Paper No.		
Filed: Decemb	er 30,	2015

Filed on behalf of: Junior Party Biogen MA Inc.

By: Michele C. Bosch
Barbara C. McCurdy
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
michele.bosch@finnegan.com
barbara.mccurdy@finnegan.com
202-408-4193 tel
202-408-4400 fax

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Junior Party Patent 8,399,514 B2,

 $\mathbf{v}_{ullet}$ 

FORWARD PHARMA A/S, Senior Party Application 11/576,871.

Patent Interference 106,023 (McK) Technology Center 1600

**REVISED BIOGEN MOTION 4** 

(for judgment based on priority)



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTR	INTRODUCTION			
II.	PREC	PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED			
III.	EVID	VIDENCE RELIED UPON			6
IV.	REAS	SONS V	WHY T	HE RELIEF SHOULD BE GRANTED	9
	A.	APPI	LICABI	LE LAW	9
		1.	Conc	eption	9
		2.	First	Inventor and Diligence	9
		3.	Redu	ction to Practice: Actual and Constructive	11
	B.	BEC.	AUSE I GENT	ENTITLED TO JUDGMENT ON PRIORITY T WAS FIRST TO CONCEIVE AND WAS IHROUGH CONSTRUCTIVE AND ACTUAL NS TO PRACTICE	12
		1.	19, 20	"Neill's Corroborated Conception at least by February 004 was <i>Before</i> FP's Earliest Alleged Conception on per 8, 2004	12
		2.	Bioge	en's Constructive and Actual Reductions to Practice	. 14
			i.	Each of Biogen's Applications is a Constructive Reduction to Practice	14
			ii.	Practicing the Method of the Count throughout Biogen's Phase III Clinical Trials Constitutes a Series of Actual Reductions to Practice	16
		3.		en Was Diligent from before October 8, 2004 through tructive and Actual Reductions to Practice	16
			i.	The BG-12 Program Involved Many People and Teams	18
			ii.	Biogen Worked Every Day during the Diligence Period on Activities Toward Reduction to Practice	21
				(a) Category 1: Nonclinical (Animal) Studies (Sept. 2004 – June 2007)	. 21



		(b)	Planning and Operation (at least Sept. 2004  – Mar. 2006)	22
		(c)	Category 3: Advancing Clinical Development Toward Phase III (Dec. 2004 – Mar. 2007)	27
		(d)	Category 4: Phase III Clinical Trial Operation and Evaluation (Mar. 2007 – Apr. 2011)	32
4.	Daily I	Diligeno	ce: Detailed Monthly Descriptions	35
	i.	_	ory 1: Nonclinical (Animal) Studies (at least 004 – June 2007)	36
	ii.	_	ory 2: Phase IIb Clinical Trial Planning and ion (Sept. 2004 – Mar. 2006)	37
	iii.	_	ory 3: Advancing Clinical Development d Phase III (Dec. 2004 – Mar. 2007)	42
	iv.		ory 4: Phase III Clinical Trial Operation and tion (Mar. 2007 – Apr. 2011)	47
V. CONCLUSION	N			49
APPENDIX 1 - List of	of Cited	Exhibi	ts	
APPENDIX 2 - Copy	of Auth	nority		
APPENDIX 3 - Daily	Dosing	Date F	Ranges	
APPENDIX 4 - BG-12	2 Progr	am Stru	acture	
APPENDIX 5 - List of	f Abbre	eviation	s	
APPENDIX 6 - Daily	Activit	v Chart		



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Brown v. Barbacid</i> , 436 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	9
Coleman v. Dines, 754 F.2d 353, 224 U.S.P.Q. 857 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	9
Cooper v. Goldfarb, 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	11
De Solms v. Schoenwald, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1507 (B.P.A.I. 1990)	10
Hyatt v. Boone, 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	6, 11, 12
Hybritech Inc. v. Abbott Labs., No. CV 86-7461, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001 (C.D. Cal. 1987), aff'd, 849 F.2d 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	5
In re Jolley, 308 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	11
Jones v. Evans, 46 F.2d 197 (C.C.P.A. 1931)	11
Keizer v. Bradley, 270 F.2d 396, 123 U.S.P.Q. 215 (C.C.P.A. 1959)	11, 15
Lacotte v. Thomas, 758 F.2d 611 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	11, 12
Louis v. Okada, Intf. No. 104,311, Paper 293, at 12, 2002 WL 31358222, at *6 (B.P.A.I. Oct. 16, 2002)	10
Price v. Symsek, 988 F.2d 1187, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	9
Rines v. Morgan, 250 F.2d 365 (C.C.P.A. 1957)	10
Scott v. Koyama, 281 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10



Vogt v. Neuschotz, 154 U.S.P.Q. 376 (B.P.A.I. 1966)	11
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. 102(g)(1)	6
35 U.S.C. § 112	15
35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1	11
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 41.201	6, 15



# DOCKET

# 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.

