

Filed on behalf of: Celgene Corporation

Filed: June 28, 2018

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
U.S. Patent No. 8,741,929

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
LIST OF EXHIBITS	viii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. MCL Is a Unique and Difficult-to-Treat Cancer.....	4
B. The '929 Patent	6
III. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF ALLEGED PRIOR ART	6
A. Drach	6
B. Zeldis	10
C. Querfeld.....	10
D. The Press Release.....	11
IV. GROUNDS 1 AND 2 SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE PTO ALREADY CONSIDERED AND REJECTED THE SAME ARGUMENTS	11
A. Grounds 1 and 2 Should Be Denied Because the Petitioners' Arguments Have Already Been Rejected by the PTO	12
B. The <i>Becton</i> Factors Strongly Favor Denying Institution	18
V. GROUNDS 1 AND 2 SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONERS FAIL TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS	21
A. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art and Claim Construction.....	21
B. The Challenged Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Drach in View of Zeldis (Ground 1).....	22
1. A POSA would not have reasonably expected that <i>lenalidomide</i> could effectively treat MCL based on what was known about <i>thalidomide</i> allegedly treating MCL.....	23

2.	A POSA would not have reasonably expected that lenalidomide could effectively treat relapsed and/or refractory MCL based on what was known about lenalidomide’s alleged potency in other areas	31
3.	In the absence of hindsight, a POSA would not have arrived at the claimed dosing regimen	40
C.	The Challenged Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Drach in view of Zeldis and Querfeld (Ground 2).....	41
VI.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS SUPPORT THE NONOBVIOUSNESS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	43
A.	Revlimid® Met a Long-Felt and Unmet Need for Treating MCL.....	43
B.	Unexpected Results Further Evidence Nonobviousness.....	45
C.	Failure of Others to Develop an Improved Treatment for MCL Further Evidences Nonobviousness	47
VII.	GROUND 3 SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONERS FAIL TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN ANTICIPATED	48
A.	Petitioners Have Failed to Establish that the Press Release Is a Printed Publication Under 35 U.S.C. § 311(b).....	49
B.	Even if the Press Release Were Prior Art Under § 311(b), It Is Not Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)	52
1.	The Press Release is the inventor’s own work	52
2.	The claimed invention was conceived before the date on the Press Release and then diligently reduced to practice	54
B.	Even if the Press Release Were Prior Art, Petitioners Have Failed to Establish that it Anticipates the Challenged Claims	55
VIII.	CONCLUSION	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	33
<i>Apple Inc. v. Cal. Institute of Tech.</i> , IPR2017-00702 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2017).....	49
<i>Avanir Pharm. v. Actavis S. Atl.</i> , 36 F. Supp. 3d 475 (D. Del. 2014), <i>aff'd sub nom. Avanir Pharm. v. Par Pharm.</i> , 612 F. App'x 613 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	24
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , No. IPR2017-01586 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	18, 19, 20
<i>Boston Sci. v. Johnson & Johnson</i> , 647 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	28
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb v. Teva Pharms. USA</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	46
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs IV v. Pharmacyclics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01076 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2015).....	50, 51
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs v. Acorda Therapeutics</i> , IPR2015-01850 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 9, 2017)	53
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs VI v. Celgene Corp.</i> , No. IPR2015-01169 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 16, 2015).....	29
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA</i> , 657 F. Supp. 2d 967 (S.D. Ind.), <i>aff'd</i> , 619 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	53
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Versata Dev. Grp.</i> , IPR2016-01019 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 4, 2016).....	50

<i>Glastetter v. Novartis Pharm.</i> , 252 F.3d 986 (8th Cir. 2001)	28
<i>Hengdian Grp. DMEGC Magnetics v. Hitachi Metals, Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-01313 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 6, 2017)	17
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	49
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	44, 47
<i>In re Gangadharam</i> , 889 F.2d 1101 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	33
<i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	52, 53
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	49
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	50
<i>In re Soni</i> , 54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	45
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest, Mfg.</i> , 424 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	52
<i>Leo Pharm. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	45
<i>LG Elecs. v. Advanced Micro Devices</i> , IPR2015-00329 (P.T.A.B. July 10, 2015)	50
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Corel Software</i> , IPR2016-01300 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 4, 2017)	51
<i>Neil Ziegman, N.P.Z. v. Stephens</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.