

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HOPEWELL PHARMA VENTURES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MERCK SERONO S.A.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2023-00481
Patent 8,377,903

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. State Of The Art.....	3
A. MS	3
1. MS Clinical Course and Treatment as of 2004.....	3
2. Outcome Measures In MS Clinical Trials	5
3. Cladribine Investigations For MS.....	5
B. Alleged Prior Art.....	6
1. Bodor (Ex. 1022).....	6
2. Stelmasiak (Ex. 1013).....	7
III. The '903 Patent Invention	7
IV. Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	8
V. Claim Construction.....	9
VI. The Cited Portion of Bodor is not “By Another”	9
A. The Cited Portion of Bodor is not Prior Art Under Pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e).....	9
1. Petitioner bears the burden to prove Bodor is “by another.”	10
2. Petitioner fails to show Bodor’s regimen is “by another.”	12
3. Bodor’s regimen is not “by another.”	12

VII. The Challenged Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Bodor
And Stelmasiak.....18

A. Bodor And Stelmasiak Do Not Disclose Or Suggest All Claim
Limitations.....19

1. Bodor And Stelmasiak Do Not Disclose Or Suggest The
Claimed Weight-Based Induction Or Maintenance
Dosing19

2. Neither Bodor Nor Stelmasiak Discloses Or Suggests A
Maintenance Period As Claimed24

a) Bodor Does Not Teach or Suggest Re-treatment24

(1) Cladribine Safety25

(2) Dosing of Approved DMAs For MS Was
Based on Pharmacological Effects and Safety.....27

(3) The Art Did Not Suggest A Maintenance
Period As Claimed30

b) Stelmasiak Does Not Teach Or Suggest A
Maintenance Period As Claimed.....33

B. No Motivation To Combine Bodor With Stelmasiak To Arrive
At The Challenged Claims Or Reasonable Expectation Of
Success In Doing So.....35

1. Petitioner’s Routine Optimization Arguments Fail35

2.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Adopt Weight-Based Dosing Or Reasonably Have Expected To Arrive At The Claimed Weight-Based Dosing Regimen	48
3.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Bodor With Stelmasiak To Arrive At The Claimed Induction Doses Or Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Doing So	49
4.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Re-Treat Patients After Bodor’s 10-Month Cladribine-Free Period With A Reasonable Expectation Of Success	53
5.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated To Combine Bodor With Stelmasiak To Arrive At The Claimed 1.7 Mg/Kg Maintenance Dose	55
C.	The Dependent Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Bodor And Stelmasiak	57
VIII.	Objective Indicia Support Non-Obviousness	58
A.	Skepticism Of Others	58
B.	Unexpected Results	60
C.	Satisfaction of a Long-Felt, Unmet Need	63
D.	Nexus	63
IX.	Conclusion	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (en banc).....	58
<i>Duncan Parking Techs., Inc. v. IPS Grp., Inc.</i> , 914 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	11, 12, 18
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	11
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	64
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Pat. Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	47
<i>In re DeBaun</i> , 687 F.2d 459 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	9, 18
<i>In re Enhanced Sec. Research, LLC</i> , 739 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	54
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	23
<i>In re Land</i> , 368 F.2d 866 (C.C.P.A. 1966)	10
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	36
<i>Neptune Generics, LLC v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 921 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	60
<i>Quanergy Sys., Inc. v. Velodyne Lidar USA, Inc.</i> , 24 F.4th 1406 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	64
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	64
<i>Riverwood Int’l Corp. v. R.A. Jones & Co.</i> , 324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	11
<i>Standard Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	24
<i>Unigene Lab’ys, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	48

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.