

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS V LLC;  
HAYMAN CREDES MASTER FUND, L.P.;  
HAYMAN ORANGE FUND SPC – PORTFOLIO A;  
HAYMAN CAPITAL MASTER FUND, L.P.;  
HAYMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.;  
HAYMAN OFFSHORE MANAGEMENT, INC.;  
HAYMAN INVESTMENTS, LLC;  
NXN PARTNERS, LLC;  
IP NAVIGATION GROUP, LLC;  
J KYLE BASS; and ERICH SPANGENBERG,  
Petitioner,

v.

BIOGEN MA INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case: IPR2015-01993  
U.S. Patent No. 8,399,514

---

**BIOGEN'S OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Petitioner’s Definition of a Person of Ordinary Skill is Overly Broad .....4

III. Biogen Is Entitled to the Filing Date of Its Provisional Application .....5

    A. The Provisional Application Provides Written Description Support for and Enables the ’514 Patent Claims .....7

        1. The Provisional Application Provides Written Description Support for the ’514 Patent Claims.....7

        2. *Atofina* Does Not Affect Biogen’s Entitlement to Priority.....10

            a. *Atofina* Applies Only Within the Limited Context of Anticipation .....11

            b. *Atofina* Does Not Apply to Written Description .....13

        3. The Provisional Application Enables the ’514 Patent Claims .....14

    B. The Remaining Requirements of § 119(e)(1) Are Satisfied .....16

IV. Joshi ’999 Is Disqualified as Prior Art Under § 103(c)(1).....17

    A. Joshi ’999 Is Prior Art Only Under § 102(e).....18

    B. Joshi ’999 and the Claimed Invention Were Commonly Owned by or Subject to an Obligation of Assignment to the Same Entity When the ’514 Invention Was Made.....18

        1. Joshi ’999 and the Invention of Claims 1-16 and 20 Were Commonly Owned by or Subject to an Obligation of Assignment to Fumapharm When Conception Was Complete .....19

        2. Joshi ’999 and the Invention of Claims 1-20 Were Commonly Owned by or Subject to an Obligation of

Assignment to Biogen When the Invention Was Constructively Reduced to Practice.....21

V. Kappos 2006 Is Not Prior Art as to Claims 1-16 and 20.....24

VI. Even If Kappos 2006 and Joshi '999 Are Prior Art, the '514 Patent Claims Are Not Obvious .....25

A. Kappos 2006 and Joshi '999 Do Not Disclose a Range of Effective Doses Encompassing the Claimed Dose of About 480 mg/day .....25

1. Joshi '999 Does Not Disclose a Daily Dose .....25

2. The Phase 2 Study Results of Kappos 2006 Further Undermine the Board's Overlapping Ranges Theory .....28

B. One of Ordinary Skill Would Not Have Selected a Dose of About 480 mg/day of DMF .....29

1. The ICH Guideline Would Have Provided No Reason to Select a Dose of About 480 mg/day .....29

a. A Parallel Dose-Response Study Is Necessary to Determine a Therapeutically Effective Dose to Treat MS .....29

b. The Study of Kappos 2006 Complied With the ICH Guideline.....31

c. The ICH Guideline's General Guidance on Dose-Ranging Studies Fails to Suggest Any Particular Dose of DMF to Treat MS.....33

2. Gastrointestinal Side Effects Would Have Provided No Reason to Select a Dose of About 480 mg/day .....35

C. One of Ordinary Skill Would Not Have Reasonably Expected from the Asserted Prior Art that a Dose of About 480 mg/day of DMF Would Be Successful.....39

VII.	Objective Evidence Supports Patentability of the '514 Patent Claims .....	42
A.	The Magnitude of Clinical Efficacy Exhibited by the 480 mg/day Dose Was Unexpected .....	43
B.	Tecfidera <sup>®</sup> Satisfied a Long-Felt but Unmet Need for a Safe and Effective Oral MS Treatment .....	49
C.	Tecfidera <sup>®</sup> Has Been Praised by the Industry .....	53
VIII.	Conclusion .....	54

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	34
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	39
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc) .....	7
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	10, 11, 12, 13
<i>BioGatekeeper, Inc. v. Kyoto Univ.</i> , IPR2014-01286, Paper 12 (PTAB Feb. 11, 2015).....	42
<i>In re Brana</i> , 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	14
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	39, 42
<i>ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	12
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00053, Paper 66 (PTAB May 1, 2014) .....	18, 19, 21, 24
<i>Creative Compounds, LLC v. Starmark Labs.</i> , 651 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	48
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	53

# 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.