

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

CELGENE CORP.

Patent Owner.

---

IPR2018-01509

Patent No. 7,189,740

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,189,740**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION .....   | 1  |
| II.  | GROUND FOR STANDING.....   | 1  |
| III. | IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND STATEMENT OF THE<br>PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED (37 C.F.R. §42.22(A) AND 37<br>C.F.R. §42.104(B)) ..... | 2  |
| IV.  | THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW .....  | 2  |
| V.   | STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED .....  | 3  |
| A.   | Summary of the Argument.....   | 3  |
| B.   | The '740 Patent and Its Prosecution.....   | 5  |
| 1.   | The '740 Patent .....  | 5  |
| 2.   | The '740 Patent Prosecution .....  | 6  |
| C.   | The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....  | 9  |
| D.   | Claim Construction .....   | 10 |
| E.   | Scope and Content of the Prior Art .....   | 11 |
| 1.   | Background on MDS .....  | 11 |
| 2.   | TNF $\alpha$ Was a Known Target for MDS. ....  | 13 |
| a.   | Shetty 1996 .....  | 13 |
| 3.   | Thalidomide Clinical Trials Showed Promise, Including<br>in Inhibiting TNF $\alpha$ .....  | 14 |
| a.   | Raza 2000b .....   | 14 |
| b.   | Raza 2000d .....   | 15 |
| c.   | Raza 2001 .....  | 16 |
| d.   | Thomas 2000a.....  | 17 |
| 4.   | Revimid (Lenalidomide) Was a Known Compound with<br>Increased Potency over Thalidomide.....  | 18 |
| a.   | Thomas 2000a (continued) .....   | 18 |
| b.   | Corral 1999b .....   | 19 |
| c.   | Marriott 2001 .....  | 20 |
| d.   | Celgene Press Release 8/28/2001 .....  | 21 |

|    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| e. | The '230 Patent.....  | 22 |
| 5. | Clinical Trials of Revimid .....  | 23 |
| a. | List 2001 .....   | 24 |
| b. | Ritter 2001 .....   | 25 |
| c. | Celgene Press Release 5/8/2001 .....  | 25 |
| d. | Celgene Press Release 6/7/2001 .....  | 26 |
| F. | The Law of Obviousness.....   | 27 |
| G. | Ground 1: Claims 1–6, 11–12, and 14–34 Were Unpatentable<br>As Obvious over List 2001 in View of the '230 Patent and<br>Celgene Press Releases 5/8/2001 and 8/28/2001.....        | 28 |
| 1. | Independent Claim 1 Was Obvious. ....   | 29 |
| 2. | Dependent Claims 2, 4–6, and 34 Were Obvious.....   | 32 |
| 3. | Dependent Claims 3 and 23 Were Obvious.....   | 33 |
| 4. | Dependent Claims 16–17 and 32–33 Were Obvious.....  | 33 |
| 5. | Dependent Claim 11 Was Obvious.....   | 34 |
| 6. | Dependent Claim 12 Was Obvious.....   | 34 |
| 7. | Dependent Claims 14 and 15 Were Obvious.....  | 35 |
| 8. | Dependent Claims 24–28 Were Obvious.....  | 36 |
| 9. | Dependent Claims 18–22 and 29–31 Were Obvious.....  | 37 |
| H. | Ground 2: Claims 1–6, 11–12, and 14–34 Were Unpatentable<br>As Obvious Over Thomas 2000a in View of the '230 Patent and<br>the Celgene Press Releases 5/8/2001 and 8/28/2001..... | 43 |
| 1. | Independent Claim 1 Was Obvious. ....   | 43 |
| 2. | Claims 2–6, 23, and 34 Were Obvious. ....   | 46 |
| 3. | Dependent Claim 11 Was Obvious.....   | 47 |
| 4. | Dependent Claim 12 Was Obvious.....   | 47 |
| 5. | Dependent Claims 14 and 15 Were Obvious.....  | 48 |
| 6. | Dependent Claims 16–17 and 32–33 Were Obvious.....  | 49 |
| 7. | Dependent Claims 24–28 Were Obvious.....  | 50 |
| 8. | Dependent Claims 18–22 and 29–31 Were Obvious.....  | 51 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| I.  | The POSA Was Motivated to Combine the Prior Art Teachings. ....   | 54 |
| J.  | Any Secondary Considerations Fail to Overcome the Showing<br>of Obviousness. ....                             | 58 |
| 1.  | Revlimid Sales Do Not Save the '740 Patent. ....  | 58 |
| a.  | There Is No Nexus Between the Claims and<br>Secondary Considerations. ....                                    | 58 |
| b.  | Any Commercial Success of Revlimid Is<br>Attributable to Celgene's Marketing Efforts and<br>REMS Program..... | 60 |
| 2.  | There Were No Unexpected Results.....   | 61 |
| 3.  | The '740 Patent Satisfied No Long-Felt but Unmet Need. ....   | 61 |
| 4.  | Copying Is Irrelevant. ....   | 62 |
| VI. | MANDATORY NOTICES .....   | 62 |
| A.  | Real Parties-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....  | 62 |
| B.  | Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....   | 62 |
| C.  | Identification of Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service<br>Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)) .....  | 63 |
| D.  | Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)) .....  | 64 |

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

| Exhibit | Description  |
|---------|--|
| 1001    | U.S. Patent No. 7,189,740, titled Methods of Using 3-(4-Amino-Oxo-1,3-Dihydro-Isoindol-2-yl)-Piperdine-2,6-Dione for the Treatment and Management of Myelodysplastic Syndromes   |
| 1002    | File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,189,740   |
| 1003    | Declaration of Mark Levin, M.D. in Support of Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,189,740   |
| 1004    | Alan F. List et al., <i>Rational Approaches to Design of Therapeutics Targeting Molecular Markers: Targeting Angiogenesis in Hematologic Malignancies</i> , HEMATOLOGY, 2001 AM. SOC. HEMATOLOGY (ASH) EDUC. PROGRAM BOOK 443 (2001) |
| 1005    | Deborah A. Thomas, M.D. & Hagop M. Kantarjian, M.D., <i>Current Role of Thalidomide in Cancer Treatment</i> , 12 CURRENT OPINION IN ONCOLOGY 564 (2000)  |
| 1006    | U.S. Patent No. 6,281,230, titled Isoindolines, Method of Use, and Pharmaceutical Compositions   |
| 1007    | Press Release, Celgene Corp., Celgene Advances Immunomodulatory Drug (IMiD™) Clinical Program (Feb. 29, 2000)  |
| 1008    | Press Release, Celgene Corp., PR Newswire, Positive Interim Results Presented at the VIIIth International Myeloma Workshop on Celgene Corporation's Lead IMiD™ (REVIMID™) (May 8, 2001)  |
| 1009    | Press Release, Celgene Corp., PR Newswire, Initial Phase I Solid Tumor Data on Celgene's Lead Imid™, Revimid™ (June 7, 2001)   |

# 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.