

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION,  
Petitioner

v.

PLEXXIKON INC.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case No.: PGR2018-00069

---

**PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,844,539**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1450  
*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

Petition for Post-Grant Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,844,539

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	MANDATORY DISCLOSURES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	5
A.	Real Parties-in-Interest.....	5
B.	Related Matters.....	5
C.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....	6
D.	Service Information .....	6
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(A) .....	6
IV.	REQUIREMENTS FOR PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.204.....	6
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a)) .....	6
B.	Identification of Challenge and Relief Requested .....	7
C.	Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(3)).....	8
D.	Level Of Skill In The Art .....	8
V.	THE '539 PATENT.....	8
A.	The Challenged Claims .....	8
B.	The '539 Patent Family .....	11
VI.	IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL .....	12
A.	PGR-Eligibility Of The '539 Patent.....	12
1.	The Standard For Claiming Benefit To An Earlier- Filed Application.....	14
2.	The Standard For Written Description, 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) .....	14
3.	P2 Fails To Provide Written Description Support For The Challenged Claims .....	18

Petition for Post-Grant Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,844,539

4.	The Challenged Claims Are Not Entitled To Benefit Under 35 U.S.C. § 120 Because They Fail To Meet The Enablement Requirement Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 .....	46
B.	Ground 1: Because The Challenged Claims Are Not Entitled To Benefit Of P2 Or Any Earlier Application, They Are Anticipated By The '185 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) (AIA) .....	67
1.	The Standard For Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) (AIA) .....	67
2.	The Challenged Claims Are Anticipated By The '185 Patent .....	68
C.	Ground 2: All Of The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) (AIA) For Failure To Meet The Written Description Requirement .....	70
D.	Ground 3: All Of The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) (AIA) For Failure To Meet The Enablement Requirement .....	71
VII.	CONCLUSION .....	71

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>AbbVie Deutschland GmbH &amp; Co., KG v. Janssen Biotech, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	17
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc) .....	14, 17
<i>Brenner v. Manson</i> , 383 U.S. 519 .....	48, 66
<i>Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffman-La Roche Inc.</i> , 541 F.3d 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	18
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	16, 17
<i>Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , 108 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	47
<i>Hollmer v. Harari</i> , 681 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	14
<i>In re Fouche</i> , 439 F.2d 1237 (C.C.P.A. 1971) .....	49
<i>In re Gosteli</i> , 872 F.2d 1008 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	18, 69
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	14
<i>In re Ruschig</i> , 379 F.2d 990 (C.C.P.A. 1967) .....	15, 16, 18
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	67

...

Petition for Post-Grant Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,844,539

<i>In re Wands,</i> 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	48
<i>Inguran, LLC v. Premium Genetics (UK) Ltd.,</i> PGR 2015-00017 (PTAB Dec. 22, 2015).....	13, 14
<i>Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS,</i> 723 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	17, 40
<i>Paice LLC v. Ford Motor Co.,</i> 881 F.3d 894 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 1, 2018) .....	14
<i>Peters v. Active Mfg. Co.,</i> 129 U.S. 530 (1889).....	70
<i>Plexxikon Inc. v. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation,</i> Civil Action No. 4:17-cv-04405 HSG (EDL) (N.D. Cal.) .....	5, 70
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.,</i> 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	15, 18
<i>Rasmussen v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.,</i> 413 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	48, 62
<i>Upsher-Smith Labs v. Pamlab, L.L.C.,</i> 412 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	70
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 100(i) .....	1, 13
35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....	1, 3, 7, 12, 13, 67
35 U.S.C. § 112 .....	1, 14, 47
35 U.S.C. § 120 .....	1, 14
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
MPEP 2164.05(a).....	52

# 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.