



Jay J. Cho, Ph.D.

Associate

jcho@pbwt.com

Tel: 212-336-2989

Fax: 212-336-1238

Jay J. Cho, Ph.D. is an Associate in the Firm's Litigation department with a focus on patent litigation, particularly in the pharmaceutical and biotechnology space. Throughout his career, Jay has been involved in numerous patent cases related to, among other technologies, small molecules, polypeptides, vaccines, and antibodies in U.S. District Courts and before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. Jay has litigated numerous patent cases brought under the Hatch-Waxman Act, and as a trial attorney, Jay had a major role in contributing to the recent victory for the innovator involving a blockbuster antipsychotic drug. With a deep knowledge in biochemistry, molecular biology and genetics, Jay has also represented pharmaceutical companies in various matters involving antibodies and antibody-related products.

Education

- Fordham University School of Law (J.D., 2014)
- Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine (Ph.D., 2012)
 - Biochemistry, Cellular and Molecular Biology, and Neuroscience
- Korea University (B.S., 2005)
 - Life Sciences

Admissions

- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
- New York

Languages

- Korean

Publications

- Co-Author, "Drosophila Heparan Sulfate Proteoglycan Facilitation of Sema Mediated Repulsion During Axon Guidance," *Genes Dev.* (2012)

Biologics Blog

Biologics Blog is a source of insights, information and analysis related to biologics, including the legal developments, trends and changing regulation that impact the biotechnology industry. Patterson Belknap represents biotechnology, pharmaceutical and healthcare companies in a broad range of patent litigation matters, including patent infringement cases, PTO trial proceedings, patent licensing and other contractual disputes. Our team includes highly experienced trial attorneys with extensive technical knowledge, many of whom have advanced scientific degrees and industry experience in fields such as molecular biology, biochemistry, chemistry, statistics and nuclear engineering.

FDA's Draft Guidance for Industry Seeks to Answer Questions on Biosimilar Interchangeability

November 30, 2020

FDA has published new draft guidance for industry titled "Biosimilarity and Interchangeability: Additional Draft Q&As on Biosimilar Development and the BPCI Act." The draft guidance supplements two prior documents concerning biosimilar interchangeability published in December 2018.[1] This new guidance, in...

No Antitrust Violations for Creating and Enforcing Humira Patent Thicket

July 6, 2020

Last month, Judge Manish Shah of the United States District Court of the Northern District of Illinois dismissed an antitrust complaint brought by indirect purchasers of AbbVie's blockbuster rheumatoid arthritis drug, Humira®. The suit alleged antitrust violations under a novel...

FDA Finalizes New Definition of Biological Product

February 27, 2020

Last week, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") issued a final rule to amend its regulation that defines the term "biological product" in line with the definition set by the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 ("BPCIA"),...

Federal Circuit Walks Back Its "Exceptional" Stance on the Doctrine of Equivalents in the Latest *Amgen v. Sandoz* Decision

September 6, 2019

In Amgen's long-running dispute with biosimilar-maker Sandoz over biosimilar versions of Amgen's filgrastim (Neupogen®) and pegfilgrastim (Neulasta®) biologics, the Federal Circuit earlier this year affirmed summary judgment of no literal infringement and no infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. Amgen...

Prosecution History Estoppel Bars Amgen's Doctrine-of-Equivalents Infringement Claim Against Neulasta (Pegfilgrastim) Biosimilar Maker Coherus

July 31, 2019

Amgen Inc. v. Coherus Biosciences Inc., No. 2018-1993, Slip op. at 6 (Fed. Cir. July 29, 2019) stems from a Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act action brought by Amgen against Coherus seeking FDA approval to market a biosimilar version...

Federal Circuit Invalidates Polynucleotide-Labeling Claims for Lack of Enablement

July 16, 2019

In Enzo Life Sciences v. Roche Molecular Systems, No. 2017-2498, 2017-2499, 2017-2545, 2017-2546, Slip op. (Fed. Cir. July 5, 2019), the Federal Circuit affirmed summary judgment of invalidity for lack of enablement of Enzo's two patents relating to non-radioactive labeling...