Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper No. 9
Entered: May 8, 2018

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CIPLA LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00162
Patent 7,820,788 B2

Before JEFFREY N. FREDMAN, RAMA G. ELLURU, and SUSAN L. C. MITCHELL, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

FREDMAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Institution of Inter Partes Review
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)

Dismissing Petitioner's Motion for Joinder
37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Petitioner Cipla Ltd. ("Petitioner") filed a Petition (Paper 2, "Pet.") requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–12 (the "challenged claims") of U.S. Patent No. 7,820,788 B2 (Ex. 1001, "the '788 patent"). Patent Owner Abraxis Bioscience, LLC ("Patent Owner") filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 8 ("Prelim. Resp.").

Concurrently with the Petition, Petitioner filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3, "Joinder Motion"). The Joinder Motion seeks to join this proceeding with *Actavis LLC v. Abraxis Biosciences*, IPR 2017-01101 ("2017-01101 IPR"). Joinder Motion 1.

At the time Petitioner filed the instant Petition and Joinder Motion, the Board had instituted *inter partes* review of the '788 patent in the 2017–01101 IPR. Subsequent to that institution, the parties in the 2017–01101 IPR submitted a Joint Motion to Terminate *Inter Partes* Review under 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72 and 42.74. Because we granted the motion to terminate, there is no instituted *inter partes* review for Petitioner to join, and the Joinder Motion is moot.

However, because the instant Petition is not statutorily barred, a separate *inter partes* review may be instituted. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).

We have authority to determine whether to institute an *inter partes* review under 35 U.S.C. § 314 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a). To institute an *inter partes* review, we must determine that the information presented in the Petition shows "a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition." 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). For the reasons set forth below, we conclude that Petitioner has

not established a reasonable likelihood that they would prevail in showing the unpatentability of at least one of the challenged claims of the '788 patent. Therefore, we deny institution of an *inter partes* review for claims 1–12 of the '788 patent.

B. Related Proceedings

Petitioner indicates that the '788 patent was asserted in *Abraxis BioScience, LLC v. Actavis LLC, C.A.* No. 16-1925-JMV-MF; and *Abraxis BioScience, LLC v. Cipla Ltd.*, C.A. No. 16-9074-JMV-MF. Pet. 5. In addition to the 2017-01101 IPR, Actavis filed three additional requests for *inter partes* review of other patents owned by Abraxis that are related to the '788 patent: IPR2017-01100 (involving U.S. Patent No. 8,853,260); IPR2017-01103 (involving U.S. Patent No. 7,923,536); and IPR2017-01104 (involving U.S. Patent No. 8,138,229). *Id.*

Petitioner indicates they also filed petitions for *inter partes* review of related U.S. Patent Nos. 8,138,229 (IPR2018-00164), and 7,923,536 (IPR2018-00163). Pet. 6. U.S Patent 8,138,229 and U.S. Patent 7,923,536 are both continuations of the '788 patent.

C. The '788 Patent (Ex. 1001)

The '788 patent involves methods of formulating pharmaceuticals with carriers to "reduce one or more side effects." Ex. 1001, 3:55–61. Such methods specifically involve formulating taxol (paclitaxel), an agent active against carcinomas, (*id*. at 4:31–39), with albumin, a protein found in human plasma (*id*. at 5:8–18).

The '788 patent specifically prefers that the composition "have a particle or droplet size less than about 200 nanometers" (*id*. at 9:52) and a "ratio of albumin to pharmaceutical agent in the pharmaceutical composition

[that] is about 18:1 or less" (*id*. at 3:27–28). It is also stated in the '788 patent that:

> While the ratio of protein to pharmaceutical agent will have to be optimized for different protein and pharmaceutical agent combinations, generally the ratio of protein, e.g., albumin, to pharmaceutical agent is about 18:1 or less (e.g., about 15:1, about 10:1, about 5:1, or about 3:1). More preferably, the ratio is about 0.2:1 to about 12:1. Most preferably, the ratio is about 1:1 to about 9:1.

Id. at 11:61–67. The '788 patent also prefers a formulation "essentially free of cremophor" because "cremophor typically is used as a solvent for paclitaxel, and is associated with side effects that can be severe" (*id*. at 12:1–6).

D. Illustrative Claims

Of the challenged claims, claim 1 is the sole independent claim of the '788 patent. The remaining challenged claims 2–12 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Claim 1 is illustrative of the challenged claims and recites:

> 1. A pharmaceutical composition for injection comprising paclitaxel and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, wherein the pharmaceutically acceptable carrier comprises albumin, wherein the albumin and the paclitaxel in the composition are formulated as particles, wherein the particles have a particle size of less than about 200 nm, and wherein the weight ratio of albumin to paclitaxel in the composition is about 1:1 to about 9:1.

Ex. 1001, 38:17–24.

E. The Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

Petitioner contends that the challenged claims are unpatentable based on the following grounds. Pet. 7–8.

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
Desai[1]	§ 102(b)	1–9, 11, 12
Desai	§ 103(a)	1–12
Desai, Kadima,[2] and Liversidge[3]	§ 103(a)	1–12

Petitioner relies also on the Declaration of Cory Berkland, Ph.D. Pet. 1–75; *see* Ex. 1002.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Claim Interpretation

In an *inter partes* review, claim terms in an unexpired patent are given their broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which they appear. 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b); *Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, 136 S. Ct. 2131, 2144–46 (2016). Under this standard, we interpret claim terms using "the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in the applicant's specification." *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054 (Fed. Cir. 1997). "Under a broadest reasonable interpretation, words of the claim must be given their plain meaning, unless such meaning is inconsistent with the

[1] WO 99/00113 A1, published Jan. 7, 1999 (Ex. 1006, "Desai").
[2] WO 00/06152 A1, published Feb. 10, 2000 (Ex. 1004, "Kadima").
[3] US 5,399,363, issued Mar. 21, 1995 (Ex. 1005, "Liversidge").

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.