

Filed on behalf of Patent Owner Genentech, Inc. by:

David L. Cavanaugh
Reg. No. 36,476
Owen K. Allen
Reg. No. 71,118
Robert J. Gunther, Jr.
Pro Hac Vice to be filed
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 to be filed
Durie Tangri LLP
217 Leidesdorff Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01693
Patent 6,407,213

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	4
A. Antibody “Variable” And “Constant” Domains	4
B. “Humanized” Antibodies	6
III. THE '213 PATENT	8
A. The Invention.....	8
B. Advantages Of The '213 Invention	10
C. Prosecution History.....	11
IV. MYLAN’S ASSERTED REFERENCES.....	12
A. Kurrle	12
B. Queen 1990.....	13
C. Furey	15
D. Chothia & Lesk.....	16
E. Chothia 1985	17
F. Hudziak	17
V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	18
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	18
VII. ARGUMENT.....	20
A. The Board Should Deny All Proposed Grounds Because Neither Kurrle Nor Queen 1990 Is Prior Art.....	20

1.	The inventors produced and tested humanized 4D5 antibodies using their consensus sequence approach before July 26, 1990.	20
a)	Consensus sequence.....	20
b)	Humanized 4D5 antibody sequences.....	22
c)	Production and testing of humanized 4D5 antibodies.....	25
(i)	First humanized 4D5 variable domain fragment.....	27
(ii)	First humanized 4D5 full length antibody.....	29
(iii)	Other humanized 4D5 variants.....	30
2.	The challenged claims were reduced to practice before July 26, 1990.....	32
a)	HuMAb4D5-5 and HuMAb4D5-8 embody the challenged claims.	32
(i)	Limitations common to all claims.....	32
(ii)	Additional limitations for certain claims.....	37
b)	The inventors determined that HuMAb4D5-5 and HuMAb4D5-8 would work for the intended purpose of the challenged claims before July 26, 1990.....	39
c)	Contemporaneous records from non-inventors corroborate the invention of the challenged claims.	40
3.	Kurrle and Queen 1990 are not prior art.....	40
a)	Limitations common to all claims.....	41
b)	Additional limitations for certain claims.....	42
B.	Mylan's Proposed Grounds Fail On The Merits.....	43

1.	Grounds 1, 2, and 3: Kurrle and Queen 1990 do not anticipate or render obvious the “lacks immunogenicity” limitation of claim 63.	45
2.	Grounds 2 and 3: Kurrle and Queen 1990 do not anticipate or render obvious the “up to 3-fold more” binding affinity limitation of claim 65.	46
3.	Grounds 2, 3, and 6: Mylan’s asserted references do not anticipate or render obvious the “consensus” limitations of claims 4, 33, 62, 64, and 69.	48
	a) Queen 1990.	48
	b) Kurrle.	50
	c) Hudziak.	50
4.	Ground 2: Queen 1990 does not anticipate the challenged claims.	51
5.	Grounds 3, 4, and 5: Mylan has failed to explain how or why a person of ordinary skill would combine Queen 1990 and Kurrle.	53
6.	Ground 3: The Board should deny Ground 3 as duplicative of Grounds 1 and 2.	54
7.	Ground 4: Claim 12 would not have been obvious over Queen 1990 and Kurrle in view of Furey.	55
8.	Ground 5: Claims 73, 74, 77, and 79 would not have been obvious over Queen 1990 and Kurrle in view of Chothia & Lesk and/or Chothia 1985.	57
	a) Claims 73 and 74.	57
	b) Claims 77 and 79.	59

9.	Ground 6: Queen 1990 would not have led a person of ordinary skill to make the substitutions required by claims 30, 31, 33, and 42.	60
10.	Ground 7: Claim 42 would not have been obvious over Queen 1990 in view of Furey and Hudziak.	62
11.	Ground 8: Claim 60 would not have been obvious over Queen 1990 in view of Chothia & Lesk and Hudziak.	62
C.	Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness Confirm The Patentability Of The Challenged Claims.	63
1.	Unexpected results.	63
2.	Commercial success.	65
VIII.	CONCLUSION	65

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.