

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APOTEX INC. AND APOTEX CORP.
Petitioners

v.

CELGENE CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00685
Patent 8,741,929 B2
Issued: June 3, 2014

Title: METHODS OF USING 3-(4-AMINO-1-OXO-1,3-DIHYDRO-
ISOINDOL-2-YL)-PIPERIDINE-2,6-DIONE
FOR TREATMENT OF MANTLE CELL LYMPHOMAS

PETITIONERS' REQUEST FOR REHEARING

Case No. IPR2018-00685

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. The Board Erred in Denying Institution Pursuant to § 325(d), Overlooking or Disregarding that Drach Discloses Substantially More Than the References Substantively Before the Examiner	3
1. Unlike the References Substantively Considered By the Examiner, Drach Discloses the Clinical Use of Lenalidomide For Treating Cancers Similar to MCL	4
2. The Board Erred in Disregarding Its Own Finding that Drach Was “Stronger Evidence” than the References Before the Examiner	6
B. The Board Misapprehended the Teachings of Querfeld in Finding that Querfeld Was Cumulative of Zeldis.....	7
C. The Board Abused Its Discretion By Not Instituting a Trial, as Numerous Disputed Issues of Material Fact Exist Concerning Unexpected Results	8
IV. CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	7
<i>Star Fruits S.N.C. v. United States</i> , 393 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	3
AGENCY PROCEEDINGS	
<i>Merial Ltd. v. VIRBAC</i> , IPR2014-01279, Paper No. 18 (Apr. 15, 2015).....	6, 7
<i>Yamaha Golf Car Co. v. Club Car, LLC</i> , IPR2017-02141-2-3-4, 2018 WL 3198594 (Jun. 26, 2018)	3, 12
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	<i>passim</i>
CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS	
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)	1, 2
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	9, 12

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. (“Petitioners”) submit this Request for Rehearing of the Board’s Decision Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,741,929 (Paper No. 8) (“Decision”).

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board should grant rehearing of its Decision not to institute based on three crucial errors in its analysis.

First, with respect to Grounds 1 and 2, the Board overlooked or disregarded that the Drach reference, a review article synthesizing relevant prior art for mantle cell lymphoma (“MCL”) treatment, discloses substantially more than what was substantively considered by the Examiner. Specifically, the Board determined that Drach, which discloses the clinical use of *lenalidomide* and was not substantively considered by the Examiner, was cumulative of references the Examiner considered that focused only on the use of *thalidomide* to treat MCL. The Board also disregarded its own finding that Drach was “stronger evidence” than the thalidomide references because Drach disclosed that lenalidomide was “a new treatment paradigm” for MCL. Drach’s unique teachings were lynchpins of Petitioners’ argument and the declaration of Petitioners’ expert, Dr. Thirman, with respect to reasonable expectation of success and of lack unexpected results.

Second, with respect to Ground 2, the Board misapprehended that the Querfeld reference, which was not considered during prosecution, was cumulative of the Zeldis reference, despite Querfeld disclosing a Phase II lenalidomide clinical study not disclosed by Zeldis. Querfeld's additional teachings are relevant to the issues of reasonable expectation of success and lack of unexpected results, and were relied upon by Dr. Thirman and Petitioners.

Lastly, the Board should have instituted trial in light of numerous disputed issues of material fact present here. Indeed, Dr. Thirman squarely disagreed with the declaration of Dr. Zhang, which was submitted by Patent Owner during prosecution, on the issue of unexpected results. Likewise, Dr. Thirman disagreed with many factual assertions of Patent Owner in its Preliminary Response regarding reasonable expectation of success and unexpected results. Such factual disputes should have been viewed in a light most favorable to the Petitioner and should ultimately be resolved at trial.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Requests for rehearing are governed by 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), which provides in pertinent part that a party's "request must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply." *Id.* When rehearing a decision on petition, a panel reviews the decision for

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.