

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APOTEX INC. AND APOTEX CORP.,  
Petitioners

v.

CELGENE CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-00685  
Patent 8,741,929 B2  
Issued: June 3, 2014

Title: METHODS USING 3-(4-AMINO-1-OXO-1,3-DIHYDRO-  
ISOINDOL-2-YL)-PIPERIDINE-2,6-DIONE  
FOR TREATMENT OF MANTLE CELL LYMPHOMAS

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES .....	5
A. Real Parties-In-Interest.....	5
B. Related Matters.....	5
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....	5
D. Service Information .....	5
III. REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEW .....	6
A. Grounds for Standing .....	6
B. Identification of Challenge .....	6
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	7
V. THE PRIOR ART AND THE '929 PATENT .....	7
A. Background.....	7
B. Thalidomide Was Known to Treat Relapsed and/or Refractory MCL But Had Undesired Side Effects; Lenalidomide Was Less Toxic and Suggested for Such Treatment .....	9
C. Lenalidomide Was Known to Be More Potent Than Thalidomide and Was Successfully Used in Treating Cancers Related to MCL .....	9
D. Lenalidomide Dosages, Dosage Forms and Cycling Regimens Were Known	11
E. The Claimed Method of Treating Relapsed and/or Refractory MCL Using Lenalidomide Was Disclosed by Celgene Prior to Filing .....	12
F. '929 PATENT.....	13

VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 14

VII. KEY PRIOR ART REFERENCES AND DISCLOSURE DATES ..... 14

VIII. OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ..... 16

    A. Ground 1: Claims 1-4, 8-9, 15 and 20 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Drach in View of Zeldis..... 16

        1. Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious ..... 16

        2. Claims 2-4, 8-9, 15 and 20 Would Have Been Obvious ..... 23

    B. Ground 2: Claims 4 and 20 Would Have Been Obvious Based on Drach in View of Zeldis and Further in View of Querfeld ..... 27

    C. There Is No Evidence of Secondary Considerations to Rebut the Strong *Prima Facie* Evidence of Obviousness..... 28

        1. The Efficacy of Lenalidomide in Relapsed and/or Refractory MCL Patients Would Have Been Expected..... 28

        2. The Need for Treatments of Relapsed and/or refractory MCL is Still Unmet and Not Satisfied by the '929 Patent ..... 29

IX. ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)..... 30

    A. Ground 3: Claims 1-4, 8-9, 15 and 20 Are Anticipated by the Celgene Press Release ..... 30

        1. Claim 1 Is Anticipated..... 30

        2. Claims 2 and 3 Are Anticipated ..... 32

        3. Claims 4 and 20 Are Anticipated ..... 33

        4. Claim 8 Is Anticipated..... 34

        5. Claim 9 Is Anticipated..... 34

        6. Claim 15 Is Anticipated..... 35

X. CONCLUSION.....35

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
<i>Altana Pharm. AG vs. Teva Pharm. USA Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	20
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	19, 29
<i>Brown v. 3M</i> , 265 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	32, 33
<i>Hitachi Koki Co., Ltd. v. Doll</i> , 620 F. Supp. 2d 4 (D.D.C. 2009) <i>aff'd sub nom. Hitachi Koki Co., Ltd. v. Kappos</i> , 397 F. App'x 660 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	29
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955).....	24
<i>In re Carey</i> , 392 F.2d 646 (C.C.P.A. 1968).....	19
<i>In re Cavanagh</i> , 436 F.2d 491 (C.C.P.A. 1971).....	29
<i>In re Elsner</i> , 381 F.3d 1125 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	34
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	19
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Kali Labs. Inc.</i> , 482 F. Supp. 2d 478 (D.N.J. 2007), <i>vacated on other grounds</i> , 344 F. App'x 595 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	21
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	3, 28
<i>Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner</i> ,	

# 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.