

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**Boehringer Ingelheim International GmbH and
Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Petitioner**

v.

**Genentech, Inc.
Biogen Idec, Inc.
Patent Owners**

**CASE IPR2015-00415
Patent 7,820,161**

**GENENTECH, INC.'S AND BIOGEN INC.'S PATENT OWNER
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND.....	5
	A. Rituximab With Methotrexate To Treat RA.	5
	B. Prosecution History.....	6
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
IV.	BOEHRINGER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE ANY REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING.	8
	A. Boehringer Never Attempts To Explain How Any Particular Combination Of References Allegedly Renders Obvious Any Claim Of The Patented Invention.	8
	1. Boehringer Nowhere Articulates Any Reason For A Skilled Artisan To Have Combined Specific References And Arrived At Any Claimed Invention.....	11
	2. Boehringer Nowhere Articulates Why A Skilled Artisan Allegedly Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success With Respect To Any Of The Proposed Combinations.....	17
	3. Boehringer Selectively Cites From References While Ignoring Their Teachings As A Whole, Including Teachings Away.....	21
	a) <i>Half Of Boehringer’s “Prior Art Combinations” Fail At The Outset Because They Rely On The Gryn Letter (Ex. 1026), Which Is Not A Printed Publication.</i>	21
	b) <i>The Other Half Of Boehringer’s “Prior Art Combinations” Also Fail Because They Rely On The Edwards 1998 Hypothesis.....</i>	26
	(i) Skilled Artisans Would Not Have Combined The Edwards 1998 Hypothesis With Other References And Arrived At Any Of The Claimed Inventions.....	26

(a)	Skilled Artisans Would Not Have Accepted The Edwards Hypothesis Because Its Underlying Premises Were Inconsistent With Scientific Literature As Of The Priority Date.....	28
(b)	The Edwards Hypothesis Would Have Discouraged Skilled Artisans From Combining Any Of The References And Arriving At The Claimed Inventions.....	33
(c)	Based On The Edwards Hypothesis, Skilled Artisans Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In Combining Any Of The References And Arriving At The Claimed Inventions.....	35
(ii)	Boehringer Fails To Establish That The Differences Between Claim 1 And The Edwards 1998 Hypothesis Would Have Been Bridged By Combination With Any Other References.....	36
(a)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of O'Dell (Ex. 1003)	36
(b)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of Pincus (Ex. 1008).....	38
(c)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of Kalden (Ex. 1020).....	40
(d)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of (O'Dell or Pincus or Kalden) and The Rituxan® Label (Ex. 1006)	41
(e)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of (O'Dell or Pincus or Kalden) and Maloney (Ex. 1023).....	42

(iii)	Boehringer Fails To Establish That The Differences Between Claim 2 And The Edwards 1998 Hypothesis Would Have Been Bridged By Combination With Any References.....	43
(iv)	Boehringer Fails To Establish That The Differences Between Claim 3 And The Edwards 1998 Hypothesis Would Have Been Bridged By Combination With Any References.....	44
(a)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of Verhoeven (Ex. 1016)	47
(b)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of Kavanaugh (Ex. 1019).....	49
(c)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of Boers (Ex. 1022)	50
(v)	Boehringer Fails To Establish That The Differences Between Claim 4 And The Edwards 1998 Hypothesis Would Have Been Bridged By Combination With Any References.....	52
(a)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of (O'Dell or Pincus or Kalden) And The Rituxan® Label (Ex. 1006).....	52
(b)	Edwards 1998 Hypothesis In View Of (O'Dell or Pincus or Kalden) and Tobinai (Ex. 1013).....	53
(vi)	Boehringer's "Prior Art Combinations" For Claims 5-12 Fail For At Least The Same Reasons They Fail For Claims 1-4.	54

B.	Boehringer Fails To Rebut The Record Evidence Of Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness.	54
1.	The Claimed Treatment Addresses A Long-Felt Need For A New Way To Treat RA, And Enjoys Significant Commercial Success.	55
2.	The Claimed Treatment Produces Unexpected Results.	56
V.	CONCLUSION.....	60

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.