

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NOS. 90/007,542 AND 90/007,859

Patent

Attorney's Docket No. 22338-10230, -10231

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Control Nos.:	90/007,542 90/007,859	Group Art Unit:	3991
Confirmation Nos.:	7585 ('542) 6447 ('859)	Examiner:	B.M. Celsa
Filed:	13 May 2005 ('542) 23 December 2005 ('859)		
Patent Owner:	Genentech, Inc. and City of Hope		
For:	Merged Reexaminations of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,415 (Cabilly et al.)		

DECLARATION OF DR. E. FINTAN WALTON UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.132

I, E. Fintan Walton, do hereby declare and state

1. I am a citizen of and reside in the United Kingdom.
2. I hold bachelor's and doctoral degrees, both from Trinity College, University of Dublin, Ireland. I also conducted research at the University of Michigan. My research experience, in which I reached the level of departmental head at Celltech Ltd. (1984-1992), covered gene expression, metalloproteinases and HIV research. I gained broad commercial experience in biotechnology in my management positions at Celltech Ltd. (1984-1992), and before that at Bass Brewing Ltd. (1982-1983).
3. I am presently Chairman and CEO of PharmaVentures Ltd., a company that assists healthcare company clients in forming alliances, conducting acquisitions and executing other transactions of strategic importance, including patent license agreements. In addition to its consulting services, PharmaVentures publishes reports on deal making to the pharmaceutical and related industries and produces a proprietary comprehensive database, PharmaDeals, which contains details of over 28,000 transactions that have taken place in the pharmaceutical industry. Those details include, where available, information on total deal value, upfront payments, equity investments, milestone payments, royalty rates and other financial parameters.
4. Through my experience at PharmaVentures and elsewhere, I have built up substantial expertise in the analysis of healthcare markets and of pharmaceutical and biotechnology

WALTON § 1.132 DECLARATION

PAGE 1

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

PAGE B1233

Sanofi/Regeneron Ex. 1046, pg 1105

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NOS. 90/007,542 AND 90/007,859

companies, their technologies, and their intellectual property. Deal structuring, valuation and negotiation form a major part of my business.

5. My company has been retained for this reexamination to evaluate certain conclusions made by the Patent and Trademark Office about the licensing of U.S. Patent 4,399,216 (the "Axel patent") as reported in an article published in the Harvard Journal of Law & Technology Vol. 17, No. 2, Spring 2004, at pp. 583-618 (the "Harvard Journal article"). We were also asked to evaluate the licensing of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,415 ("the '415 patent") to determine if the '415 patent is recognised within the industry and enjoys commercial success that would be relevant to the patentability of the '415 patent.
6. My company has been previously retained to act as an expert witness in *MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc. and City of Hope*, Case No. CV03-2567, which was filed in the Central District of California.
7. I note that I have been, and am being, compensated for my time at a rate of \$650.00 per hour. Attached as Exhibit A is a list enumerating the materials that I reviewed in preparing my declaration.

Introductory Remarks

8. I have extensive experience in reviewing patent licensing practices in the healthcare sector. I have reviewed many patent license agreements and evaluated the circumstances under which these licenses were taken.
9. Based on my experience, I have learned that in executing a patent license, a company usually will not agree to pay substantial fees, or provide other significant economic concessions, to a patent owner unless that company has reached a conclusion that the patentee could successfully enforce the patent being licensed against the company. If the prospective licensee reaches a conclusion that either the patent is invalid, or that its conduct would not result in a finding of infringement of the patent, that prospective licensee generally will not take the license, or will not otherwise provide any significant economic concessions to the patent owner.

Observations On Overlap of Axel Licensees and '415 Patent Licensees

10. I have read the comments at page 46 of the Final Action concerning the licensing of the Axel patent, based on what was reported in the Harvard Journal article. In particular, I observe that the Final Action concludes from what is reported in the article that the licensing of the Axel patent provides evidence that "one of ordinary skill in the art interpreted the *Axel patent* claims as being directed to functional proteins, including antibodies." I do not draw the same conclusion from this article.
11. Initially, I observe that the Harvard Journal article describes the technological advance made by Dr. Axel and his collaborators as being the simultaneous transformation of a eukaryotic cell with a selectable marker and another foreign gene that coded for desired proteinaceous material, where the presence of the selectable marker allowed for isolation of successful transformants from non-transformants (see generally pp. 584-586).

WALTON § 1.132 DECLARATION

PAGE 2

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

PAGE B1234

Sanofi/Regeneron Ex. 1046, pg 1106

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NOS. 90/007,542 AND 90/007,859

12. The Harvard Journal article does not explain why the reported Axel patent licensees took a license under one or more of the Axel patents. It does provide, at pages 592-593, a list of observations based on the reported Axel patent licenses.
13. According to the Harvard Journal article, six of the products reported as subject to a license under the Axel patent do not fall within any of the categories specifically claimed in that patent.¹ See Harvard Journal article at pp. 592-593. These products include: Ovidrel®, a recombinant human chorionic gonadotropin; Epogen® and Procrit®, recombinant human erythropoietin; Aranesp®, a modified recombinant human erythropoietin; Gonal-f®, a human follicle stimulating hormone; and Thyrogen®, a recombinant human thyroid stimulating hormone. See Harvard Journal article at pp. 615, 616 and 618.
14. The Harvard Journal article also indicates that the majority of the reported licensed products, including certain Genentech products, are not antibodies. See Harvard Journal article at pp. 592-593, 614-618.
15. The Harvard Journal article reports that 28 of 29 of the products reported as subject to a license under the Axel patent are produced in CHO cells (a particular type of mammalian host cell), and that "...it is almost certain that all [of the manufacturing processes] use some selective agents in culturing their transformed cells in accordance with the Axel patent." Harvard Journal article at p. 593.
16. In view of these observations, I do not believe one can reasonably conclude that companies took licenses under the Axel patent based on an understanding that the licensed product was specifically claimed in the Axel patent. Indeed, at least six of the products are not specifically claimed in the Axel patent. This demonstrates to me that whether the protein made by these licensees was specifically claimed in the Axel patent could not have been a significant reason why they took their respective licenses.
17. To the extent that one can infer anything from what is reported in the Harvard Journal article about why the Axel patent licensees took their respective licenses, it would be that these licensees believed the Axel patent to be broadly claiming the technique of using a selectable marker in mammalian host cells that allowed for isolation of successful transformants from non-transformants. This seems to be the only common factor reported in the licensing data for the licensed products. It is also the advance in the field of recombinant DNA technology that the Harvard Journal article attributes to Dr. Axel and his collaborators.
18. Accordingly, I do not believe the licensing information provided in the Harvard Journal article is evidence that a person of ordinary skill in the art interpreted the Axel patent claims as being directed to production of functional proteins, including antibodies.

¹ The Axel patent claims indicate that the foreign DNA employed could code for interferon, insulin, growth hormone, clotting factor, viral antigen, antibody or enzyme. See Harvard Journal article at page 588 and Axel patent claims 3-8.

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NOS. 90/007,542 AND 90/007,859

19. An additional observation can be made about the licensing experiences of the Axel patent. Specifically, I observe that two antibody products were identified in the Harvard Journal article as having been licensed under the Axel patent (i.e., Humira® by Abbott, and Zevalin® by Biogen Idec). See Harvard Journal article at pp. 614, 617. These two antibody products are also licensed under the '415 patent.²
20. I believe Abbott and Biogen Idec are companies with extensive experience in licensing patents concerning biological products. Based on my experience, the decision of each company to license both the '415 and Axel patents suggests two things. First, each company must have concluded that both patents covered in some manner the way their products are made. Second, each company must have concluded that the '415 patent was independently patentable over the Axel patent. Otherwise, neither company would have taken a license under both patents, or paid royalties under both patents to different patent owners.

Overview of the '415 Patent, and Its Place in the Industry and Market

21. I have been informed that evidence of substantial licensing of an invention by market participants supports a conclusion that the invention is not obvious, in part because it indicates that the industry has recognized that the patent represents a non-obvious advance over the prior art. I also have been told that evidence of commercial success of an invention supports a conclusion that an invention is not obvious over the prior art.
22. I understand that evidence of licensing and commercial success of the '415 patent is appropriate to consider if it can be linked to the merits of the invention (e.g., as opposed to being attributable to the prior art). In this case, this means that licensing and commercial success evidence is relevant if it can be shown to be attributable to the merits of the '415 patent, rather than being due to the merits of U.S. Patent 4,816,567 ("the '567 patent") and other prior art, or being due to other factors unrelated to the merits of the '415 patent.
23. Accordingly, I have evaluated whether the licensing by others of the '415 patent, and the royalties Genentech has been paid on U.S. sales of products licensed under the '415 patent, are properly attributable to the merits of the '415 patent, independent of the merits of the '567 patent and other prior art.

Licensing Activity of the '415 Patent

24. I have reviewed each of the licenses Genentech has entered into under the '415 patent.³ In general, confidentiality considerations between Genentech and the licensees preclude

² I know this based on my review of each of the licenses Genentech has entered into under the '415 patent.

³ Because of confidentiality considerations regarding these licenses, I have not provided a detailed table of the companies, products, and terms of the licenses. Nevertheless, my opinions are grounded on the terms of these licenses.

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NOS. 90/007,542 AND 90/007,859

public disclosure of many terms and conditions of the licenses. Because of this, I present my findings in a manner that limits disclosure of license terms.

25. Genentech has licensed the '415 patent, either in conjunction with the '567 patent or without the '567 patent, to at least 35 companies.
26. Of the companies that have licensed the '415 patent, many have elected to take licenses under both the '567 and the '415 patents, while others have taken licenses only under the '415 patent⁴ and not under the '567 patent.
27. A number of licenses granting rights under both the '567 and '415 patents require the licensee to pay one royalty on net sales of products covered by the '567 patent and a separate and additional royalty on net sales of products covered by the '415 patent, even if the product was also covered by the '567 patent. In other words, in certain of these "dual" licenses, the royalty obligations under each patent are independent.⁵
28. I also observe from my review of the licenses that after the '415 patent issued, but before the '567 patent expired, several licenses were entered into that granted rights only under the '415 patent (i.e., without also granting rights under the '567 patent).
29. A number of the companies that have taken a license under the '415 patent are currently marketing an antibody product under that license within the United States.⁶
30. The companies that have taken licenses under the '415 patent include some of the largest biotechnology and pharmaceutical companies in the world in terms of product revenue, as identified by Med Ad News in 2005 and 2007.⁷

Revenue Generated From Licensing Activity

31. I have reviewed reports of royalty payments made by licensees under the '567 and the '415 patents for therapeutic antibody products sold in the U.S., including a compilation of

⁴ These licenses did grant rights to continuations, continuations-in-part, divisionals of the '415 patent, and foreign counterparts of those patents. No such U.S. patents have issued to date.

⁵ MedImmune has licensed both the '415 and the '567 patent for Synagis®, but has paid royalties to Genentech only under the '415 patent. See Joint Appendix Volume 1 filed with the United States Supreme Court in *MedImmune, Inc. v Genentech*, No. 05-608 at pp. 414-416.

⁶ Some products publicly known to be licensed under the '415 patent are Humira®, Remicade®, Synagis®, Tysabri® and Erbitux®. See Genentech Presentation by David Ebersman, Investment Community Meeting, Financial Overview, 14 March 2008, at slide 8, available at, www.gene.com/gene/it/webcasts/pdf/finance.pdf.

⁷ Med Ad News, July 2005, "Top 100 biotechnology companies;" Med Ad News, September 2007, "Top 50 pharmaceutical companies."

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.