

Filed on behalf of: Celgene Corporation

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ALVOGEN PINE BROOK LLC,
Petitioner

v.

CELGENE CORPORATION,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01714
U.S. Patent No. 7,968,569

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A) BECAUSE INSTITUTION WOULD RESULT IN AN INEFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES	5
A. The Timing of the Petition and the Advanced Nature of the District Court Litigation Render Institution Inefficient	5
B. Institution Should Be Denied Because it Would Upset the Careful Balance Struck by the Hatch-Waxman Act	8
III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE PETITIONER DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE TWO ASSERTED GROUNDS	11
A. The State of the Art & The '569 Patent	12
1. MM Is a Unique and Difficult-to-Treat Cancer.....	12
2. The Inventions of the '569 Patent Unexpectedly Treat MM.....	13
B. Scope and Content of the Asserted References	16
1. Palumbo	16
2. The May Press Release	17
3. The August Press Release.....	18
4. Hideshima	19
5. The '230 Patent.....	19
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	20

D.	Claim Construction.....	20
E.	Petitioner Does Not Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1–15 Would Have Been Obvious in View of its Two Asserted Grounds	20
1.	Neither Ground 1 nor Ground 2 Teaches or Suggests the Specific Amounts of Lenalidomide in the Specific Dosing Cycles of the Claimed Inventions	21
2.	Petitioner Cannot Rely on Dr. Tricot’s Conclusory and Contradictory Declaration to Supply a Limitation that Is Missing from the Prior Art.....	25
3.	The Additional References that Petitioner Relies Upon Do Not Fill the Gaps of Grounds 1 and 2	28
(a)	The Board Should Disregard Petitioner’s Additional References	29
(b)	Petitioner Has Not Established a Motivation to Arrive at the Claimed Cyclic-Dosing Limitation, or any Reasonable Expectation of Successfully Doing So	31
(i)	REVIMID Was Known to Cause Profound Cytopenias and Significant Myelosuppression.....	32
(ii)	Petitioner Does Not Explain Why a POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Dose REVIMID in Accordance with the Claims	34
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	47

Authorities

Page(s)

Cases

AIDS Healthcare Found., Inc. v. Gilead Scis., Inc.,
890 F.3d 986 (Fed. Cir. 2018)9

Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.,
897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 10, 11

Avanir Pharm. v. Actavis S. Atl.,
36 F. Supp. 3d 475 (D. Del. 2014)40

Celgene Corp. v. Cipla Ltd.,
No. 17-cv-06163 (D.N.J.)6

Celgene Corp. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs., Inc. et al.,
No. 16-cv-07704 (D.N.J.) 7

Celgene Corp. v. Sun Pharma Global FZE et al.,
No. 18-cv-11630 (D.N.J.)6

Celgene Corp. v. Zydus Pharmaceuticals (USA) Inc. et al.,
No. 17-cv-02528 (D.N.J.) 6-7

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs VIII, LLC v. The Trustees of the University
of Pennsylvania*,
IPR2015-01835 (PTAB March 6, 2017)..... 37, 46

Depomed, Inc. v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC,
2014 WL 4215435 (D.N.J. Aug. 25, 2014) 37, 46

Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.,
IPR2017-00804 (PTAB Oct. 03, 2018)47

*Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-Mak), Inc. v. Gilead
Pharmasset LLC*,
IPR2018-00119 (PTAB May 4, 2018).....26

<i>Initiative for Meds., Access & Knowledge (I-Mak), Inc. v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC,</i> IPR2018-00103 (PTAB June 13, 2018).....	26
<i>Janssen Prod., L.P. v. Lupin Ltd.,</i> 109 F. Supp. 3d 650 (D.N.J. 2014).....	35
<i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC,</i> 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	25-26
<i>Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Bayer Intellectual Property,</i> IPR2018-01143 (PTAB December 3, 2018).....	7, 8
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.,</i> IPR2018-00752 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	5
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene’s Energy Grp., LLC,</i> 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018).....	5
<i>Orexo AB v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC,</i> 903 F.3d 1265 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	21
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Corning Optical Communications LLC,</i> IPR2017-00528 (PTAB May 30, 2017).....	22
<i>Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA,</i> 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	21
<i>QuantifiCare, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.,</i> IPR2017-02113 (PTAB Mar. 16, 2018)	30
<i>Ex Parte Solomon Bekele,</i> No. 2011-003027, 2012 WL 2573051 (BPAI June 12, 2012).....	22
<i>Unified Patents v. Custom Media,</i> No. IPR2015-00516 (PTAB June 25, 2015).....	26
<i>Zetec, Inc. v. Westinghouse Elec. Co.,</i> Case IPR2014-00384 (PTAB July 23, 2014)	30

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.