

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Biocon Pharma Limited
Petitioner,

v.

Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,101,659 to Ksander *et al.*

Issue Date: January 24, 2012

Title: Methods of Treatment and Pharmaceutical Composition

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2020-01263

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,101,659 Under
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-80, 42.100-123**

Mail Stop “PATENT BOARD”
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW	1
III. STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A); PROCEDURAL STATEMENTS).....	6
IV. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)).....	7
A. Each Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	7
B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	7
1. Judicial Matters:.....	7
2. Administrative Matters:	9
C. Designation of Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)):	9
V. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(A))	10
VI. OVERVIEW OF THE '659 PATENT	10
A. The Claims	10
B. The Specification.....	11
C. Prosecution History	11
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100(B), 42.104(B)(3))	12
VIII. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”).....	12
IX. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	14
X. INVALIDITY ANALYSIS	14
A. The Law of Obviousness.....	14

B.	The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art	15
C.	The Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	15
1.	Angiotensin II and NEP Inhibition	15
2.	EP'072.....	18
3.	Shetty.....	20
4.	Gomez-Monterrey.....	22
5.	Ksander	23
6.	The '996 Patent	25
7.	PDR.....	26
D.	Ground 1: Claims 1-4 Would Have Been Obvious over EP'072, Shetty, Gomez-Monterrey, and Ksander.....	26
1.	Claim 1	26
a.	EP'072 Teaches Pharmaceutical Compositions Comprising the Combination of an AT 1- Antagonist and a NEP Inhibitor in about a 1:1 Ratio.....	26
b.	A POSA Would Have Substituted Valsartan for Irbesartan	29
c.	Gomez-Monterrey and Ksander teach replacement of SQ28603	31
d.	“About a 1:1 Ratio”	36
e.	Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	39
f.	Representative Claim Chart.....	42
2.	Dependent Claims 2-4.....	43
a.	Claim 2.....	43
b.	Claim 3.....	45
c.	Claim 4.....	45
E.	Ground 2: Claims 1-4 Would Have Been Obvious over the PDR in View of the '996 Patent, Gomez-Monterrey and EP'072.....	46

1.	Claim 1	46
a.	Pharmaceutical Compositions Comprising Valsartan for the Treatment of Hypertension Were Known.....	46
b.	Pharmaceutical Compositions Comprising Sacubitril for the Treatment of Hypertension Were Known.....	47
c.	Combination of Valsartan and an NEP Inhibitor	50
d.	“About a 1:1 Ratio”	53
e.	Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	54
f.	Representative Claim Chart.....	54
2.	Dependent Claims 2-4.....	56
a.	Claim 2.....	56
b.	Claim 3.....	58
c.	Claim 4.....	58
F.	No Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness	59
1.	No Unexpected Results.....	60
2.	No Commercial Success	63
XI.	THE BOARD SHOULD INSTITUTE TRIAL BASED ON BIOCON’S PETITION; 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) AND § 314(A)	64
A.	No Denial Should Be Based on §325(d).....	64
1.	Petitioner’s Asserted Grounds Are Not Cumulative of Art Considered during Prosecution (Becton Factors (a-d)).	64
2.	Petitioner Has Pointed Out Sufficiently How the Examiner Erred in Its Evaluation of the Asserted Prior Art (Becton Factor (e))/Additional Evidence and Facts Presented in the Petition Warrant Reconsideration (Becton Factor (f))	65
B.	§ 314(a)/ The <i>Apple</i> Factors Favor Institution	67
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Acorda Therapeutics, Inc. v. Roxane Labs., Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	15, 63
<i>Actavis LLC v. Abraxis Bioscience, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01103 Paper 7 (October 10, 2017)	66
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (Feb. 13, 2020).....	64, 65, 66
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Alexion Pharmaceuticals Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00740	65
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche, Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	39
<i>Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00368, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 2013)	59
<i>Apotex, Inc. v. UCB Biopharma, SPRL</i> , IPR2019-00400, Paper 17 (July 15, 2019)	64
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020).....	67
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (May 13, 2020).....	67
<i>Apple Inc. v. Seven Networks LLC</i> , IPR2020-00156, Paper 10 (PTAB Jun. 15, 2020)	67
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Dec. 15, 2017)	64
<i>Biomarin Pharmaceutical Inc. v. Genzyme Therapeutic Products Ltd. Partnership</i> , IPR2013-00534, Paper 81 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 23, 2015).....	38

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.