

Royal Society of Chemistry, Law Group
Recent Chemistry Case Law 2014

Kempner
& Partners

Hospira UK Limited

-v-

Genentech Inc

Stuart Jackson

Partner

Kempner & Partners

Fountain House, 4 South Parade, Leeds, LS1 5QX

Tel : +44 (0)113 393 1925

Fax : +44 (0)113 269 1512

e-mail: jackson@kempnerandpartners.com



Trastuzumab

- ▶ Monoclonal antibody used in adjuvant chemotherapy against cancers that overexpress the HER2 gene
- ▶ Successfully commercialised as Herceptin by Genentech
- ▶ SPC for trasuzumab expired on 28 July 2014
- ▶ Two follow-on patents in force after expiry of SPC:
 - EP 1 210 115 (dosage regimen)
 - EP 1 308 455 (composition)

Patents Court

- ▶ Validity of 115 and 455 patents challenged by Hospira
- ▶ Heard before Birss J in March 2014

The 115 Patent

- ▶ Very broad description, including use against many cancers and other indications, but very narrow claims
- ▶ Claim 1 limited to :
 - Use to treat breast cancers overexpressing HER2
 - with initial dose of 8mg/Kg, and
 - Subsequent doses of 6mg/Kg,
 - Administered at 3 week intervals

The Common General Knowledge

- ▶ Shared by clinician and pharmacokineticist in team who would work together
- ▶ Trastuzumab used in conjunction with cytotoxic agents such as paclitaxel
- ▶ Use to treat breast cancers overexpressing HER2
- ▶ The FDA label for Herceptin
- ▶ Target serum concentration of 20 μ g/ml
- ▶ Safe to administer up to 8mg/Kg
- ▶ The benefit of convenience

Questions about Construction

- ▶ Is the mere proposal to use a treatment, without the disclosure of efficacy, sufficient?
- ▶ Must there be clinical trial results in the patent specification?
- ▶ Clinical trials are expensive, but a mere proposal is not a contribution to the art.
- ▶ The requirements for sufficiency must be balanced against the rules of novelty and inventive step
- ▶ Plausibility

Obviousness

- ▶ The FDA label discloses:
 - initial 4mg/Kg with subsequent 2mg/Kg at weekly intervals
 - paclitaxel administered in a 3 weekly schedule
 - steady state serum concentration between weeks 16 and 32 with troughs of 79 and peaks of 123 μ g/ml
- ▶ Would a 3 weekly regimen occur to a clinician, and if so, would he try it?
- ▶ Pharmacokinetics shows trough concentration of 20 μ g/ml from 500mg administered 3 weekly

Obviousness – Decision

- ▶ A pharmacokinetics expert in the team would not regard 8mg/Kg followed by 3 weekly 6mg/kg as inventive, and would see no reason not to undertake a clinical trial
- ▶ The clinician in the team would see no reason not to undertake a trial with 3 weekly dosing, would expect it to work, and would be encouraged to do so by the great benefit of increased convenience
- ▶ 115 Patent held to be obvious with regard to the FDA label in the light of common general knowledge

Sufficiency

- ▶ If claim 1 of 115 is not obvious, is it insufficient?
- ▶ The assertion that the invention will work across the scope of the claim must be plausible or credible
- ▶ There is no pharmacokinetics on 3 weekly dosing in the patent, so would the FDA label support doing a trial?
- ▶ Held that if claim 1 did involve an inventive step, the team would not conduct a trial based on the information in the patent and cgk, therefore the patent is invalid for insufficiency

The 455 patent

- ▶ Concerned with the purification of trastuzumab for therapeutic use
- ▶ Claim 1 defines a composition of trastuzumab with <25% “acidic variants” (mainly with asparagine at position 30 deamidated to aspartate)
- ▶ The patent explains that such a composition can be made by a special reverse wash ion exchange method, but claim 1 is not limited to product made in this way.
- ▶ Only the reverse wash method of purification is described or exemplified in the patent

The 455 patent

- ▶ Describes the use of affinity chromatography to extract antibodies from the mixture derived from cell culture
- ▶ The product from the affinity column is purified by the reverse was method
- ▶ The product after the reverse wash has a lower level of acidic variants (ca.13%) than the starting material (ca.25%)
- ▶ States that reverse wash improves the yield/purity ratio, but quotes no figures, and does not state that <25% acidic variants cannot be obtained without reverse wash step

The Common General Knowledge

- ▶ Protein can be degraded by deamidation of asparagine residues to aspartate
- ▶ Protein purification techniques such as ion exchange, affinity and size-exclusion chromatography
- ▶ A trade off between purity and yield
- ▶ As the scale of a chromatographic separation increases, the resolution decreases

Claim Construction

- ▶ Claim 1 is to “a composition for therapeutic use”
- ▶ Does this require full manufacturing scale?
- ▶ Dependent claims to compositions with <20%, <13% and about 1 to 18% acidic variants

Novelty

- ▶ Lack of novelty requires the prior art to make an enabling disclosure (Lord Hoffmann in *Synthon*)
- ▶ Andya discloses a composition made by reconstituting lyophilised trastuzumab containing 82% trastuzumab
- ▶ Quantity sufficient for therapeutic use
- ▶ Method disclosed is slow and troublesome, but it would yield a composition with claim 1 (and claims 2 and 4)
- ▶ Andya does not anticipate claim 3 (<13% acidic variant)
- ▶ Claim 3 is not invalid for lack of novelty, but claims 1, 2 and 4 are

Obviousness

- ▶ The 455 patent claims trastuzumab with a specified impurity levels *per se*
- ▶ Would it be obvious to want to make such products?
- ▶ Could they be made without invention?
- ▶ The reverse wash method taught by 455 is irrelevant
- ▶ The reverse wash method is the subject of another Genentech patent, EP 1 308 456, which is in force

Obviousness Attacks

- ▶ Waterside
- ▶ Andya
- ▶ Common general knowledge
- ▶ Common general knowledge plus Protein A

Obviousness Attacks – Waterside

- ▶ Slides presented at a conference by Genentech relating to analysis of trastuzumab manufactured in CHO cells at full production scale for Phase III trials
- ▶ Analytical chromatograms on cation exchange columns showed that trastuzumab could be separated from the Asn 30 acidic variant
- ▶ Discloses trastuzumab for therapeutic use
- ▶ No level of acidic variants stated

Obviousness Attacks – Waterside

- ▶ Skilled team would understand from waterside that trastuzumab for therapeutic use could be made by method described
- ▶ It would be obvious to make it with low level of impurity
- ▶ Waterside teaches that any level of impurity can be achieved by the known technique described
- ▶ Purification method described in 455 is not the only way
- ▶ All relevant claims held invalid for lack of inventive step

Arguments against Obviousness over Waterside

- ▶ Ion exchange purification would be difficult at production scale
- ▶ Genentech did not remove the acidic variants
- ▶ Variants were not generally removed
- ▶ **But:**
- ▶ Position 30 is in an area that affects antibody binding
- ▶ Acidic variant has lower activity, so larger amounts would need to be administered

Obviousness – cgk plus Protein A

- ▶ It was obvious to make trastuzumab in CHO cells
- ▶ 455 discloses that such product falls within claim 1 without further purification (24.2% acidic variants)
- ▶ **But:**
- ▶ Impurity levels disclosed in 455 include levels of 25% to 29% acidic variants
- ▶ A composition within claim 1 was not inevitable, and hospira had no experimental evidence
- ▶ Birss J held that Hospira had not proven its case based on this argument, so it failed.

Present Position

- ▶ 455 Patent revoked
 - No appeal sought
- ▶ 115 Patent revoked
 - Permission to appeal refused by High Court
 - Permission to appeal granted following application to Court of Appeal