

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MILTENYI BIOMEDICINE GmbH and MILTENYI BIOTEC INC.,
Petitioner

v.

THE TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Patent Owner

IPR Trial No. IPR2022-00853
U.S. Patent No. 9,464,140
Issue Date: October 11, 2016

Title: Compositions and Methods for Treatment of Cancer

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR
REHEARING OF INSTITUTION DECISION**

(authorized by Order of November 23, 2022, Ex. 3004)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. Miltenyi Does Not Satisfy the High Standard Required for Rehearing	2
II. Miltenyi Cannot Show that the Board’s Assessment of Reasonable Expectation of Success Was an Abuse of Discretion.....	3
III. Miltenyi Ignores the Reasonable Expectation of Success Requirement.....	8
IV. Milone Was Discussed Extensively During Prosecution.....	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Apple Inc. v. Koss Corp.</i> , IPR2021-00381, Paper 15 (PTAB July 2, 2021)	15
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim v. Schering-Plough</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	6
<i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int’l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	9
<i>EMC Corp. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00085, Paper 29 (PTAB June 5, 2013)	4, 7
<i>Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. v. Biomarin Pharm.</i> , 825 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	passim
<i>OSI Pharms., LLC v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 939 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	passim
<i>Miltenyi Biomedicine GmbH v. Trustees of the Univ. of Pennsylvania</i> , IPR2022-00853, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 11, 2022)	passim
<i>Miltenyi Biomedicine GmbH v. Trustees of the Univ. of Pennsylvania</i> , IPR2022-00855, Paper 10 (PTAB Oct. 11, 2022)	9
<i>Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Corcept Thers., Inc.</i> , 18 F.4th 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	9, 13
<i>Spectrum Solutions LLC v. DNA Genotek Inc.</i> , IPR2022-00134, Paper 7 (PTAB June 7, 2022)	15
<i>Univ. of Strathclyde v. Clear-Vu Lighting</i> , 17 F.4th 155 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	6, 9

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	13, 15
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c) & (d).....	2
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)	3, 7

Miltenyi’s Request for Rehearing of the Board’s decision not to institute trial on U.S. Patent No. 9,464,140 (the “140 patent”) comes nowhere close to establishing that the Board misapprehended or overlooked a dispositive argument for institution. In a thorough opinion, the Board considered Miltenyi’s arguments and evidence and concluded that given “the inherent unpredictability of the field” and “the history of failures of similar technology,” Miltenyi was not likely to demonstrate a reasonable expectation of success on Grounds 1 and 2. In Ground 3, it then exercised its discretion not to revisit the same reference the Examiner considered in detail. The Board properly denied institution.¹

Unable to undermine the Board’s critical factual predicates, Miltenyi argues as to Grounds 1 and 2 that the Board got the law wrong when it analogized this case to *OSI v. Apotex*, 939 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2019). But the Board was correct—and certainly did not misapprehend or overlook anything—when it concluded that the facts of this case mirror *OSI*’s and that there would have been no reasonable expectation of success. Miltenyi’s favored case, *Genzyme v. Biomarin*, 825 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2016), does not permit the Board to sidestep the reasonable expectation analysis when there is a teaching or motivation or a pending clinical trial; it simply held on the facts of that case—where unlike here

¹ Petitioner does not challenge the Board’s decision to not institute on Ground 4.

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.