

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC and FRESENIUS KABI SWISSBIOSIM GmbH,
Petitioner,

v.

COHERUS BIOSCIENCES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

PGR2019-00064
Patent 10,155,039

Before SUSAN L.C. MITCHELL, CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ,
JOHN H. SCHNEIDER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PAULRAJ, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Denying Institution of Post-Grant Review
35 U.S.C. § 324 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.208

I. INTRODUCTION

Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC and Fresenius Kabi SwissBioSim GmbH (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting post-grant review of claims 1–12 (the “challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 10,155,039 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’039 patent”). Paper 3 (“Pet.”). Coherus BioSciences, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response to the Petition. Paper 9 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 324.

To institute a post-grant review, we must determine whether the information presented in the petition “would demonstrate that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable.” 35 U.S.C. § 324(a). After considering the Petition and the Preliminary Response, we determine, for the reasons set forth below, that Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that it is “more likely than not” that any of the challenged claims are unpatentable based on the grounds presented. Therefore, we do not institute a post-grant review of those claims.

A. *Related Matters*

Petitioner and Patent Owner both indicate that the ’039 patent is the subject of the following litigation: *Coherus BioSciences, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.*, Case No. 1:19-cv-00139-RGA (D. Del.). Pet. 2; Paper 6, 2.

B. *The ’039 Patent*

The ’039 patent, titled “Stable Aqueous Formulations of Adalimumab,” discloses pharmaceutical adalimumab compositions suitable for long-term storage. Ex. 1001, Abstract. The ’039 patent issued from an application (Appl. No.

15/799,851) filed October 31, 2017, and claims priority to three provisional applications, all of which were filed before the AIA critical date.

Adalimumab is the active pharmaceutical ingredient in the drug Humira. Ex. 1001, 7:31–32. Adalimumab is described in U.S. Pat. No. 6,090,382, which is incorporated by reference in its entirety in the '039 patent. *Id.* at 1:57–59. Although Humira was commercially available in an aqueous formulation at the time the '039 patent was filed, the '039 patent discloses that the stability of aqueous adalimumab could be improved by removing the citrate and phosphate buffer, mannitol, and sodium chloride. Ex. 1002, 5:5–27.

According to the specification, “adalimumab compositions which comprise only one buffer (as opposed to two or more buffers) are more stable than adalimumab compositions comprising both a citrate buffer and a phosphate buffer.” *Id.* at 11:58–61. The specification provides acetate, succinate, histidine, phosphate, tartrate, maleate, and citrate as examples of sole buffers that are more stabilizing than the citrate and phosphate buffer combination. *Id.* at 16:26–27, 21:46–47. The specification further describes that “sodium chloride is destabilizing” and that other stabilizers are “significantly better [options] . . . than mannitol.” *Id.* at 5:7–8, 14:23.

The specification also provides testing data used to demonstrate the improved stability of the '039 patent's adalimumab compositions. Some of the tests used Humira as a control for purposes of stability comparison. *See, e.g., id.* at 37:18–23. The data from the Humira-control tests show that single buffer adalimumab formulations are more stable than the commercially available Humira. *Id.* The '039 specification further discloses analyzing the adalimumab compositions using size exclusion chromatography (“SEC”) and capillary isoelectric focusing (“cIEF”), among other techniques. *See generally id.* at 25:1–

63:49. Table E-1, reproduced below, displays examples of acetate-buffered formulations that exhibit comparable or superior stability to Humira.

TABLE E-1

Form No.	pH	Measured pH for Block E formulations at t0 and t1 (one week, 40° C.)							PS			
		citrate	phosphate	sorbitol	Gly	Arg	mannitol	NaCl	80	t0	t1	t2
1	5.2	8	18	0	0	0	65	100	0.1	5.15	5.11	5.21
2	3.5	8	18	0	0	0	65	100	0.1	3.36	3.49	3.50
3	5.2	0	0	0	0	0	65	100	0.1	5.13	5.24	5.24
4	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	65	100	0.1	3.31	3.43	3.45
5	3.5	0	0	65	0	0	0	100	0.1	3.30	3.48	3.42
6	3.5	0	0	0	0	130	0	0	0.1	3.24	3.52	3.42
7	3.5	0	0	0	0	130	0	0	0	3.27	3.59	3.48
8	3.5	0	0	0	240	0	0	0	0	3.27	3.33	3.39
9	5.2	0	0	0	240	0	0	0	0	5.05	5.25	5.20
10	3.5	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	3.30	3.45	3.41
11	5.2	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	5.20	5.38	5.39
12	3.5	0	0	0	150	50	0	0	0	3.24	3.38	3.37

Id. at 39.

C. Illustrative Claims

Petitioner challenges claims 1–12 of the '039 patent, of which claims 1, 5, and 9 are the only independent claims. Claim 1 is representative of the independent claims and recites:

1. A stable aqueous pharmaceutical composition comprising:
 - a) adalimumab;
 - b) a buffer;
 - c) polysorbate 80; and
 - d) a sugar,

wherein the composition is free of i) mannitol, ii) citrate and phosphate buffers, and iii) sodium chloride and wherein the composition has a pH of about 5 to about 6.

D. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

Petitioner advances three grounds of unpatentability in relation to claims 1–12 of the '039 patent and seek cancellation of those claims. Pet. 1. Petitioner argues that the challenged claims are unpatentable for: 1) lack of written description; 2) lack of enablement; and 3) indefiniteness. *Id.*

Ground	Claims	Statutory Basis
1	1–12	35 U.S.C. § 112 (written description)
2	1–12	35 U.S.C. § 112 (enablement)
3	1–12	35 U.S.C. § 112 (indefiniteness)

Petitioner also relies on the declaration of Christian Schöneich, Ph.D. Ex. 1002.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Post-Grant Eligibility

Post-grant reviews are only available for patents “described in section 3(n)(1)” of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-20, 125 Stat. 284 (2011) (“AIA”). AIA § 6(f)(2)(A); *see Arkema Inc. v. Honeywell Int’l Inc.*, PGR2016-00011, Paper 13 at 15 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2016). These patents issue from applications “that contain[] or contained at any time . . . a claim to a claimed invention that has an effective filing date . . . on or after” March 16, 2013. AIA § 3(n)(1). *See also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(a) (requiring that “petitioner . . . certify that the patent for which review is sought is available for post-grant review”).

The '039 patent issued on December 18, 2018, from U.S. Application No. 15/799,851, filed on October 31, 2017. Ex. 1001, codes (45), (21), (22). The '851 application, through a continuation application, claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/698,138, filed on September 7, 2012, U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/769,581, filed on Feb. 26, 2013, and U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/770,421, filed on Feb. 28, 2013. *Id.* at codes (60), (63).

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.