

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 IPR2016-01694  
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 .....	5
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. Queen 1989 .....	12
B. Queen 1990.....	13
C. PDB Database.....	15
D. Tramontano.....	15
E. Kabat 1987.....	16
F. Hudziak .....	17
V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL .....	17
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	18
VII. ARGUMENT.....	19
A. The Board Should Deny Grounds 2, 3, 4, And 7 Because Neither Queen 1990 Nor Tramontano Is Prior Art.....	19

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.....	26
(ii)	First humanized 4D5 full length antibody.....	28
(iii)	Other humanized 4D5 variants.....	30
2.	The challenged claims were reduced to practice before July 26, 1990.....	31
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. ....	39
3.	Queen 1990 and Tramontano are not prior art.....	40
a)	Limitations common to all claims.....	41
b)	Additional limitations for certain claims.....	41
B.	Mylan's Proposed Grounds Fail On The Merits.....	43

1.	Grounds 1, 3, 5, and 6: Queen 1989 in view of the PDB database does not render the challenged claims obvious. ....	44
a)	Queen 1989 contradicts Mylan's obviousness theory.....	44
b)	Queen 1989 does not disclose or suggest substituting residues within about 3 angstroms of a CDR.....	45
c)	Mylan's proposed combination of Queen 1989 with the PDB database results in a broad genus that would not have led to the claimed substitutions. ....	46
2.	Grounds 2, 4, and 7: Queen 1990 in view of the PDB database does not render the challenged claims obvious.....	48
a)	Queen 1990 contradicts Mylan's obviousness theory.....	48
b)	Mylan's proposed combination of Queen 1990 with the PDB database results in a broad genus that would not have led to the claimed substitutions. ....	50
3.	Grounds 1 and 2: Queen 1989 and Queen 1990 do not render obvious claims 63 and 65.....	51
a)	Claim 63: "Lacks immunogenicity" .....	51
b)	Claim 65: "Up to 3-fold more" binding affinity .....	52
(i)	Queen 1990.....	53
(ii)	Queen 1989.....	53
4.	Grounds 2, 5, and 7: Mylan's asserted references do not render obvious the "consensus" sequence limitations of claims 4, 33, 62, 64, and 69. ....	54
a)	Grounds 2 and 7: Queen 1990 does not render obvious the "consensus" sequence claimed in the '213 patent.....	55

b)	Ground 5: Queen 1989 in view of Kabat 1987 does not render obvious the “consensus” sequence claimed in the ’213 patent. ....	57
5.	Grounds 3 and 4: Claims 75-77 and 79 would not have been obvious in view of Mylan’s proposed combinations. ....	59
a)	Claim 75 .....	59
b)	Claims 76-77 and 79 .....	61
6.	Grounds 6 and 7: Claims 30, 31, 33, 42, and 60 would not have been obvious in view of Mylan’s proposed combinations. ....	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.