

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NEPTUNE GENERICS, LLC

PETITIONER

V.

AVENTIS PHARMA S.A.

PATENT OWNER

CASE NO.: IPR2019-00136

PATENT NO. 5,847,170

FILED: MARCH 26, 1996

ISSUED: DECEMBER 8, 1998

INVENTORS: HERVÉ BOUCHARD,
JEAN-DOMINIQUE BOURZAT, ALAIN COMMERÇON

TITLE: TAXOIDS, THEIR PREPARATION, AND PHARMACEUTICAL
COMPOSITIONS CONTAINING THEM

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,847,170**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. | Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. | Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))..... | 7 |
| III. | Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8) | 7 |
| | A. Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))..... | 7 |
| | B. Related Judicial and Administrative Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))..... | 8 |
| | C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))..... | 9 |
| IV. | Payment of Fees (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.103)..... | 10 |
| V. | Identification of Challenge | 10 |
| | A. Overview of U.S. Patent No. 5,847,170 | 10 |
| | 1. The Challenged Claims..... | 11 |
| | 2. The Prosecution History | 12 |
| | B. Claim Construction | 15 |
| | C. Statement of Relief | 15 |
| | 1. Claims for Which Review is Requested | 15 |
| | 2. Statutory Grounds of Challenge | 16 |
| VI. | Overview of the State of the Art as of March 27, 1995..... | 16 |
| | A. Paclitaxel Was An Approved Cancer Therapeutic and 10-DAB-III Was A Well-Accepted Starting Material Used to Synthesize Paclitaxel and its Analog. | 17 |
| | B. Worldwide Paclitaxel Analog Research Was Well Underway, Utilizing Best Laboratory Practices | 20 |
| | C. A POSA Would Have Known that a BOC Group at C-3' on Paclitaxel's Side-chain Enhanced Therapeutic Activity, and C-7 and C-10 Were Receptive to Modification..... | 24 |
| | D. Summary of Prior Art References | 26 |

| | | |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. | <i>Commerçon</i> (Ex.1009)..... | 26 |
| 2. | <i>Kant</i> (Ex.1010)..... | 29 |
| 3. | <i>Wong</i> (Ex.1011)..... | 31 |
| 4. | <i>Bouchard</i> (Ex.1014)..... | 32 |
| E. | Ordinary Skill in the Art..... | 33 |
| VII. | The District Court’s Validity Findings are not Pertinent to the Grounds Herein..... | 34 |
| VIII. | Detailed Explanation of the Challenge..... | 36 |
| A. | Ground 1: Claim 1 is obvious in view of <i>Commerçon</i> , <i>Kant</i> , <i>Wong</i> , and a POSA’s knowledge..... | 36 |
| 1. | A POSA Would Have Chosen Paclitaxel as a Lead Compound..... | 37 |
| 2. | <i>Commerçon</i> , <i>Kant</i> , <i>Wong</i> and a POSA’s Knowledge Motivated Modifying Paclitaxel to Obtain Cabazitaxel..... | 38 |
| 3. | A POSA Would Have Reasonably Expected to Successfully Synthesize Cabazitaxel in view of <i>Commerçon</i> , <i>Kant</i> , and <i>Wong</i> | 51 |
| B. | Claim 2 is Obvious In View of the Above Prior Art and a POSA’s Knowledge..... | 57 |
| C. | Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious in View of <i>Bouchard</i> | 59 |
| IX. | Alleged Unexpected results are Insufficient to Overcome the Obviousness of the Challenged Claims..... | 61 |
| A. | The Commerçon Declaration Failed to Show Unexpectedly Superior Activity Over Prior Art Taxanes..... | 62 |
| 1. | Prior Art SAR Studies at C-7 and C-10 Disclosed Superiority of Cabazitaxel Over Comparatives A and B Was Expected..... | 63 |
| 2. | Comparatives A and B Were Not the Closest Prior Art; Proper Comparisons Show Cabazitaxel is Not Superior..... | 66 |
| 3. | Cabazitaxel’s Activity Would Need to be Vastly Superior to be Unexpected..... | 68 |
| B. | Cabazitaxel’s Alleged Superior Activity Against Resistant Cell Strains Was Not Unexpected..... | 71 |

| | | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| X. | Other Secondary Considerations Do Not Overcome the Prima Facie Case of Obviousness | 74 |
| 1. | Commercial Success | 75 |
| 2. | Long Felt Need/Failure of Others | 76 |
| 3. | Copying | 76 |
| XI. | This Petition Presents New Art and Arguments to the Board | 77 |
| XII. | Conclusion | 79 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <i>Acorda Therapeutics, Inc. v. Roxane Laboratories Inc.</i> , No. 2017-2078, 2017-2134, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 25536 (Fed. Cir. Sep. 10, 2018)..... | 76 |
| <i>Anacor Pharms., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 12499 (Fed. Cir. May 14, 2018)..... | 57 |
| <i>Bayer Healthcare Pharm. v. Watson Pharm.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... | 76 |
| <i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 923 F. Supp. 2d 602 (D. Del. 2013)..... | 21 |
| <i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 923 F. Supp.2d 602 (D. Del. 2013)..... | 46 |
| <i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs, Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... | 62 |
| <i>Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 670 F. Supp. 2d 359 (D.N.J. 2009) | 62 |
| <i>Dystar Textilfarben GmbH v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... | 45 |
| <i>Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg</i> , 849 F.2d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... | 34 |
| <i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... | 75 |
| <i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs</i> , 952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991)..... | 66 |
| <i>In re Mayne</i> , 104 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... | 39 |
| <i>In re Merck & Co.</i> , 800 F.2d 1091, 1096 (Fed. Cir. 1986) | 36 |
| <i>In re O’Farrell</i> , 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... | 51 |
| <i>In re Swanson</i> , 540 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... | 34 |

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.