UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
EVERGREEN THERAGNOSTICS, INC.
Petitioner
– vs. –
ADVANCED ACCELERATOR APPLICATIONS SA
Patent Owner

CASE NO. PGR2021-00001

PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,596,278 (ALL CLAIMS)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

]	Page	
I.	INTRODUCTION				
II.	GRC	UNDS	S FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a))	2	
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY AND THE '278 PATENT2				
	A.	Back	ground of the Technology	2	
	B.	The	² 278 Patent	4	
		1.	Summary of the Specification of the '278 Patent	4	
		2.	Summary of the Claims of the '278 Patent	5	
		3.	Summary of the Relevant Portions of the Prosecution History	5	
IV.	CLAIMS FOR WHICH PGR IS REQUESTED, PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED, AND SPECIFIC STATUTORY GROUNDS ON WHICH THE CHALLENGE IS BASED (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b))				
	A.	Prior	Art Patents and Printed Publications Relied Upon	8	
	B.	Leve	el of Ordinary Skill in the Art	12	
	C.	Clair	n Construction	12	
	D.	Over	view of the Prior Art	13	
		1.	Strosberg (Ex. 1011) and Protocol (Ex. 1012)	13	
		2.	Prior Art Disclosing that it was Routine to Use an Acetic Acid/Sodium Acetate Buffer to Maintain the pH during Complexation		
		3.	The '536 Patent (Ex. 1013)	17	
		4.	Filice (Ex. 1028)	18	



Petition for Post Grant Review of U.S. Patent No. 10,596,278

	5.	Maus (Ex. 1009)	.19			
	6.	Kwekkeboom (Ex. 1010)	.20			
	7.	SEC Statement (Ex. 1018)	.21			
E.	Challenge 1: Independent Claims 1 and 20 and Dependent Claims 2-5, 8-19, 21-22, and 24-25 of the '278 Patent Are Anticipated by Protocol (Ex. 1012)					
	1.	Independent Claim 1	.21			
	2.	Dependent Claims 2-5 and 8-19	.26			
	3.	Independent Claim 20	.31			
	4.	Dependent Claims 21-22 and 24-25	.33			
F.	2-5, Proto	Challenge 2: Independent Claims 1 and 20 and Dependent Claims 2-5, 8-19, 21-22, and 24-25 Would Have Been Obvious Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of Maus (Ex. 1009) Further in View of SEC Statement (Ex. 1018)				
	1.	Independent Claim 1	.35			
	2.	Dependent Claims 2-5 and 8-19	.40			
	3.	Independent Claim 20	.44			
	4.	Dependent Claims 21-22 and 24-25	.47			
G.	Been Rodri (Ex. States	Challenge 3: Dependent Claims 6-7 of the '278 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over (i) Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of De León-Rodríguez (Ex. 1014) and/or Banerjee (Ex. 1016) or (ii) Protocol Ex. 1012) in View of Maus (Ex. 1009) Further in View of SEC statement (Ex. 1018) Further in View of De León-Rodríguez (Ex. 014) and/or Banerjee (Ex. 1016)				
Н.	Been 1028 Furth	enge 4: Dependent Claim 23 of the '278 Patent Would Have Obvious Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of Filice (Ex.) or Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of Maus (Ex. 1009) er in View of SEC Statement (Ex. 1018) Further in View of (Ex. 1028)	52			



	I.	Challenge 5: If Dependent Claims 8-10 Are Not Construed as Product-by-Process Claims They Would Have Been Obvious Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of the '536 Patent (Ex. 1013) or Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of Maus (Ex. 1009) Further in View of SEC Statement (Ex. 1018) Further in View of the '536 Patent (Ex. 1013)	.56
	J.	Challenge 6: If Dependent Claims 11-14 Are Not Construed as Product-by-Process Claims, They Would Have Been Obvious Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of the '536 Patent (Ex. 1013) Further in View of Maus (Ex. 1009) or Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of Maus (Ex. 1009) Further in View of SEC Statement (Ex. 1018) Further in View of the '536 Patent (Ex. 1013)	60
	K.	Challenge 7: If Dependent Claim 17 Is Not Construed as a Product-by-Process Claim It Would Have Been Obvious Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of the General Knowledge of a POSA or Over Protocol (Ex. 1012) in View of Maus (Ex. 1009) Further in View of SEC Statement (Ex. 1018) Further in View of the General Knowledge of a POSA.	67
	L.	Objective Considerations of Non-Obviousness Do Not Affect Obviousness Challenges (2-7)	69
	M.	Challenge 8: The Claims of the '278 Patent Are Not Enabled for Their Full Scope if the Recited Stability Limitations Are Not Anticipate by (or Obvious over) the Pharmaceutical Aqueous Solution Disclosed in Protocol (Ex. 1012)	70
	N.	Challenge 9: Claim 24 is Invalid for Improper Dependency	74
V.	CON	CLUSIONS	75
VI.	MAN	DATORY NOTICES	75
	A.	Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	75
	B.	Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))	75
	C.	Designation of Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))	77
	D.	Service of Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	77





DOCKET

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.

