

Paper No. _____
Filed: May 18, 2016

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD. and
DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

HELSINN HEALTHCARE S.A.,
Patent Owner

Case PGR2016-00008
Patent 9,173,942

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to Petition for Post-Grant Review
of U.S. Patent No. 9,173,942**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	5
	A. Aloxi [®] Is a Breakthrough Drug Product for Patients Suffering from CINV	5
	B. The Development of Aloxi [®]	7
	1. Roche's Early Palonosetron Work.....	7
	2. Patent Owner Resumes Roche's Abandoned Palonosetron Program	8
	3. Patent Owner's Partnership with MGI.....	10
	C. The '942 Patent Discloses Stable Palonosetron Formulations for Treating Emesis.....	12
	1. The '942 Patent Discloses Palonosetron Formulations for Treating Emesis	12
	2. The '942 Patent Discloses Stable, Low-Concentration Palonosetron Formulations.....	14
	D. Prosecution History of the '942 Patent and Its Family Members.....	16
	E. Related Litigations	16
	1. The ANDA Action.....	17
	2. The 505(b)(2) Action	19
	3. The Second 505(b)(2) Action	20
III.	DRL Has Failed to Show That the '942 Patent Claims Lack Written Description Support	20
	A. The Specification Discloses the Claimed Formulations, Including That They Are Stable and Effective	21
	B. DRL's Arguments Miscomprehend the Claimed Inventions.....	25
	C. The Cases Relied upon By DRL Are Inapposite	27
	D. The Fausel Declaration Cannot Support DRL's Written Description Arguments	30

;

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IV.	The Claimed Inventions Are Not Invalid under the On-Sale Bar Based on the MGI Agreement.....	33
A.	Under the Correct Interpretation of AIA § 102, the MGI Agreement Cannot Invalidate the '942 Patent Claims.....	33
1.	Any Allegedly Invalidating Sale or Offer for Sale Must Have Made the Claimed Inventions Available to the Public.....	34
a.	The Plain Language Supports Patent Owner's Statutory Interpretation.....	35
b.	The Legislative History Supports the Patent Owner's Statutory Interpretation.....	39
c.	The Policy Behind the AIA Supports Patent Owner's Statutory Interpretation.....	44
d.	Patent Owner's Interpretation Is Consistent with the Patent Office's Interpretation.....	46
2.	The MGI Agreement Did Not Make the Claimed Formulations "Available to the Public".....	48
B.	The MGI Agreement Was Not a Commercial Offer for Sale of the Claimed Inventions.....	51
C.	The Claimed Inventions Were Not Ready for Patenting.....	55
D.	The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) and Not Adopt This Ground.....	60
V.	DRL's Claim Constructions Are Unnecessary or Incorrect.....	61
VI.	Conclusion.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

<i>3D Sys., Inc. v. Aarotech Labs., Inc.</i> , 160 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	44
<i>Abuelhawa v. United States</i> , 556 U.S. 816 (2009).....	38
<i>Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	21
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	4, 20, 21, 25
<i>Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	29
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	35
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs XI LLC v. Insys Pharma, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01799, Paper 9 (Mar. 10, 2016)	31
<i>Cooper Cameron v. Kvaerner Oilfield Products., Inc.</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	28
<i>Crandon v. United States</i> , 494 U.S. 152 (1990).....	44
<i>Dey, L.P. v. Sunovion Pharms., Inc.</i> , 715 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	49
<i>Duncan v. Walker</i> , 533 U.S. 167 (2001).....	35
<i>EBC, Inc. v. Clark Bldg. Sys., Inc.</i> , 618 F.3d 253 (3d Cir. 2010)	58
<i>Elan Corp. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 366 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Envirotech Corp. v. Westech Eng'g Inc.</i> , 904 F.2d 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	53
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	52, 55
<i>Excelsior Med. Corp. v. Lake</i> , IPR2013-00494, Paper 10 (Feb. 6, 2014)	60
<i>FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.</i> , 556 U.S. 502 (2009).....	37
<i>Fed. Energy Admin. v. Algonquin SNG, Inc.</i> , 426 U.S. 548 (1976).....	43
<i>In re Fisher</i> , 427 F.2d 833 (C.C.P.A. 1970)	56
<i>Garcia v. United States</i> , 469 U.S. 70 (1984).....	40
<i>Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.</i> , 134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	27, 28
<i>Gilead Scis., Inc. v. Natco Pharma Ltd.</i> , 753 F.3d 1208 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	44
<i>Grp. One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.</i> , 254 F.3d 1041 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	53
<i>Holder v. Martinez Gutierrez</i> , 132 S. Ct. 2011 (2012).....	38
<i>Hulu LLC v. Intertainer, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01456, Paper 8 (Mar. 6, 2015)	60
<i>ICU Med., Inc. v. Alaris Med. Sys.</i> , 558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	29

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.