

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/553,339	10/26/2006	Neil P. Desai	638772000301	3605
25226 7590 04/28/2009 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 755 PAGE MILL RD PALO ALTO CA 04204 1018			EXAMINER	
			TSAY, MARSHA M	
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	11/553,339	DESAI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Marsha M. Tsay	1656			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 January 2009</u>.</li> <li>This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</li> </ol>					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 2-23 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-9 and 14-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 2-6 and 10-13 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01.12.09.  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

Office Action Summary

Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090415



Application/Control Number: 11/553,339 Page 2

Art Unit: 1656

This Office action is in response to Applicants' remarks received January 12, 2009.

Applicants' arguments filed have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome some of the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous Office actions are hereby withdrawn.

Claim 1 is canceled. Claims 7-9, 14-23 are withdrawn. Claims 2-6, 10-13, to the species anticancer agents, the (sub)species taxanes, and the (sub)species paclitaxel, are currently under examination.

Priority: The request for priority to provisional application 60/432317, filed December 9, 2002, is acknowledged.

## **Objections and Rejections**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-6, 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Damascelli et al. (2001 Cancer 92(10): 2592-2602) as evidenced by Ibrahim et al. (2000 Proc

Am Soc Clin Oncol 19: abstract 609F). Damascelli et al. disclose ABI-007, a paclitaxel-human

albumin nanoparticle having a dimension of 150-200 nm (p. 2593 col. 2, Fig. 1). It is known that

ABI-007 is cremophor-free (evidenced by Ibrahim et al.). Damascelli et al. do not disclose a

weight ratio of albumin to paclitaxel is about 1:1 to about 5:1.



Application/Control Number: 11/553,339 Page 3

Art Unit: 1656

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Damascelli et al. by determining the optimum concentration and/or weight ratio of albumin to paclitaxel that will result in a composition that will deliver paclitaxel most effectively in an albumin delivery system (claims 2-6, 10-13). Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."); In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969) (Claimed elastomeric polyurethanes which fell within the broad scope of the references were held to be unpatentable thereover because, among other reasons, there was no evidence of the criticality of the claimed ranges of molecular weight or molar proportions.). For more recent cases applying this principle, see Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc., 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989); In re Kulling, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990); and *In re Geisler*, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997).



Application/Control Number: 11/553,339 Page 4

Art Unit: 1656

The previous 103(a) has been withdrawn in view of Applicants' remarks. However, the Damascelli et al. and Ibrahim et al. references are believed to be relevant art under 103(a) as noted above.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marsha M. Tsay whose telephone number is (571)272-2938. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on 571-272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Maryam Monshipouri/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

April 15, 2009

