NOVARTIS'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

¹ IPR2018-00507 has been joined to this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	POSA	3
III.	THE '131 PATENT	5
IV.	GROUND 1: WASIK DOES NOT ANTICIPATE	7
	A. Read As A Whole, Wasik Disclosed Liquid, Not Solid, Tumors.....	8
	B. In Wasik, “Tumor” Referred Exclusively To Lymphomas	10
	C. Wasik Did Not Incorporate By Reference Any Solid Kidney Tumor Teaching	17
	D. Ambiguous Disclosures Do Not Anticipate.....	17
V.	GB'072 DESCRIBES THE CLAIMED INVENTIONS	18
	A. GB'072 Describes Solid Excretory System Tumors And Solid Kidney Tumors	19
	B. GB'072 Describes Advanced Solid Excretory System Tumors.....	21
VI.	STATE OF THE ART IN 2001.....	22
	A. Advanced RCC Was Notoriously Difficult To Treat.....	22
	B. The Intracellular Signaling Pathways Reportedly Involved In Tumor Cell Proliferation Were Not Reasonably Predictable	23
	C. mTOR Inhibitor Development For Cancer Therapy Was In Very Early Stages.....	25
	1. Rapamycin’s <i>In Vivo</i> Anti-Tumor Activity Was Not Reasonably Predictable	25
	2. Everolimus Had Not Demonstrated <i>In Vivo</i> Anti- Tumor Activity Against Any Solid Tumor.....	28

3.	There Were Only Preliminary Phase I Data For Temsirolimus In Cancer Patients	31
4.	mTOR Inhibitors Had Known Differences.....	32
D.	What Role PTEN Played In RCC, If Any, Was Not Well- Understood Or Reasonably Predictable	34
VII.	STATE OF THE ART IN 2002.....	36
A.	mTOR Inhibitor Development For Cancer Therapy Was Still In Very Early Stages.....	36
B.	What Role PTEN Played In RCC, If Any, Was Still Not Well-Understood Or Reasonably Predictable	40
VIII.	GROUND 2: THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER WASIK AND NAVARRO	41
IX.	GROUND 3: THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER WASIK, NAVARRO, CROWE, AND LUAN	45
A.	Petitioners Have Not Established That Luan Is Prior Art.....	45
1.	Luan Was Not Published Before The February 2001 Priority Date	45
2.	GB'072 Antedates Luan	46
B.	A POSA Would Not Have Had A Motivation To Combine	47
C.	A POSA Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success	50
X.	GROUND 4: THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER HIDALGO, ALEXANDRE, CROWE, SCHULER, NEUMAYER, AND NAVARRO.....	53
A.	A POSA Would Not Have Had A Motivation To Combine	53

B.	A POSA Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success	55
1.	Crowe, Schuler, Neumayer, And Navarro Did Not Reasonably Suggest That Everolimus Was Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors	55
2.	Hidalgo And Alexandre Did Not Reasonably Suggest That Temsirolimus Was Therapeutically Effective Against Advanced RCC	56
3.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected Everolimus To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Advanced RCC Based On Molecular Biology.....	63
4.	A POSA Would Not Have Reasonably Expected An Immunosuppressant To Be Therapeutically Effective Against Solid Kidney Tumors, Like Advanced RCC	64
XI.	GROUND 5: THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER HIDALGO, ALEXANDRE, CROWE, SCHULER, NEUMAYER, NAVARRO, AND LUAN.....	65
XII.	A POSA WOULD NOT HAVE SELECTED EVEROLIMUS FOR THE CLAIMED METHODS	66
XIII.	CONSTITUTIONALITY OF <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	70
XIV.	CONCLUSION.....	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	42, 64
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	45
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC</i> , 435 F. App’x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	61
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Sicor Pharms., Inc.</i> , 705 F. Supp. 2d. 971 (S.D. Ind. 2010).....	46, 47
<i>Ex Parte Saito</i> , Appeal 2008-5777 (B.P.A.I. Dec. 22, 2008)	46
<i>Falkner v. Inglis</i> , 448 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	20
<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Ltd.</i> , Nos. 2016-2206, U.S. App. LEXIS 25454 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	42, 64
<i>ICN Photonics, Ltd. v. Cynosure, Inc.</i> , 73 F. App’x 425 (Fed Cir. 2003)	20
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d. 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	49
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	48, 54
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	66
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	8
<i>In re Hughes</i> , 345 F.2d 184 (C.C.P.A. 1965).....	17

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.