

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MILTENYI BIOMEDICINE GmbH and MILTENYI BIOTEC INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR 2022-00853
Patent 9,464,140

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER
TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
AND REAL PARTY IN INTEREST NOVARTIS PHARMA AG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | ii |
| EXHIBIT LIST | iv |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. BACKGROUND | 4 |
| A. The State of CAR-T Cell Therapy Before 2011 | 4 |
| B. The “Lazarus Moment” — The Inventors’ Breakthrough | 7 |
| C. The ’140 Patent | 12 |
| III. PETITIONERS FAIL TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF DEMONSTRATING OBVIOUSNESS OF ANY CLAIM | 14 |
| A. Petitioners Misconstrue the Claims To Avoid the Treatment and Effectiveness Limitations | 16 |
| 1. The Preamble Is Limiting | 17 |
| 2. “Antitumor Effective Amount” | 19 |
| B. Petitioners Cannot Demonstrate a Reasonable Expectation of Success | 23 |
| 1. The Art Reflected Decades of Failures and Tremendous Skepticism That Petitioners Ignore | 23 |
| 2. Petitioners’ Cherry-Picked References Do Not Support Reasonable Expectation of Success | 28 |
| C. Porter Is Not Prior Art | 41 |
| D. Objective, Contemporaneous Evidence Proves the Non-Obviousness of the Claimed Methods | 42 |
| IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 325(d) | 44 |
| A. The Same or Substantially the Same Art Previously Was Presented to the Examiner | 46 |
| B. Petitioners Have Not Demonstrated that the Office Erred in a Manner Material to the Patentability of Challenged Claims | 51 |
| C. The File History of U.S. Patent Application No. 15/353,899 Is Irrelevant | 52 |
| V. CONCLUSION | 54 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Gerate GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020)..... | passim |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (en banc) | 43 |
| <i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 23 |
| <i>Biocon Pharma Ltd. v. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.</i> , IPR2020-01263, Paper 12 (PTAB Feb. 16, 2021) | 50, 51 |
| <i>Broad Institute v. Regents of the Univ. of California</i> , Patent Interference No. 106,048 (DK), 2017 WL 657415 (PTAB Feb. 15, 2017)..... | 34 |
| <i>Coalition For Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Biogen MA Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01136, Paper 23 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2015 Denying Institution of Inter Partes Review) | 36 |
| <i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals Int’l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021) | 15, 17, 18, 36 |
| <i>Envtl. Designs v. Union Oil Co. of Cal.</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983) | 40 |
| <i>Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. Ltd. P’ship v. Biomarin Pharma. Inc.</i> , 825 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 23 |
| <i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... | 40 |
| <i>Gustafson v. Alloyd Co.</i> , 513 U.S. 561 (1995)..... | 21 |
| <i>In re Chu</i> , 66 F.3d 292 (Fed. Cir. 1995) | 24, 40 |
| <i>In re Cyclobenzaprine HCl Extended-Release Capsule Pat. Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... | 42 |
| <i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982) | 3, 41, 42 |
| <i>In re Wesslau</i> , 353 F.2d 238 (C.C.P.A. 1965) | 30 |
| <i>Kayak Software Corp. v. IBM</i> , CBM2016-00075, Paper 16 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2016) | 49 |

..

Leo Pharm. Products, Ltd. v. Rea, 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....43

Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp. v. West-Ward Pharmaceuticals Int’l Ltd.,
923 F.3d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 2019)36, 37

OSI Pharms., LLC v. Apotex Inc., 939 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2019)24, 25, 32, 40

Phillips Corp. v. AWH, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)22

Univ. of Strathclyde v. Clear-Vu Lighting LLC, 17 F.4th 155 (Fed. Cir.
2021)24, 25, 27, 28

OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 102(a)3, 41, 42

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)41

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)14

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)3, 44, 49, 50

...

EXHIBIT LIST

| Ex. | Title |
|------|--|
| 2001 | Jason Fagone, <i>Has Carl June Found a Key to Fighting Cancer?</i> , PHILA. MAG. (Aug. 1, 2013). |
| 2002 | Denise Grady, <i>An Immune System Trained to Kill Cancer</i> , N.Y. TIMES (Sept. 12, 2011), https://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/13/health/13gene.html . |
| 2003 | Jasone Fagone, <i>Walt Keller, Leukemia Survivor, Has Passed</i> , PHILA. MAG. (Feb. 20, 2014), https://www.phillymag.com/news/2014/02/20/walt-keller-leukemia-survivor-obituary-1953-2014/ . |
| 2004 | Gina Kolata, <i>A Cancer Treatment Makes Leukemia Vanish, but Creates More Mysteries</i> , N.Y. TIMES (Feb. 2, 2022), https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/02/health/leukemia-car-t-immunotherapy.html . |
| 2005 | Denise Grady, <i>In Girl's Last Hope, Altered Immune Cells Beat Leukemia</i> , N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 9, 2012), https://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/10/health/a-breakthrough-against-leukemia-using-altered-t-cells.html . |
| 2006 | Denise Grady, <i>F.D.A. Approves First Gene-Altering Leukemia Treatment, Costing \$475,000</i> , N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 30, 2017), https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/30/health/gene-therapy-cancer.html . |
| 2007 | FOOD AND DRUG ADMIN., FDA APPROVAL BRINGS FIRST GENE THERAPY TO THE UNITED STATES (Aug. 30, 2017), https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approval-brings-first-gene-therapy-united-states . |
| 2008 | FOOD AND DRUG ADMIN., BREAKTHROUGH THERAPY (Jan. 4, 2018), https://www.fda.gov/patients/fast-track-breakthrough-therapy-accelerated-approval-priority-review/breakthrough-therapy . |
| 2009 | FOOD AND DRUG ADMIN., PRIORITY REVIEW (Jan. 4, 2018), https://www.fda.gov/patients/fast-track-breakthrough-therapy-accelerated-approval-priority-review/priority-review . |
| 2010 | Barbara Savoldo et al., <i>CD28 costimulation improves expansion and persistence of chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cells in lymphoma patients</i> , 121 J. CLINICAL INVESTIGATION 1822 (2011). |
| 2011 | Brian G. Till et al., <i>Adoptive immunotherapy for indolent non-Hodgkin lymphoma and mantle cell lymphoma using genetically modified autologous CD20-specific T cells</i> , 112 BLOOD 2261 (2008). |

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.