

Paper 9, April 27, 2023

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. 8,377,903

Ser. No. 12/766,173

Issue Date: Feb. 19, 2013

Title: Cladribine Regimen for Treating Multiple Sclerosis

Case No. IPR2023-00050

Patent No. 8,377,903 B2

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DENIAL OF
INSTITUTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	ii
<u>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</u>	iii
I. Statement Of Precise Relief Requested.....	1
II. Legal Standard.....	2
III. Background, Including Statement of Facts Materials to Rehearing.	3
IV. Argument, With Full Statement of the Reasons for Relief Requested.....	9
<i>A. The Decision Misapprehended or Overlooked the Treatment of Weight-Based Dosing in Both the '903 Patent and in Bodor.</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>B. The Decision Erred as a Matter of Law in Applying Inherency.</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>C. The Decision Overlooks or Misapprehends the Sufficiency of Bodor's Disclosure During the Maintenance Period.</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>D. The Decision Overlooks or Misapprehends the Basis for Obviousness over Bodor in Light of the Level of Ordinary Skill.</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>E. The Decision Overlooks or Misapprehends the Combination of Bodor and Rice 2000.</i>	<i>15</i>
V. Conclusion	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>AdjustaCam, LLC v. NewEgg, Inc.</i> , 861 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	2
<i>Arnold P'ship v. Dudas</i> , 362 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	3
<i>CommScope Techs. LLC v. Dali Wireless Inc.</i> , 10 F.4th 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	14
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	14
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Mustek Sys., Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	12
<i>Ineos USA LLC v. Berry Plastics Corp.</i> , 783 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	15
<i>Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.</i> , 827 F.2d 744 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	14
<i>Peters v. Active Mfg. Co.</i> , 129 U.S. 530 (1889)	14
<i>Star Fruits S.N.C. v. United States</i> , 393 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	3
<i>Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner</i> , 778 F.2d 775 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	12
<i>UCB, Inc. v. Actavis Lab'ys UT, Inc.</i> , No. 2021-1924, 2021-2336, 2023 WL 2904757, [65 F.4th 679] (Fed. Cir. 2023)	12

Ultratec, Inc. v. CaptionCall, LLC,
872 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2017)2

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.712

I. Statement Of Precise Relief Requested

Petitioner TWi Pharmaceuticals Inc. respectfully requests rehearing of the Decision Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review, Paper 8 (“*Decision*”) because the *Decision* overlooked or misapprehended that it allows Patent Owner to remove from the public domain use of the very treatment disclosed in Bodor (Ex. 1029) **on a patient of average weight** and claim an exclusive property right in that previously disclosed treatment. The *Decision* overlooked or misapprehended the scope of the prior art references (including materials incorporated by reference therein) and mistakenly applied an inherency standard (where instead the claim reads directly on the prior art disclosure) to conclude, incorrectly, that the Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonably likelihood of showing invalidity over the prior art. Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board grant rehearing and institute *inter partes* review of claims 17, 19–20, and 22–29 (“Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,377,903 (“the ’903 patent”) (Ex. 1002). This Request is timely filed within 30 days of the entry of the *Decision*.

It is undisputed that the Challenged Claims do **not** include a limitation requiring that the total dose of Cladribine during the “maintenance period” be lower than the total dose of Cladribine during the “induction period,” which the patent repeatedly characterizes as the invention. The patent never describes “weight-based” dosing as the invention but instead admits that expressing cladribine dosage in terms

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.