

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.  
Petitioner

v.

GENENTECH, INC. AND CITY OF HOPE  
Patent Owners

---

U.S. Patent No. 6,331,415

“Methods of Producing Immunoglobulins, Vectors and  
Transformed Host Cells for Use Therein”

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. 2016-01373

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,331,415  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100 *et seq.***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '415 PATENT .....	4
A.	The '415 Patent Specification .....	4
B.	The Challenged Claims .....	6
C.	Construction Of The Challenged Claims .....	7
D.	The Prosecution History Of The '415 Patent.....	7
1.	Interference With The Boss Patent .....	8
2.	Ex Parte Reexamination Of The '415 Patent.....	8
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	11
IV.	IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)).....	12
V.	THE PRIOR ART .....	13
A.	The State Of The Prior Art.....	13
1.	Recombinant DNA Technology Was Well Understood Prior To April 1983.....	13
2.	The Actual “Prevailing Mindset” In 1983 Was That Recombinant DNA Technology Could Be Used To Produce Multiple Proteins Of Interest In A Single Host Cell .....	16
3.	The Techniques For <i>In Vitro</i> Recovery And Reconstitution Of Complex Eukaryotic Proteins Were Well-Known In The Prior Art.....	20
4.	By April 1983, The Limitations Of Hybridoma Technology Were Well-Known.....	22
B.	Overview Of The Cited Prior Art.....	23

1.	The Axel Patent Teaches That Antibodies Can Be Recombinantly Expressed In Eukaryotic Host Cells.....	23
2.	The Mulligan Papers Disclose An Improved Vector That Expresses Multiple Genes Of Interest And That Is Useful In A Wide Variety Of Eukaryotic Host Cells.....	27
3.	Prof. Berg’s Nobel Article Explicitly Teaches The Expression of Multiple, Different Genes Of Interest From A Single Vector In A Single Host Cell.....	31
4.	Southern Discloses A Two Vector System With Distinct Selectable Markers.....	32
5.	The Builder Patent Discloses Techniques For <i>In Vitro</i> Recovery And Reconstitution Of Recombinantly Expressed Proteins.....	35
C.	Near Simultaneous Invention Of The Claimed Invention By Three Research Groups Working Independently.....	36
VI.	EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)).....	38
A.	Ground 1: The Mulligan Papers Combined With The Axel Patent Render Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, 19, And 33 Of The ’415 Patent Obvious.....	38
B.	Ground 2: The Mulligan Papers Combined With the Axel Patent In Further View Of The Nobel Article Render Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, 19, And 33 Of The ’415 Patent Obvious.....	48
C.	Ground 3: The Mulligan Papers Combined With The Axel Patent In Further View Of The Builder Patent Render Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, 19, And 33 Of The ’415 Patent Obvious.....	49
D.	Ground 4: Southern Combined With The Axel Patent Render Claims 1-2, 11-12, 14, 18-20 And 33 Of The ’415 Patent Obvious.....	51
E.	Ground 5: Southern Combined With The Axel Patent In Further View Of The Builder Patent Render Claims 1-2, 11-12, 14, 18-20 And 33 Of The ’415 Patent Obvious.....	54

F.	The Near Simultaneous Invention Of The Claimed Subject Matter By Three Separate Research Groups Supports A Finding Of Obviousness .....	55
G.	Secondary Considerations Do Not Support A Finding Of Non-Obviousness.....	56
1.	Licensing Does Not Support Non-Obviousness .....	56
2.	Commercial Success Does Not Support Non-Obviousness .....	57
3.	There Was No Skepticism That Antibodies Could Be Produced Recombinantly .....	58
H.	This Petition Is Not Duplicative Of Other IPRs Or Of Previous Arguments Presented During Prosecution .....	59
VII.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8) .....	62
A.	Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	62
B.	Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) .....	62
C.	Lead and BackUp Counsel and Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)-(4) .....	63
VIII.	IPR REQUIREMENTS (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.101, 42.104, and 42.108).....	64
A.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)) .....	64
IX.	PAYMENT OF FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a) AND § 42.103)) .....	64
X.	CONCLUSION.....	64

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>In re Applied Materials, Inc.</i> , 692 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	58
<i>Cabilly v. Boss</i> , 55 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1238 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1998) .....	8
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter &amp; Gamble Co., IPR2013-00505</i> , 2014 WL 1253037 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2014) .....	62
<i>EWP Corp. v. Reliance Universal, Inc.</i> , 755 F.2d 898 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	57
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	55
<i>Geneva Pharms., Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC</i> , 349 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	62
<i>Geo M Martin Co. v. All Mach. Sys. Int’l LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	55
<i>HTC Corp. v. NFC Tech., LLC</i> IPR2015-00384, Paper 11 at 9-11 .....	59
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	57
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	42, 43, 45
<i>In re Kemps</i> , 97 F.3d 1427 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	42
<i>Leapfrog Enters., Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.</i> , 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	41
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC</i> IPR2015-00483, Paper 10 at 15 (Jul. 15, 2015) .....	61
<i>Petroleum Geo-Services Inc. v. WesternGeco LLC</i> , IPR2015-01478, 2015 WL 1276718 (PTAB Mar. 17, 2015).....	56
<i>Pharmastem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	41
<i>Research in Motion Corp. v. WI-LAN USA, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00126, 2013 WL 8563788 (PTAB June 20, 2013).....	61

# 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.