

Paper No. ____
Filed: May 3, 2018

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GRÜNENTHAL GMBH,

Petitioner

v.

ANTECIP BIOVENTURES II LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case PGR2017-00022
U.S. Patent No. 9,408,862

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
CORRECTED CONTINGENT MOTION TO AMEND**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE PROPOSED CLAIMS ARE INVALID FOR LACK OF WRITTEN DESCRIPTION	2
A.	Proposed Claims 31-56	2
B.	Proposed Claims 36-38 and 48-50	3
III.	PROPOSED CLAIMS 31-56 ARE INVALID FOR LACK OF ENABLEMENT	5
IV.	PROPOSED CLAIMS 31-56 ARE OBVIOUS BASED ON THE ART CITED IN THE PETITION.....	8
V.	PROPOSED CLAIMS 45, 52-53 ARE OBVIOUS OVER HANNA	11
A.	Hanna Discloses Zoledronic Acid Dosage Forms Having Bioavailabilities Within the Claimed Ranges	11
B.	Hanna Also Discloses Zoledronic Acid Dosage Forms Having Bioavailabilites within the Claimed Ranges in Fasted Dogs	13
VI.	PROPOSED CLAIMS 46-50, 51-52, AND 55-56 ARE OBVIOUS OVER HANNA	15
A.	Proposed Claims 46-50	15
B.	Proposed Claims 51, 55 and 56.....	16
C.	Proposed Claim 52	17
VII.	PROPOSED CLAIMS 31-44 ARE OBVIOUS OVER FOX, LASLETT, HANNA, AND PAZIANAS	17
A.	Proposed Claim 31	17
1.	Hanna Discloses Oral Zoledronic Acid Dosage Forms According to Proposed Claim 31.....	17

2.	Fox and Laslett Teach Administration of Zoledronic Acid for the Treatment of Knee Pain	17
3.	Pazianas Teaches the Fasting Limitations of Claim 31	19
4.	A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine the Teachings of Fox, Laslett, Hanna and Pazianas with a Reasonable Expectation of Success	20
B.	Proposed Claims 32-33	22
C.	Proposed Claims 34-38	23
D.	Proposed Claims 39-41	24
E.	Proposed Claims 42-43	25
F.	Proposed Claim 44	25
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. IRECO Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	8
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , 108 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	7
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (C.C.P.A. 1955)	16
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	16
<i>In re Wertheim</i> , 541 F.2d 257 (C.C.P.A. 1976)	12
<i>Nat'l Recovery Techs., Inc. v. Magnetic Separation Sys., Inc.</i> , 166 F.3d 1190 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	6
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.</i> , 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	4, 5
<i>See In re Woodruff</i> , 919 F.2d 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	12

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §103	1, 25
35 U.S.C. §112	1, 25

I. INTRODUCTION

In an attempt to avoid the prior art asserted in the Petition, Patent Owner contingently seeks to substitute original claims 2-30 with proposed claims 31-56, which, *inter alia*, narrow the claimed bioavailability ranges. But all the newly proposed claims are still unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112 and/or §103.

The proposed claims' narrower bioavailability ranges are nowhere disclosed in the '241 application (Exh. 2027, the application leading to the '862 patent). Therefore, these new claims, like the original claims, are invalid for lack of written description. Dependent claims 36-38 and 48-50 further lack adequate written description because their respective dosage amount limitations are also not described in the '241 application.

Also, like the original claims, the proposed claims are not enabled. The specification does not disclose a single example of a pharmaceutical formulation having the newly claimed bioavailability, and does not report any bioavailability data associated with any dosage form. Patent Owner's expert, Dr. William Wargin, and Petitioner's expert, Dr. Clive Wilson, agree that a POSA in May 2014 would have been skeptical that different zoledronic acid salt forms would have bioavailabilities within the claimed ranges. They further agree that the '862 patent provides no information that would cure that skepticism.

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.