

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

GENENTECH, INC., HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE AG, AND ABBVIE INC.,

Patent Owner.

PTAB Case No. PGR2022-00023

Patent No. 10,993,942

**PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,993,942**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES	2
A. Real Parties-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	2
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
C. Identification of Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	3
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	4
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	4
V. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED.....	5
A. Summary of the Argument.....	5
B. Scientific Background.....	6
C. Summary of the '942 patent.....	9
1. Effective Filing Date.....	9
2. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	10
3. Disclosure.....	11
4. Claims	15
5. Prosecution History.....	17
D. Proposed Claim Construction.....	21
E. Post-Grant Review Is Proper.....	24
F. <u>Ground 1</u> : Claims 1-3, 5-6, 14, 25-27, and 30 of the '942 patent Lack Written Description.....	26
1. The written description standard.....	27
2. The specification makes clear that the invention is limited to a combination therapy, not an escalating- dose monotherapy	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
3. The specification does not disclose the claimed escalating-dose regimes for GDC-0199.....	42
4. Even if it were to disclose the elements separately, the disclosure provides no description of their combination.....	46
VI. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE.....	48
VII. CONCLUSION.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	48, 49, 50, 51, 52
<i>Apple Inc. v. Parus Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00687, Paper 9 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2020).....	52
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc)	27, 28, 29, 48
<i>Biogen Int’l GmbH v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , 18 F.4th 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	28, 37, 45, 47, 48
<i>Collegium Pharm., Inc. v. Purdue Pharma L.P.</i> , PGR2018-00048, Paper 58 (PTAB Nov. 19, 2021)	24, 25, 45, 48
<i>Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Rsch. Org. v. BASF Plant Sci. Co.</i> , PGR2020-00057, Paper 35 (PTAB Oct. 1, 2021)	21
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int’l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	23
<i>Forest Labs., LLC v. Sigmapharm Labs., LLC</i> , 918 F.3d 928 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	31
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	46, 47, 48
<i>Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.</i> , 134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	passim
<i>ICU Med., Inc. v. Alaris Med. Sys., Inc.</i> , 558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	27, 30, 33, 40
<i>In re Boesch</i> , 617 F.2d 272 (CCPA 1980)	44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>In re Wilder</i> , 736 F.2d 1516 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	31
<i>LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	47
<i>Medtronic Corevalve LLC v. Speyside Med., LLC</i> , IPR2021-00244, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 18, 2021).....	50
<i>Metabolite Labs., Inc. v. Lab. Corp. of Am. Holdings</i> , 370 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	22
<i>Microsurgical Tech, Inc. v. Regents of Univ. of Colo.</i> , PGR2021-00026, Paper 12 (PTAB June 16, 2021).....	24
<i>N. Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp.</i> , 908 F.2d 931 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	40
<i>Netapp, Inc. v. Proven Networks, LLC</i> , IPR2020-01436, Paper 11 (PTAB Apr. 9, 2021)	50
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	22
<i>Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS</i> , 723 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	29, 47
<i>Nuvo Pharm. (Ir.) Designated Activity Co. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs. Inc.</i> , 923 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	28
<i>Oticon Med. AB v. Cochlear Ltd.</i> , IPR2019-00975, Paper 15 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2019).....	50
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	25
<i>Regents of Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	31

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.