UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COHERUS BIOSCIENCES, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

HOFFMANN-LAROCHE INC.,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,063,182

PETITION
to Institute an *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,063,182
under 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 et seq.

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1450
Submitted Electronically via the PTAB E2E

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES vi

EXHIBIT LIST viii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES 7

A. Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(1)) 7

B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(2)) 7

C. Lead and Back-up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(3)) 8

D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(4)) 8

III. PAYMENT OF FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.103) 8

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104 9

A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a) 9

B. Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b); Relief Requested 9

V. THE '182 PATENT 9

A. The '182 Patent Only Generically Encompasses Fusion Proteins Comprising the 75-kDa TNFR, and Does Not Specifically Disclose Etanercept 9

B. The Claims of the '182 Patent Cover a Genus of Fusion Proteins Comprising Soluble Fragments of the 75-kDa TNFR and the hinge-CH2-CH3 Region of Human IgG 11

C. The Priority Date of the '182 Patent Is No Earlier Than August 31, 1990. 13

D. The Prosecution History of the '182 Patent 14

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1. The Board Found the '182 Patent Nonobvious Based Solely on Alleged Evidence of Unexpected Results, Which the Examiner Did Not Substantively Address 15

2. CFAD's Prior Petition for IPR Challenging the '522 Patent Relied on Different Prior Art than Coherus' Petition, and Failed to Substantively Address Unexpected Results.....16

VI. LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART 19

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 42.104(B)(3).....19

VIII. PATENTS AND PRINTED PUBLICATIONS RELIED ON IN THIS PETITION 20

A. U.S. Patent No. 5,395,760 ("Smith") – May 10, 1990.....21

B. Watson et al., "A Homing Receptor-IgG Chimera as a Probe for Adhesive Ligands of Lymph Node High Endothelial Venules" ("Watson") – June 1990 22

C. Zettlmeissl et al., "Expression and Characterization of Human CD4:Immunoglobulin Fusion Proteins" ("Zettlmeissl") – June 1990 24

D. Prior Art Informing the General Knowledge of the POSA.....25

IX. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER THE PRIOR ART.....26

A. Ground 1: The Claims of the '182 Patent Are Obvious Over Watson in view of Smith '760.....27

1. Applying Watson's General Method for Efficient Expression of Fusion Proteins to the TNFR Sequences Taught by Smith Results in a Fusion Protein That Falls Within the Scope of Every Claim of the '182 Patent 28

2. The Prior Art Motivated the POSA to Combine Watson and Smith 33

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

3. The POSA Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Preparing the Fusion Proteins Claimed in the '182 Patent....36

4. Nothing in the Prior Art "Teaches Away" from Preparing the Claimed TNFR:hinge IgG Fusion Proteins....38

B. Ground 2: The Claims of the '182 Patent Are Obvious Over Smith in view of Zettlmeissl and Watson....40

1. Modifying Smith's TNFR:IgG Fusion Proteins As Taught By Zettlmeissl and Watson Results in the Exact Fusion Proteins Recited in the '182 Patent Claims....40

2. Zettlmeissl and Watson Motivated the POSA to Modify Smith's Fusion Proteins to Optimize Expression....43

3. The POSA Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Preparing the Claimed Fusion Proteins....45

C. The Limitations of Claims 2-36 Are Obvious....46

1. Specific TNFR Peptide Sequences (Claims 2-3, 11, 13, 17-19, 26-27, 35)....46

2. An IgG1 Heavy Chain (Claims 4, 11, 13, 16, 20, 24, 26, 35)....47

3. The Heavy Chain Sequences Consist Essentially of Those Encoded by the pCD4-Hγ1 Vector (Claims 5, 10, 21, 25)....47

4. A Pharmaceutical Composition Comprising a Pharmaceutically Acceptable Carrier (Claims 6, 12, 29, 36)....48

5. The Protein is Purified (Claims 7, 14, 22, 28)....49

6. The Protein is Produced by Mammalian / CHO Cells (Claims 8, 15, 23, 26, 32, 33)....49

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

7. The Protein Consists (Essentially) of the TNFR Fragment and the Hinge-CH2-CH3 Region (Claims 9, 11, 16, 24, 26, 31, 34, 35) 50

8. Independent Claims 13, 18, 26, and 30 Are Obvious 51

D. Any Objective Indicia Cannot Overcome the Strong Showing of Obviousness 53

1. Increased Binding Affinity for TNF Compared to the Soluble Receptor Was Expected, and Motivated the POSA to Make the Claimed Fusion Proteins 54

2. Superior Neutralization of TNF Compared to the Soluble Receptor Was Expected, and Motivated the POSA to Make the Claimed Fusion Proteins 56

3. Differences Between the Claimed Fusion Proteins and Antibodies Were Expected, and Patent Owner Has Not Demonstrated Any Surprisingly Superior Results....58

a. Lack of CDC Was Expected....59

b. Patent Owner's Evidence Regarding ADCC Is Unreliable 61

c. Lack of Aggregation Was Not Unexpected 63

d. Patent Owner Has Not Compared the Closest Prior Art and Has Not Shown that Any Unexpected Results are Significant....64

X. CONCLUSION....66

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.