

Paper 1, October 14, 2022

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

---

Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

---

TWI PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

MERCK SERONO SA,

*Patent Owner.*

---

U.S. Patent No. 7,713,947

Ser. No. 11/722,018

Issue Date: May 11, 2010

Title: Cladribine Regimen for Treating Multiple Sclerosis

---

Case No. IPR2023-00049

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,713,947  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100 *et. seq.***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u></b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b><u>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</u></b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b><u>EXHIBIT LIST</u></b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b><u>LISTING OF CLAIMS</u></b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b><u>MANDATORY NOTICES</u></b> .....	<b>xiii</b>
1. Real Parties-In-Interest, § 42.8(b)(1) .....	xiii
2. Related Matters, § 42.8(b)(2) .....	xiii
3. Lead and Back-Up Counsel, § 42.8(b)(3) .....	xiv
4. Service Information, § 42.8(b)(4).....	xiv
(i) <i>Electronic Mailing Address</i> .....	xiv
(ii) <i>Postal Mailing Address</i> .....	xiv
(iii) <i>Hand-Delivery Address</i> .....	xv
(iv) <i>Telephone number</i> .....	xv
(v) <i>Facsimile Number</i> .....	xv
5. Payment of Fees, § 42.15(a) .....	xv
<b><u>INTRODUCTION</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b><u>GROUND FOR STANDING</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b><u>BACKGROUND</u></b> .....	<b>3</b>
I. Scope And Content Of The Prior Art .....	3
A. <i>History of Cladribine Treating Multiple Sclerosis</i> .....	3

<i>B. Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications.</i>	7
1. <i>Bodor</i>	7
2. <i>Rice</i>	7
II. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
III. The '947 Patent Prosecution History	8
IV. Discretion Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	11
V. Discretion Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	20
<i>A. whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted.</i>	21
<i>B. Proximity of the court's trial date to the Board's projected statutory deadline.</i>	21
<i>C. Investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and parties.</i>	22
<i>D. Overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding.</i>	22
<i>E. Whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party.</i>	23
<i>F. Other circumstances and considerations that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits.</i>	23
<i>G. Conclusion</i>	23
<b><u>IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHALLENGE</u></b>	<b>23</b>
I. The Claims Challenged	24
II. Specific Grounds And Art.	24
III. Claim Construction	25
IV. Grounds of Unpatentability	25

A.	<i>Explanation Of Ground 1 For Unpatentability: Claims 36, 38–39, 41–46, 48 of the '947 Patent anticipated by Bodor.</i>	27
1.	Independent Claim 36.	27
a.	Limitation 1(a):	27
b.	Limitation 1(b):	28
c.	Limitation 1(c):	33
d.	Limitation 1(d);	33
e.	Limitation 1(e).	39
2.	Dependent Claim 38.	40
3.	Dependent Claim 39.	40
4.	Dependent Claim 41.	40
5.	Dependent Claim 42.	40
6.	Dependent Claim 43.	40
7.	Dependent Claim 44.	40
8.	Dependent Claim 45.	41
9.	Dependent Claim 46.	41
10.	Dependent Claim 47.	41
11.	Dependent Claim 48.	41
B.	<i>Explanation Of Ground 2 For Unpatentability: Claims 36, 38–39, and 41–48 of the '947 Patent obvious over Bodor.</i>	41
1.	Repeating Bodor’s Method (Limitations (iii) and (iv) of claim 36)	42
2.	Total Dosage Amount (Limitations (i) and (iii) of claim 36)	44

3.	Obvious to Administer the Same Dosage as Induction Phase (1.7 mg/kg) during Maintenance Phase.....	48
4.	All Other Limitations .....	49
C.	<i>Explanation Of Ground 3 For Unpatentability: Claims 36, 38–39, and 41–48 of the '947 Patent obvious over Bodor in view of Rice.....</i>	49
1.	Repeating Bodor’s Method (Limitations (iii) and (iv) of claim 36) .....	49
2.	Total Dosage Amount (Limitations (i) and (iii) of claim 36) .....	51
3.	Obvious to Administer the Same Dosage as Induction Phase (1.7 mg/kg) during Maintenance Phase.....	54
4.	All Other Limitations .....	55
D.	<i>No Secondary Considerations Overcome This Strong Showing of Obviousness. ....</i>	55
	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u>.....</b>	<b>56</b>
	<b><u>CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT</u>.....</b>	<b>58</b>
	<b><u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u> .....</b>	<b>59</b>

# 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.