

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SANDOZ INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

PHARMACYCLICS LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2019-00865  
U.S. Patent No. 9,795,604

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background and State of the Art .....	4
	A. Chronic Graft Versus Host Disease Was Poorly Understood and Difficult to Treat.....	4
	1. Treating cGVHD Was Unpredictable and Difficult at the Time of Invention.....	5
	2. The Role of B Cells and Inflammatory Cytokines in the Pathogenesis of cGVHD Was Poorly Understood .....	7
	3. Attempts to Develop Second-Line Treatments for cGVHD Failed .....	9
	B. Imbruvica® Is the First and Only FDA-Approved Treatment for cGVHD.....	11
III.	The '604 Patent and Its Prosecution History .....	12
	A. The Specification and Claims .....	12
	B. Prosecution History .....	14
IV.	Petitioner's Asserted References .....	15
	A. '085 Publication (Ex. 1002) .....	15
	B. Shimabukuro-Vornhagen (Ex. 1003).....	17
	C. Herman (Ex. 1004).....	18
	D. Uckun (Ex. 1005).....	19
V.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	19
VI.	Claim Construction.....	20

A.	“A Method of Treating Chronic Graft Versus Host Disease (GVHD)” and “Thereby Treating the Chronic GVHD in the Patient” .....	20
B.	“Therapeutically Effective Amount” .....	24
C.	“Partial Response,” “Complete Response,” and “Severity of the GVHD is Reduced” .....	26
VII.	Petitioner Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing as to Any Challenged Claim .....	26
A.	Ground 1: Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that the ’085 Publication Anticipates the Challenged Claims .....	26
1.	The ’085 Publication Is Non-Enabling .....	27
a.	The nature of the invention / relative level of skill .....	28
b.	The state and unpredictability of the prior art .....	28
c.	The quantity of experimentation / the lack of direction or guidance / the absence of working examples .....	30
d.	Petitioner’s cited cases are inapposite .....	33
2.	The ’085 Publication Does Not Expressly or Inherently Disclose Multiple Claim Elements .....	34
3.	Petitioner’s Anticipation Challenge Resorts to Impermissible Picking and Choosing .....	39
B.	Ground 2: The Challenged Claims Are Not Obvious Over the ’085 Publication in View of a POSA’s Knowledge in the Art.....	41
1.	Claim 1 Would Not Have Been Obvious.....	42
2.	The Additional Challenged Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious.....	45
a.	Claims 4, 13, and 15 .....	45

b.	Claims 6, 7, 8, 29, 30, 31, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, and 53 .....	46
c.	Claims 9 and 10 .....	47
d.	Claims 24, 28, 35, 39, 43, 50, and 55 .....	48
C.	Ground 3: The Challenged Claims Are Not Obvious Over the '085 Publication, Shimabukuro-Vornhagen, and Herman .....	49
1.	Claim 1 Would Not Have Been Obvious.....	50
2.	The Additional Challenged Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious .....	55
a.	Claims 4, 13, and 15 .....	55
b.	Claims 6, 7, 8, 29, 30, 31, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, and 53 .....	56
c.	Claims 9 and 10 .....	56
d.	Claims 24, 28, 35, 39, 43, 50, and 55 .....	57
D.	Ground 4: The Challenged Claims Are Not Obvious Over the '085 Publication, Shimabukuro-Vornhagen, and Uckun .....	57
E.	Objective Indicia of Nonobviousness .....	60
1.	Long-felt, Unmet Need .....	61
2.	Industry Praise.....	62
3.	Failures of Others.....	63
VIII.	The Board Should Deny the Petition Based on its Discretion Under § 314(a).....	63
IX.	Conclusion .....	66

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Aqua Prods., Inc. v. Matal</i> , 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (en banc) .....	33
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	41, 44
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	20
<i>Biodelivery Scis. Int’l, Inc. v. Aquestive Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00165, Paper 91 (PTAB Feb. 7, 2019).....	65
<i>Biofrontera Inc. v. DUSA Pharms, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01585, Paper 10 (PTAB Feb. 26, 2019).....	65
<i>Bristol-Meyers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	24
<i>Connell v. Sears, Roebuck &amp; Co.</i> , 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	38-39
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	63
<i>In re Depomed Patent Litig.</i> , No. 13-4507, 2016 WL 7163647 (D.N.J. Sep. 30, 2016).....	27
<i>Donghee Am., Inc. v. Plastic Omnium Advanced Innovation and Research</i> , IPR2017-01605, Paper 43 (PTAB Dec. 11, 2018) .....	27
<i>E-One, Inc., v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 15, 2019) .....	64
<i>Edwards Lifesci. Corp. v. Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01298, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2017).....	36
<i>Endo Pharms. Inc. v. Watson Labs. Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-192, 2014 WL 2859349 (E.D. Tex. June 23, 2014).....	23

# 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.