

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

<hr/>		)	
GENENTECH, INC and CITY OF HOPE,		)	
		)	
Plaintiffs,		)	
		)	C.A. No. 18-00924-CFC
v.		)	
		)	
AMGEN INC.,		)	
		)	
Defendant.		)	
<hr/>		)	

**PLAINTIFFS’ REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION  
TO DISMISS DEFENDANT’S UNENFORCEABILITY COUNTERCLAIMS  
AND TO STRIKE DEFENDANT’S ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

*Of Counsel:*

William F. Lee  
Lisa J. Pirozzolo  
Emily R. Whelan  
Kevin S. Prussia  
Andrew J. Danford  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(617) 526-6000

MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP  
Michael P. Kelly (#2295)  
Daniel M. Silver (#4785)  
Renaissance Centre  
405 North King Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 984-6300  
mkelly@mccarter.com  
dsilver@mccarter.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Genentech, Inc. and City  
of Hope*

Robert J. Gunther, Jr.  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
7 World Trade Center  
250 Greenwich Street  
New York, NY  
(212) 230-8800

Daralyn J. Durie  
Adam R. Brausa  
DURIE TANGRI LLP  
217 Leidesdorff Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 362-6666

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. The Court Should Dismiss Amgen’s Unenforceability Counterclaim For The ’213 Patent (Count 3) And Strike Amgen’s Eleventh Affirmative Defense. ....	2
B. The Court Should Dismiss Amgen’s Unenforceability Counterclaims For The Remaining Seventeen Patents-In- Suit (Counts 1-2 and 4-18).....	7
III. CONCLUSION.....	10

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Akzo N.V. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir 1986).....	4
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009) .....	7, 8, 10
<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , No. 05-cv-2308 (PGS), 2008 WL 628592 (D.N.J. Mar. 3, 2008) .....	5
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007) .....	8
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , No. 11-54-SLR, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86215 (D. Del. June 21, 2012) .....	6
<i>Collectis S.A. v. Precision Biosciences</i> , 883 F. Supp. 2d 526 (D. Del. 2012) .....	3, 5
<i>Fowler v. UPMC Shadyside</i> , 578 F.3d 203 (3d Cir. 2009) .....	7, 10
<i>Genetic Techs. Ltd. v. Interleukin Genetics Inc.</i> , No. 10-CV-69-BBC, 2010 WL 3362344 (W.D. Wis. Aug. 24, 2010).....	8
<i>Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines &amp; Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	9
<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc.</i> , No. 00-677, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19250 (D. Del. Sept. 27, 2004) .....	3, 4
<i>IBM v. Priceline Grp., Inc.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 54285 (D. Del. Apr. 10, 2017) .....	6, 7
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	2, 3
<i>Quest Integrity USA, LLC v. Clean Harbor Indus. Servs., Inc.</i> , No. 14-1483-SLR, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95148 (D. Del. July 22, 2015) .....	6
<i>Refac Int’l, Ltd. v. Lotus Dev. Corp.</i> , 81 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	6

*Ring Plus, Inc. v. Cingular Wireless Corp.*,  
614 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....6

*Rothman v. Target Corp.*,  
556 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....2

*Sepracor Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.*,  
No. 09-cv-01302 (DMC)(MF), 2010 WL 2326262 (D.N.J. June 7, 2010) .....5

*Southco, Inc. v. Penn Eng'g & Mfg. Corp.*,  
768 F. Supp. 2d 715 (D. Del. 2011) .....5

*SunPower Corp. v. PaneClaw, Inc.*,  
No. 12-1633-MPT, 2016 WL 5107029 (D. Del. Sept. 19, 2016) .....3

*Wyeth Holdings Corp. v. Sandoz, Inc.*,  
No. 09-955-LPS-CJB, 2012 WL 600715 (D. Del. Feb. 3, 2012) .....5

*Young v. Lumenis, Inc.*,  
492 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....3

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(C)(i) .....9

**Rules**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) ..... 1, 7, 8

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b) .....8

## I. INTRODUCTION

Amgen has not identified any factual dispute that would prevent the Court from disposing of its unenforceability defenses at the pleadings stage. For the '213 patent, Amgen argues that there is a factual dispute as to whether Genentech's statements to the patent examiner constituted permissible attorney argument or improper material misrepresentations. But Amgen's position cannot be reconciled with long-standing Federal Circuit precedent that an applicant's statements concerning the teachings of the prior art cannot, as a matter of law, support a claim of inequitable conduct so long as the patent examiner was capable of assessing the applicant's arguments on her own. Amgen has not pleaded any facts alleging that the patent examiner here was incapable of fully evaluating Genentech's statements concerning the prior art for herself, and Amgen's unenforceability counterclaim for the '213 patent and related Eleventh Affirmative Defense are therefore legally deficient. Indeed, Amgen does not even engage with the many cases dismissing a defendant's unenforceability counterclaims in exactly these circumstances, and the cases that Amgen does discuss only underscore the need to plead facts alleging that the patent examiner was incapable of evaluating the applicant's arguments (which Amgen has failed to do here).

For the remaining seventeen patents-in-suit, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 8(a), Amgen is obligated to plead at least *some* facts supporting its counterclaims—and Amgen has pleaded none. Instead, Amgen asserts that there are “a number of ways” in which the patents-in-suit might be unenforceable—for example, based upon the recent or anticipated expiration of certain patents, or decisions in other proceedings concerning the validity of those patents. But Amgen does not dispute that an expired patent remains enforceable against past infringement occurring during the patent's term. And Amgen's speculation about future possible outcomes in other proceedings is not a basis for pleading unenforceability. The Court therefore should also dismiss Amgen's unenforceability counterclaims for the remaining patents-in-suit.

# 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.