

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ONCUSP THERAPEUTICS, INC,
Petitioner,

v.

DAIICHI SANKYO COMPANY, LTD,
Patent Owner.

Case PGR2023-00037

U.S. Patent 11,446,386

Title: Anti-CDH6 Antibody and
Method of Producing an Anti-CDH6 Antibody-Drug Conjugate

PETITION FOR POST-GRANT REVIEW

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | xi |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. Mandatory notices | 6 |
| A. Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))..... | 6 |
| B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))..... | 6 |
| C. Counsel and Service Information (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3) and (4)) | 6 |
| III. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS | 7 |
| A. Payment of Fees | 7 |
| B. Time for Filing Petition..... | 8 |
| C. Grounds for Standing | 8 |
| D. Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b) and Relief Requested..... | 8 |
| IV. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF THE '386 PATENT..... | 9 |
| V. PROSECUTION OF THE '386 PATENT AND RELATED APPLICATIONS | 18 |
| A. U.S. Application No. 16/613,203 (“’203 Application”) | 18 |
| B. U.S. Application No. 17/010,162 (“’162 Application”) | 23 |
| VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART | 26 |
| VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)(3)..... | 26 |
| VIII. SUMMARY OF THE PRIOR ART | 28 |
| A. Int’l Application PCT/IB2015056032 (“Novartis”) | 28 |
| B. U.S. Patent Application No. 15/027,489 (“Urano”) | 28 |
| C. U.S. Patent Application No. 14/927,007 (“Sato”) | 29 |
| IX. IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '386 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE..... | 29 |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Ground 1: Lack of Written Description of Claims 1-18 of the '386 patent | 29 |
| 1. | The Very Broad Claims (Claims 1-6 and 13-18) Cover A Vast Number of Antibodies That Are Not Supported By Any Common Structural Features | 32 |
| 2. | The Limited Number Of Working Examples In The Patent Are All Nearly Identical And Are Therefore An Extremely Narrow Subset That Is Not Representative Of The Diverse Genus Of The Challenged Claims | 42 |
| 3. | The Narrower Dependent Claims (Claims 7-12) Also Lack Written Description Because They Still Claim A “Functional Fragment” Of The Claimed Genus | 48 |
| B. | Ground 2: Lack of Enablement of Claims 1-18 of the '386 Patent ... | 50 |
| 1. | The Make-and-Screen Approach Of the Invention Renders The Challenged Claims Invalid For Lack of Enablement | 51 |
| 2. | The Application of the <i>Wands</i> Factors Compels A Finding Of Undue Experimentation | 56 |
| a. | The Nature of the Invention and Breadth of the Claims | 56 |
| b. | The State of the Art, Predictability in the Field, and the Level of Ordinary Skill | 57 |
| c. | The Knowledge Of One Of Ordinary Skill | 58 |
| d. | The Amount of Direction or Guidance Provided And The Lack of Representative Examples | 59 |
| e. | The Quantity of Experimentation Required To Practice The Full Scope of the Claims | 61 |
| C. | Ground 3: Anticipation of Claims 1, 5, 13-16, and 18 By Novartis.. | 62 |
| 1. | Claim 1: “A human or humanized monoclonal antibody that specifically binds to the amino acid sequence shown of SEQ ID NO: 4 and possesses an ability to internalize that permits cellular uptake, or a functional fragment of the antibody that binds to the amino acid sequence of SEO ID NO: 4 and possesses an ability to internalize that permits cellular uptake.” | 63 |

2. Claim 5: “The antibody or the functional fragment of the antibody according to claim 1, which is humanized.” 64
3. Claim 13: “The functional fragment of the antibody according to claim 1, wherein the functional fragment is selected from the group consisting of Fab, F(ab')₂, Fab' and Fv.” 65
4. Claim 14: “The antibody or the functional fragment of the antibody according to claim 1, wherein the heavy chain or the light chain has undergone one or two or more modifications selected from the group consisting of N-linked glycosylation, O-linked glycosylation, N-terminal processing, C-terminal processing, deamidation, isomerization of aspartic acid, oxidation of methionine, addition of a methionine residue to the N-terminus, amidation of a proline residue, conversion of N-terminal glutamine or N-terminal glutamic acid to pyroglutamic acid, and a deletion of one or two amino acids from the carboxyl terminus.” 65
5. Claim 15: “The antibody according to claim 14, wherein one or two amino acids are deleted from the carboxyl terminus of a heavy chain thereof.” 66
6. Claim 16: “The antibody according to claim 15, wherein one amino acid is deleted from each of the carboxyl termini of both of the heavy chains thereof.” 67
7. Claim 18: “The antibody or the functional fragment of the antibody according to claim 1, wherein sugar chain modification is regulated in order to enhance antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxic activity.” 67
- D. Ground 4: Obviousness of Claims 1, 5, and 13-18 Over Novartis or Novartis in Combination with Urano and or Sato As To Claims 14-17 68
 1. Claim 14: “The antibody or the functional fragment of the antibody according to claim 1, wherein the heavy chain or the light chain has undergone one or two or more modifications selected from the group consisting of N-linked glycosylation, O-linked glycosylation, N-terminal processing, C-terminal processing, deamidation,

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| | isomerization of aspartic acid, oxidation of methionine, addition of a methionine residue to the N-terminus, amidation of a proline residue, conversion of N-terminal glutamine or N-terminal glutamic acid to pyroglutamic acid, and a deletion of one or two amino acids from the carboxyl terminus.” | 70 |
| 2. | Claim 15: “The antibody according to claim 14, wherein one or two amino acids are deleted from the carboxyl terminus of a heavy chain thereof.” | 71 |
| 3. | Claim 16: The antibody according to claim 15, wherein one amino acid is deleted from each of the carboxyl termini of both of the heavy chains thereof. | 71 |
| 4. | Claim 17: “The antibody according to claim 14, wherein a proline residue at the carboxyl terminus of a heavy chain thereof is further amidated.” | 72 |
| E. | Ground 5: At Least Claims 1-5 and 14-18 Are Patent-Ineligible Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 | 73 |
| 1. | Legal Standard For 35 U.S.C. § 101 Patent Ineligibility..... | 73 |
| 2. | At Least Claims 1-5 and 14-18 Are Patent-Ineligible Under The Two-Step Framework of <i>Mayo</i> and <i>Alice</i> | 76 |
| X. | Institution of Trial Should Not Be Discretionarily Denied Under <i>Becton</i> and <i>Advanced Bionics</i> | 79 |
| XI. | CONCLUSION..... | 82 |



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.