

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

FRESENIUS-KABI USA, LLC  
Petitioner

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-01910  
U.S. Patent No. 6,774,122

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,774,122**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '122 PATENT .....	7
A. Specification .....	7
B. Claims .....	8
C. Prosecution History .....	9
III. THE DECISION OF THE BOARD IN THE MYLAN AND INNOPHARMA IPRS .....	14
IV. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	20
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	20
VI. STATE OF THE ART .....	21
A. Active: Fulvestrant Was Far From Established As An Efficacious Treatment .....	21
B. Amount: The Claimed Blood Plasma Levels Are Unconventional .....	25
C. Administration: Route, Excipients, And Result Are Intertwined And Not “Successfully Answered” By The Prior Art.....	28
D. Conclusion On State Of The Art .....	36
VII. THE '122 PATENT IS VALID AND NOT OBVIOUS .....	36
A. Law Of Obviousness .....	36
B. Ground One: Howell .....	38
1. The Gellert Declaration Does Not Provide A Motivation To Make The Formulation Of The Invention .....	39
2. No Expectation Of Success.....	42
C. Ground Two: Howell In Combination With McLeskey .....	45
1. Petitioner Cannot Cure The Lack Of Efficacy Or Pharmacokinetic Data In McLeskey .....	47

**TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(Continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
2. Petitioner Cannot Cure The Unpredictability Of Compositional Differences On Intramuscular Administration.....	51
3. Petitioner Cannot Change The Fact McLeskey Involves Subcutaneous Injection While Howell Involves Intramuscular Injection .....	54
D. Ground Three: Howell In Combination With McLeskey And O'Regan.....	57
VIII. OBJECTIVE INDICIA DEMONSTRATE THE NONOBVIOUS NATURE OF THE CLAIMED METHOD OF TREATMENT .....	58
IX. CONCLUSION.....	59

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(Continued)**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00357, 2015 WL 9899009 (P.T.A.B. June 29, 2015) .....	57
<i>Bumble Bee Foods, LLC v. Kowalski</i> , IPR2014-00224, 2014 WL 2584188 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2014) .....	41
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs., Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	56
<i>Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.</i> , 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	56
<i>Exacq Techs., Inc. v. JDS Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00568, 2016 WL 4987613 (P.T.A.B. June 14, 2016) .....	18
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	48
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine HCl Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	37, 42
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	50
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	53
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	36, 46
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. Innovative Display Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2015-00496, 2015 WL 4481790 (P.T.A.B. July 20, 2015) .....	1, 3, 20, 59
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00076, 2014 WL 1410363 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 8, 2014) .....	40

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(Continued)**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme Corp v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , No. 3:12-cv-03289-PGS-LHG, 2015 WL 5089543 (D.N.J. Aug. 27, 2015) .....	41
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00633, 2016 WL 5219979 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 22, 2016) .....	17
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	38, 40
<i>Synaptics Inc. v. Amkor Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00085, 2017 WL 1403668 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 18, 2017) .....	6
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	36, 38
<i>Universal Remote Control, Inc. v. Uei Cayman, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01111, 2014 WL 6737921 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 24, 2014).....	56
<i>Valeo N. Am., Inc. v. Magna Elecs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01206, 2014 WL 7336080 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 23, 2014).....	18
 <b>Regulations</b>	
21 C.F.R. §314.94(a)(9)(iii) .....	33
21 C.F.R. §314.127(a)(8)(ii)(B) .....	33
35 U.S.C. §325(d) .....	6
37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(4).....	18
37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(5).....	18
37 C.F.R. §42.22(a)(2) .....	18
37 C.F.R. §42.24(a)(1)(i) .....	18
37 C.F.R. §42.6(a)(3) .....	18

# 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.