

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BLUEBIRD BIO, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SLOAN KETTERING INSTITUTE FOR CANCER RESEARCH,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2023-00074
Patent No. 8,058,061

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND FACTS	7
A.	The '061 Patent And The Challenged Claims	7
B.	The Prior Art Raised By Petitioner.....	11
1.	The May Abstract (Ex. 1006).....	11
2.	The Nature Article.....	12
3.	The May Thesis	14
C.	The Board's Institution Decision.....	15
III.	ARGUMENT.....	20
A.	The Challenged Claims Are Entitled To The Priority Date Of Their Provisional Application Filing Date	20
1.	Like Claim 8, Claim 7 Is Fully Described In The Provisional Application	24
2.	Like Claims 7, 8, and 15, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 11 Are Also Fully Described In the Provisional Application	29
B.	The Challenged Claims Are Not Anticipated By Or Obvious Over The Nature Article	37
1.	The Board Was Correct In Rejecting Petitioner's Argument That The Nature Article Anticipates The Challenged Claims	37
2.	Petitioner's Obviousness Arguments Regarding The Nature Article Should Also Be Rejected	40
C.	The Challenged Claims Are Not Obvious Over The May Abstract	52

D.	There Is Compelling Objective Evidence Of Non-Obviousness Of The Challenged Claims.....	59
1.	Long-felt But Unsolved Needs and Failure of Others	60
2.	The Unexpected Results And Praise From Others.....	62
3.	The Copying Of Others	64
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ajinomoto Co. v. Int’l. Trade Comm’n.</i> , 932 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	22, 23, 36, 37
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	22, 27
<i>Catalina Lighting, Inc. v. Lamps Plus, Inc.</i> , 295 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	59
<i>Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	39
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	44, 56
<i>Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.</i> , 780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	38, 39
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	44
<i>Leapfrog Enters., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.</i> , 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	59
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	51, 58
<i>Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. Toro Co.</i> , 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	44
<i>Novozymes A/S v. Dupont Nutrition Biosciences APS</i> , 723 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	36
<i>Ortho-McNeil v. Mylan Lab</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	51, 58, 59
<i>Paice LLC v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 881 F.3d 894 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	21
<i>Paragon 28, Inc. v. Wright Med. Tech., Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00896, 2020 WL 5848657 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 1, 2020)	21

Case IPR2023-00074
Patent 8,058,061

<i>In re Petering</i> , 301 F.2d 676 (CCPA 1962)	39
<i>Pozen Inv. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1151 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	21
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.</i> , 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	21
<i>SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 584 U.S. ___, 138 S.Ct. 1348 (2018).....	16
<i>Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	37
<i>Takeda Chemical v. Alphapharm</i> , 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	51, 58
<i>Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC</i> , 683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	39
<i>Zoho Corp. v. Sentius Int’l, LLC</i> , 494 F. Supp.3d 693 (N.D. Cal. 2020)	27
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 120.....	21
35 U.S.C. § 112(a)	21
Other Authorities	
37 CFR § 42.6(e).....	67
37 CFR § 42.24(d)	66
M.P.E.P. § 2161	26
U.S. Patent No. 7,541,179.....	7, 11, 45
U.S. Patent No. 8,058,061	1, 3, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 29, 35, 37, 40, 43, 45, 52, 59, 65

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.