

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CIPLA LTD.,
Petitioner

v.

ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00164
Patent 8,138,229 B2
Issued: March 20, 2012

Title: COMPOSITIONS AND METHODS OF
DELIVERY OF PHARMACOLOGICAL AGENTS

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	1
II. BASIS FOR RELIEF.....	1
A. Rehearing is Requested on Ground I (anticipation).....	3
1. The Board Misapprehended the Petitioner’s Anticipation Rationale, Which Is Not Based on Inherency.....	3
2. The Board Misapprehended the Law of Anticipation	5
3. The Board Misapprehended Dr. Berkland’s Testimony.....	6
4. The Board Misapprehended Dr. Desai’s Statements.....	10
5. The Board Misapplied Its Own Rule	11
B. Rehearing on Ground II Requested (obviousness)	12
1. The Board Weighed Patent Owner’s Testimony More Favorably than Petitioner’s Testimony.....	13
2. The Board Misapprehended Petitioner’s Obviousness Rationale as Requiring Inherency.....	15
III. CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Actavis LLC v. Abraxis BioScience LLC</i> , IPR2017-01104, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 10, 2017).....	2, 11, 12, 14
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	9
<i>Arthrocare Care Corp. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 406 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	3
<i>Cipla Ltd. v. Abraxis BioScience LLC</i> , IPR2018-00163, Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. May 8, 2018)	9
<i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282, 1287–88 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	9
<i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs.</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	5
<i>In re Lamberti</i> , 545 F.2d 747 (C.C.P.A. 1976)	15
<i>In re Preda</i> , 401 F.2d 825 (C.C.P.A. 1968)	5
<i>In re Sasse</i> , 629 F.2d 675 (C.C.P.A. 1980)	9
<i>Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Mobile Telecomms. Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2017-00640, Paper No. 16 (P.T.A.B. July 28, 2017)	11, 12, 13
<i>nXn P'ners, LLC v. Nissan Chem. Indus., Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-00694, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 31, 2016).....	12
<i>Pungkuk EDM Wire Mfg. Co. v. Ki Chul Seong</i> , IPR2016-00763, Paper No. 14 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 8, 2016).....	12
<i>REG Synthetic Fuels, LLC v. Neste Oil Oyj</i> , 841 F.3d 954 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5

Sony Corp. v. Fujifilm Corp.,
IPR2017-00618, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 18, 2017)4, 5

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 1025
35 U.S.C. § 10313
35 U.S.C. § 3142

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 1.6811
37 C.F.R. § 42.211
37 C.F.R. § 42.6311
37 C.F.R. § 42.711
37 C.F.R. § 42.1082, 11
Fed. R. Evid. 60211

I. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c)–(d), Petitioner Cipla Ltd. (“Cipla”) respectfully requests rehearing of the Board’s decision (Paper No. 9, “Decision”) denying institution of *inter partes* review of claims 1–48 (“challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,138,229 (“the ’229 patent”). Petitioner details the basis for this Motion below, specifically identifying all matters Cipla believes “the Board misapprehended or overlooked” and “the place where each matter was previously addressed” in the Petition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). Petitioner requests that the Board grant rehearing and institute a trial on all challenged claims.¹

II. BASIS FOR RELIEF

Cipla seeks rehearing on Grounds I (anticipation) and Grounds II and III (obviousness). These grounds rely on the disclosure in Desai², *as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art* (“POSA”), to meet each claim’s requirement that the “weight ratio of albumin to paclitaxel in the composition is about 1:1 to about 9:1” (“the disputed ratio limitation”).

Cipla respectfully requests that the Board grant rehearing and institute the Petition because the Board misapprehended or overlooked that: (1) the Petition

¹ Cipla does not seek rehearing on the Board’s decision Dismissing Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder (Paper No. 3).

² WO 99/00113 A1, published Jan. 7, 1999 (EX1006, “Desai”).

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.