

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

David L. Cavanaugh
Reg. No. 36,476
Owen K. Allen
Reg. No. 71,118
Heather M. Petruzzi
Reg. No. 71,270
Robert J. Gunther, Jr.
Pro Hac Vice
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
Durie Tangri LLP
217 Leidesdorff Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

Michael R. Fleming
Reg. No. 67,933
David I. Gindler
Pro Hac Vice
Joseph M. Lipner
Pro Hac Vice
Irell & Manella LLP
1800 Avenue of the
Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA
90067

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC. AND CITY OF HOPE,
Patent Owners.

Case IPR2016-00710
Patent 6,331,415

PATENT OWNERS' RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	6
A. Proteins Vary In Size And Complexity.....	6
B. Prior Art Antibody Production Techniques	9
C. By April 1983, Recombinant Techniques Were Not Well Understood And Had Only Been Used To Make Simple Proteins.	10
D. As Of April 1983, Leading Scientists Were Uncertain Whether It Was Possible To Make Antibodies Recombinantly.....	13
III. THE '415 PATENT.....	18
A. The Invention.....	18
B. Industry Recognition	19
IV. PROCEDURAL HISTORY	20
V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	23
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
VII. ARGUMENT.....	23
A. Ground 1: Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 14, 19, And 33 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Bujard In View Of Riggs & Itakura.	23
1. Bujard does not suggest co-expression in a single host cell to produce antibodies.....	24
a) Summary of Bujard	24

b)	Bujard does not disclose any process for producing antibodies.	25
c)	Bujard does not disclose co-expressing multiple genes of interest in a single host cell.	30
(i)	Bujard's "multimers" do not refer to a multi-chain protein, such as an antibody.	30
(ii)	"One or more structural genes" includes selectable markers, and is not a disclosure of the heavy and light chains of an antibody.	33
(iii)	"A plurality of translational stop codons" efficiently terminates translation of a single gene.	36
(iv)	There was no "prevailing mindset" that multiple eukaryotic genes could be co-expressed in a single host cell.	37
d)	Mylan's remaining arguments about Bujard lack merit.	39
(i)	"One or more hosts for gene expression"	39
(ii)	"Prepared as a single unit or as individual subunits"	40
2.	Riggs & Itakura does not disclose the co-expression in a single host cell limitation absent from Bujard.	41
a)	Summary of Riggs & Itakura	42
b)	A person of ordinary skill would have had no reason to combine Bujard with Riggs & Itakura.	43
c)	Bujard combined with Riggs & Itakura would have led to a two host cell approach, not the single host cell invention of the challenged claims.	44
3.	The '415 invention was not obvious to try.	47

4.	A person of ordinary skill would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in extending Riggs & Itakura's techniques to antibodies.	49
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1, 2, 18, 20, And 33 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Bujard In View Of Southern.	52
1.	Bujard does not suggest co-expression in a single host cell to produce antibodies.	52
2.	Southern does not disclose or suggest the "single host cell" or the two vector limitations absent from Bujard.	53
a)	Summary of Southern.	54
b)	A person of ordinary skill would not have combined Bujard with Southern.	55
c)	Southern does not disclose including multiple "genes of interest" in separate vectors.	56
d)	Other publications confirm that a skilled artisan would not have applied Southern to express heavy and light chains from separate vectors in the same host cell.	60
3.	A skilled artisan would have had no reasonable expectation of success combining Bujard with Southern.	61
4.	Southern cannot invalidate claims 1, 2, and 33.	62
C.	Objective Indicia Confirm The Patentability Of The Challenged Claims.	62
VIII.	CONCLUSION.	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	47
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	46
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. AbbVie Biotechnology Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01514, Paper 9 (Jan. 14, 2015).....	27
<i>Apotex Inc. v. Merck Sharpe & Dohme Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00419, Paper 14 (June 25, 2015).....	27
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (en banc)	63
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	44
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. International Trade Commission</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	62
<i>InnoPharma Licensing, Inc. v. Senju Pharmaceutical Co.</i> , IPR2015-00902, Paper 90 (July 28, 2016)	62
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	64
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	46, 65
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	47
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Mylan Laboratories, Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	47

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.