

Paper No. __

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LASSEN THERAPEUTICS 1, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SINGAPORE HEALTH SERVICES PTE LTD., AND NATIONAL
UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE,
Patent Owners.

Case No. PGR2019-00053
Patent No. 10,106,603

PATENT OWNERS' PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	The Prior Art Grounds Fail.....	2
B.	The § 112 Grounds Fail.....	3
II.	THE '603 PATENT	7
A.	The Inventors Discovered That IL-11 Produces Fibrosis	7
B.	The Inventors Discovered That Fibrosis Could Be Treated Using Known Antibodies That Inhibited IL-11 Mediated Signaling	9
C.	The Claims Are Narrowly Directed to a Preferred Embodiment of Treating Fibrosis in Humans Using Known Antibodies That Inhibit IL-11 Mediated Signaling in a Specific Way.....	12
III.	EDWARDS DISCLOSES SUITABLE ANTIBODIES AND IS INCORPORATED IN THE '603 PATENT.....	13
A.	Edwards Discloses the Structures of 8E2, 8D10, 8E4 and Sixty-One Other Antibodies That Are Described as Binding Human IL-11R α and Inhibiting IL-11 Mediated Signaling.....	13
B.	The Petition Admits Edwards Discloses Antibodies Suitable for Practicing the Claimed Invention	16
C.	Edwards Is Incorporated by Reference in the '603 Patent.....	16
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND POSA DEFINITION.....	17
A.	Claim 1 Is Limited to Administering an Antibody That Is Therapeutically Effective in a Human.....	17
B.	Petitioner's POSA Definition Can Be Adopted	19
V.	WRITTEN DESCRIPTION	20
A.	The Claims Are Directed to a Method of Treatment	20
B.	The Petition Misapplies the Law on What Is Required to Provide Written Description for a Claim to a Method of Use of a Known Genus	21
1.	The Specification Need Only Provide Written Description for the Claimed Method of Treatment	21
2.	<i>Rochester</i> Is Inapposite	24

3.	The Petition Improperly Alleges That the Specification Needed to Describe Antibodies That Could <i>Not</i> Be Used to Practice the Claimed Method	26
C.	The Petition Improperly Ignores Antibodies Suitable for Use in the Claimed Method	27
1.	The Petition Fails to Establish a <i>Prima Facie</i> Case of Unpatentability Because It Ignores Disclosure in the Specification	28
2.	The Petition Fails to Establish a <i>Prima Facie</i> Case of Unpatentability Because It Ignores What Was Known to a POSA.....	29
3.	Representative Number of Species	30
a.	The Specification Discloses Clones 8E2 and 8E4	31
b.	The Specification Discloses Sixty-Two Additional Suitable Antibodies	33
c.	Edwards’ Disclosure Must Be Considered Even If It Were Not Incorporated by Reference	33
d.	The Petition’s Failure to Even Allege That Edwards’ Species Are Not Representative Ends the Inquiry on the Written Description Ground.....	34
4.	Structural Features Common to the Members	35
D.	Petitioner’s Working Example Arguments Fail	37
1.	Numerous Working Examples Are Disclosed	38
2.	Example 6 Describes the “Enabling Attributes”	40
3.	Petitioner’s Attacks on Example 6 Are Legally Flawed.....	41
4.	Petitioner’s Attacks on Other Examples Are Equally Flawed.....	42
E.	Petitioner’s § 112 Expert Is Not Credible	43
VI.	ENABLEMENT	44
A.	The Specification Need Not Disclose What Was Known.....	44
B.	The Petition Misstates the Breadth of the Claims (<i>Wands</i> Factor 8)	45
C.	The Petition Misstates the Nature of the Invention (<i>Wands</i> Factor 4).....	46

D. State of the Art, Skill of Those in the Art, and Predictability of the Art (<i>Wands</i> Factors 5-7)	47
E. The Enablement Ground’s Ignoring of Edwards Is Fatal	51
F. The Petition Misstates the Direction, Guidance and Working Examples in the Specification (<i>Wands</i> Factors 2-3)	51
1. The Enablement Ground Ignores 8E2 and 8E4.....	52
2. The Enablement Ground Ignores Sixty-Two Additional Suitable Antibodies	52
3. The Enablement Ground Fails Because It Depends on an Alleged Absence of Even a Single Working Example	53
G. Quantity of Experimentation Required (<i>Wands</i> Factor 1)	54
VII. PRIOR ART GROUNDS	55
A. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Edwards Inherently Anticipates	60
1. The Burden of Establishing Inherency Is High.....	60
2. Petitioner Does Not Attempt to Establish That Chegini Supports Inherent Anticipation	60
3. Petitioner Fails to Establish That Wynn Evidences Inherent Anticipation	61
a. Petitioner Fails To Prove That Treating Inflammation Necessarily Treats Fibrosis	61
b. Petitioner’s Argument That Edwards Treats Heart and Kidney Disease, Which Necessarily Treats Fibrosis of Those Organs, Fails.....	65
(1) Wynn Does Not Teach That All Cardiac or Kidney Diseases Are Fibroproliferative	65
(2) Edwards Does Not Treat Heart or Kidney Disease	66
c. Edwards Does Not Teach Administering a Therapeutically Effective Amount for Treating Fibrosis.....	68
B. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Any Challenged Claim Would Have Been Obvious over Edwards Alone	69
1. Petitioner’s Recycled Inherency Arguments Fail Again.....	71

2. Petitioner’s Assertion That a POSA Would Have Sought to Treat Fibrosis of the Claimed Organs by Inhibiting IL-11 Mediated Signaling Fails.....	71
a. Petitioner Ignores the State of the Art.....	71
b. Petitioner Fails to Establish That a POSA Would Have Sought to Inhibit IL-11 to Treat Fibrosis of Any of the Organs Recited in Claim 1	74
(1) Petitioner Fails to Establish That a POSA Would Have Understood That IL-11 Caused Fibrosis of Any Organ Recited in Claim 1	75
(2) Petitioner’s Rehashed Wynn Arguments Fail Again.....	78
(3) Petitioner’s Argument That Treating Asthma Renders Obvious Treating Fibrosis of Any Other Organ Fails	80
C. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That Any Challenged Claim Would Have Been Obvious over Edwards in View of Wynn and Chegini.....	83
1. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious over Edwards in View of Wynn	83
2. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious over Edwards in View of Chegini	84
a. Chegini Does Not Teach That Fibrosis of the Claimed Organs Is Caused by IL-11	84
b. Petitioner’s Assertion That It Would Have Been Obvious to Treat Fibrosis of the Eye Fails	87
c. Petitioner’s Rehashed Arguments About Edward’s Teachings of Treating Cachexia Fail Again	87
VIII. THE PETITION’S DEFECTS ARE FATAL.....	88
IX. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325	89

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.