

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SANDOZ INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ACERTA PHARMA B.V.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR 2023-00478
Patent No. 10,272,083

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION1

BACKGROUND5

I. The '083 Patent.....5

II. The Challenged Claims8

III. The Grounds References9

 A. Barf-PCT (EX1006)10

 B. Barf (EX1005).....11

 C. Cheson (EX1008).....12

IV. The Relevant Prosecution History.....13

ARGUMENT17

V. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion Pursuant to §.325(d) to Deny Institution19

 A. The Same or Substantially the Same Art Previously Was Presented to the Office19

 B. The Same or Substantially the Same Arguments Previously Were Presented to the Office24

 C. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated that the Office Erred in a Manner Material to the Patentability of the Challenged Claims.....28

 1. The Examiner Did Not Materially Err by Citing Example 1, Rather Than Example 6 in Barf-PCT29

 2. The Examiner Correctly Considered Barf-PCT's Dosing Range and the Presumption of Obviousness31

 3. The Examiner Evaluated Clinical Dosing References Regarding Other BTK Inhibitors and Correctly Applied the Law of Routine Experimentation.....33

 4. The Examiner Properly Allowed the Claims Based on Unexpected Results.....39

 D. Barf Is Not Prior Art.....42

VI.	Petitioner Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Any Ground	45
A.	Sandoz Proposes and Relies on an Erroneous Construction of Claim 8	46
B.	No Motivation to Combine the Grounds References.....	49
1.	No presumption of obviousness of the claimed dose	49
2.	No motivation to select claimed daily dose of 200 mg	51
3.	No motivation to practice claimed dosing schedule of twice daily	55
C.	No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Treating MCL with 100 mg Twice-Daily Dose of Acalabrutinib.....	57
D.	Twice Daily Dosing of Acalabrutinib Proved Unexpectedly Superior	58
VII.	The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion Pursuant to § 314(a) to Deny Institution	58
	CONCLUSION.....	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Electromedizinische Geräte GmbH,
IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) passim

Alarm.com, Inc., v. Vivint, Inc.,
IPR2022-00728, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 1, 2022) 21, 22

Alkermes Pharma Ir. Ltd. v. Otsuka Pharm. Co.,
IPR2017-00287, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2017).....57

Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....58

Apotex Inc. v. Auspex Pharms., Inc.,
IPR2021-01507, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 9, 2022).....41

Apotex Inc. v. Celgene Corp.,
IPR2018-00685, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 27, 2018)42

Apple, Inc. v. Fintiv,
IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020).....58

Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.,
441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)47

Cambrios Film Solutions Corp. V. C3Nano Inc.,
IPR2019-00709, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 26, 2019)37

Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Laboratories., Ltd.,
619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 35, 42

Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Boston Scientific Scimed Inc.,
IPR2017-00444, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2017)28

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH,
8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....48

<i>Genetics Institute, LLC v. Novartis Vaccines &Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	50
<i>Global Tel*Link Corp. v. Securus Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00824, Paper 36 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 2, 2015).....	45
<i>Horizon Pharma Ir. Ltd. v. Actavis Laboratories, UT, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 2703785, (D.N.J. May 12, 2017)	37
<i>In re Applied Materials</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	58
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Pat. Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	37
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	32, 49, 50
<i>Ivantis, Inc. et al v. Sight Sciences, Inc.</i> IPR2022-01530, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 27, 2023).....	21, 22
<i>Johnson & Johnson Surgical Vision, Inc., v. Alcon Inc.</i> IPR2021-01069, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 10, 2021).....	21
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	37
<i>Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, Inc.</i> , 874 F.2d 804 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	37
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	47
<i>Microsoft Corp., v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> , IPR2018-00279, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. June 8, 2018).....	34
<i>Miltenyi Biomedicine GmbH v. Trs. of the Univ. of Pa.</i> , IPR2022-00853, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2022).....	57

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.