

Filed on behalf of Patent Owners Genentech, Inc. and City of Hope by:

David L. Cavanaugh  
Reg. No. 36,476  
Heather M. Petruzzi  
Reg. No. 71,270  
Robert J. Gunther, Jr.  
*Pro Hac Vice* Application  
Pending  
Wilmer Cutler Pickering  
Hale and Dorr LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Adam R. Brausa  
Reg. No. 60,287  
Daralyn J. Durie  
*Pro Hac Vice* Application  
Pending  
Durie Tangri LLP  
217 Leidesdorff Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Jeffrey P. Kushan  
Reg. No. 43,401  
Peter S. Choi  
Reg. No. 54,033  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C.  
20005

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

GENZYME CORPORATION,  
Petitioner

v.

GENENTECH, INC. AND CITY OF HOPE  
Patent Owners

---

Case IPR2016-00383  
Patent 6,331,415

---

**PATENT OWNERS' PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER  
37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. THE '383 PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D)...5

    A. Legal Framework.....5

    B. Sanofi Could Have Raised Its Arguments Based on Salser, Southern, and Ochi in Its First Petition But Did Not.....9

    C. The Grounds Presented in the '383 Petition Are Substantially the Same as Those Presented in the '1624 Petition .....12

    D. Sanofi Is Impermissibly Using Patent Owners' Preliminary Response in the '1624 IPR to Inform Its Arguments in This Proceeding.....15

    E. Sanofi's Second Bite at the Apple Will Unfairly Prejudice Patent Owners and Waste Board Resources.....18

III. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE, IN VIEW OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE '1624 IPR, SANOFI WILL BE ESTOPPED FROM PURSUING THIS IPR.....20

IV. FIELD OF THE INVENTION OF THE CABILLY '415 PATENT .....22

    A. Prior Art Antibody Production Techniques .....22

    B. The Cabilly '415 Patent.....26

    C. Claim Construction.....29

    D. Person of Ordinary Skill.....30

V. THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART.....30

    A. Salser (Ex. 1002) .....30

    B. Ochi (Ex. 1003) .....35

C. Southern (Ex. 1004).....36

VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE NO GROUND ESTABLISHES A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS .....36

A. GROUND 1: The '383 Petition Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Showing That Salser Anticipates Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 12, 15-20 and 33.....37

1. Salser Does Not Disclose the Production of Immunoglobulins .....37

2. Salser Does Not Disclose Transformation of a Single Host Cell with Multiple DNA Sequences Encoding Immunoglobulin Heavy and Light Chains.....43

3. The Petition Does Not Cite Any Relevant Example of Protein Expression in Salser .....46

4. Salser Does Not Disclose a Vector Including Both Heavy and Light Chain Sequences as Required by Claim 15 .....50

5. The Board Has Already Rejected Substantially Similar Anticipation Grounds Based on Bujard .....51

B. GROUND 2: The Petition Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Showing Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 12, 14-20, and 33 Are Obvious Over Salser in View of Ochi.....52

C. GROUND 3: Petitioner Has Failed to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Showing Claims 2, 18, and 20 Are Obvious Over Salser in View of Southern.....58

VII. CONCLUSION.....60

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

|  | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Federal Cases</b>   |                |
| <i>Amgen Inc. v. AbbVie Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2015-01514, Paper 9.....                                    | 54             |
| <i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00873, Paper 8.....                                     | 22             |
| <i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> ,<br>441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....                   | 39             |
| <i>BLD Servs., LLC v. LMK Techs., LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00721, Paper 9.....                           | 17             |
| <i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00581, Paper 8.....                  | 9              |
| <i>Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee</i> ,<br>No. 15-446 (Jan. 15, 2016) .....                   | 29             |
| <i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> ,<br>227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....               | 46, 50         |
| <i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.</i> ,<br>471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ..... | 39, 40         |
| <i>Ex Parte Lettmann</i> ,<br>Appeal No. 2008-1185, 2008 WL 552716 (BPAI Feb. 29, 2008) .....        | 39             |
| <i>Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Group, Inc.</i> ,<br>523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....                | 46, 50         |
| <i>Finnigan Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> ,<br>180 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....                | 43             |

...

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00767, Paper 14.....                                 | 7, 12         |
| <i>Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00884, Paper 38.....                                 | 22            |
| <i>Gnosis S.p.A. v. Merck &amp; Cie</i> ,<br>IPR2013-00117, Paper 71.....                            | 40            |
| <i>HTC Corp. v. NFC Tech., LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00384, Paper 11.....                                 | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Impax Labs., Inc. v. Aventis Pharm. Inc.</i> ,<br>468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....            | 39            |
| <i>In re Baxter Travenol Labs</i> ,<br>952 F.2d 388 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....                           | 40            |
| <i>Ineos USA LLC v. Berry Plastics Corp.</i> ,<br>783 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....                | 40            |
| <i>Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. v. Richmond</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00580, Paper 22.....                          | 6             |
| <i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. ATI Techs. ULC</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00327, Paper 13.....                           | 12            |
| <i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00436, Paper 17.....       | 7             |
| <i>Metabolite Labs., Inc. v. Lab Corp. of Am. Holdings</i> ,<br>370 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ..... | 42            |
| <i>NetApp Inc. v. Crossroads Sys., Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00776, Paper 12.....                        | 12            |
| <i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> ,<br>545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....                 | 45, 50        |
| <i>Nora Lighting, Inc. v. Juno Mfg., LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00601, Paper 13.....                       | 5             |

# 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.