

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SANDOZ INC.,
Petitioners

v.

PHARMACYCLICS LLC,
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 9,795,604 to Byrd *et al.*

Issue Date: October 24, 2017

Title: Methods of Treating and Preventing Graft Versus Host Disease

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2019–00865

DECLARATION OF JAMES L. FERRARA, M.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	My Background and Qualifications.....	2
III.	List of Documents Considered	4
IV.	Background of the Technology	4
	A. Ibrutinib	4
	B. Graft Versus Host Disease	8
	1. Two Types of GVHD: Acute and Chronic	10
	2. Chronic GVHD	13
V.	Claim Construction.....	15
	A. “Therapeutically Effective Amount”	16
	B. “Thereby Treating the Chronic GVHD in the Patient”	17
	C. Ibrutinib’s Chemical Structure	18
VI.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	20
VII.	The Prior Art Pertinent to the Petition.....	21
	A. The ’085 Publication	21
	B. Shimabukuro-Vornhagen	23
	C. Herman	26
	D. Uckun	28
VIII.	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims Are Anticipated by the ’085 Publication	30
	A. Legal Standard for Anticipation.....	30
	B. The ’085 Publication Anticipates Independent Claim 1 of the ’604 Patent.....	30

1.	“A method of treating chronic graft versus host disease (GVHD)”	31
2.	“Administering to a patient having chronic GVHD a therapeutically effective amount of” ibrutinib.....	32
3.	“thereby treating the chronic GVHD in the patient”	34
C.	The ’085 Publication Anticipates Dependent Claims 4, 13, and 15	35
D.	The ’085 Publication Anticipates Dependent Claims 6, 7, 8, 29, 30, 31, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, 53	36
E.	The ’085 Publication Anticipates Dependent Claim 9.....	37
F.	The ’085 Publication Anticipates Dependent Claim 10.....	39
G.	The ’085 Publication Anticipates Dependent Claims 24, 28, 35, 39, 43, 50 and Independent Claim 55	40
IX.	Ground 2: The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious in View of the ’085 Publication.....	42
A.	Legal Standard for Obviousness	42
B.	Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the ’085 Publication.....	43
C.	Dependent Claims 4, 13, and 15 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the ’085 Publication	44
D.	Dependent Claims 6, 7, 8, 29, 30, 31, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, and 53 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the ’085 Publication.....	45
E.	Dependent Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the ’085 Publication	45
F.	Dependent Claim 10 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the ’085 Publication	46
G.	Dependent Claims 24, 28, 35, 39, 43, 50 and Independent Claim 55 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the ’085 Publication.....	47

H.	Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness	47
X.	Ground 3: The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious in View of the '085 Publication Combined with Shimabukuro-Vornhagen and Herman.....	47
A.	Motivation to Combine the '085 Publication, Shimabukuro-Vornhagen, and Herman	48
B.	The Combination of References Render Claim 1 Obvious to a POSA with a Reasonable Expectation of Success	51
C.	Dependent Claims 4, 13, and 15 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the '085 Publication	52
D.	Dependent Claims 6, 7, 8, 29, 30, 31, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, 53 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the '085 Publication.....	53
E.	Dependent Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the '085 Publication	53
F.	Dependent Claim 10 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the '085 Publication	54
G.	Dependent Claims 24, 28, 35, 39, 43, 50 and Independent Claim 55 Would Have Been Obvious in View of the '085 Publication.....	54
XI.	Ground 4: The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over the '085 Publication in view of Shimabukuro-Vornhagen and Uckun	55
A.	Motivation to Combine the '085 Publication, Shimabukuro-Vornhagen, and Uckun.....	55
B.	The Combination of References Rendered the Challenged Claims Obvious to a POSA, with a Reasonable Expectation of Success	57
XII.	Conclusion	59

I. Introduction

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Sandoz Inc. (“Sandoz”) for the above-captioned *inter partes* review (“IPR”) proceeding. I am over the age of eighteen (18) and otherwise competent to make the statements contained in this Declaration, which I understand will be submitted in support of Sandoz’s IPR petition. I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR proceeding at my standard consulting rate, which is \$500 per hour. My compensation does not depend in any way on the outcome of this proceeding. I hold no interest in Sandoz Inc. or Lek Pharmaceuticals D.D.

2. I have been informed that the IPR proceeding involves the validity of U.S. Patent No. 9,795,604 (the “’604 Patent”), EX1001. In analyzing the validity of the ’604 Patent, I have been instructed to consider references published prior to October 25, 2013. I have been informed that such references are referred to as “prior art.”¹ Thus, I will refer to these references as prior art in this Declaration. I confirm

¹ While I am not an attorney, Sandoz’s counsel has explained certain aspects of patent law to me that are relevant to the discussion in this Declaration. I state throughout this Declaration where my understanding of an aspect of patent law has been informed by counsel.

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.