UNITED ST	TATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OI	FFICE
BEFORE T	THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BO	ARD
M	IYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC. Petitioner, v.	
	GENENTECH, INC. Patent Owner.	
	Patent No. 6,407,213	

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page
I.	INT	RODU	CTION	1
II.	MA	NDAT	ORY NOTICES	1
	A.	Real	Parties-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	1
	B.	Rela	ted Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))	2
	C.		tification of Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and ice Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	2
III.	GRO	OUNDS	S FOR STANDING AND PROCEDURAL STATEMENT	2
IV.			CATION OF CHALLENGE AND STATEMENT OF THE RELIEF REQUESTED	2
V.	THE	RESHO	OLD REQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW	4
VI.	STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED			
	A.		mary of the Argument	
	B.	'213	PatentBackground	7
		1.	The '213 Patent	7
		2.	Brief Overview of the '213 Patent's Prosecution History and Related Proceedings in the PTO	10
	C.	Leve	el of Ordinary Skill in the Art	11
	D.	Clair	m Construction	13
	E.	Pater	nts and Printed Publications Relied On In This Petition	16
		1.	EP 0403156 ("Kurrle") [Ex. 1071]	16
		2.	Queen 1990 [Ex. 1050]	18
		3.	Furey [Ex. 1125]	20
		4.	Chothia & Lesk [Ex. 1062]	21
		5.	Chothia 1985 [Ex. 1063]	21
		6.	Hudziak [Ex. 1021]	22
	F.	The	Prior Art Renders The Challenged Claims Obvious	23



TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

			Page
	1.	Detailed Instructions for Humanizing Antibodies Were Widely Available Before the '213 Patent Filing	23
G.		und 1: Claims 1, 2, 25, 29, 63, 66, 71, 75, 76, 78, 80 81 Are Unpatentable As Anticipated By Kurrle	25
	1.	Independent Claim 1 is Anticipated by Kurrle	25
	2.	Kurrle Anticipates Dependent Claims 2, 25 and 29	26
	3.	Independent Claim 63 is Anticipated by Kurrle	27
	4.	Independent Claim 66 and Dependent Claims 71, 72, 75 and 76 are Anticipated by Kurrle	28
	5.	Independent Claim 80 and Dependent Claim 81 Are Anticipated by Kurrle	29
H.		und 2: Claims 1, 2, 4, 29, 62, 63, 64, 65, 80 and 81 are icipated by Queen 1990	30
	1.	Independent Claim 1 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	30
	2.	Queen 1990 Anticipates Dependent Claims 2, 4 and 29	32
	3.	Independent Claim 62 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	33
	4.	Independent Claim 63 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	34
	5.	Independent Claim 64 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	34
	6.	Claims 80 and 81 are Anticipated by Queen 1990	36
	7.	Dependent Claim 65 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	37
I.		und 3: Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-67, 69, 80 and 81 Unpatentable As Obvious over Queen 1990 and	
		rle	37
	1.	Claim 1 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	37
	2.	Claims 2, 25 and 29 are Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	40
	3.	Claim 4 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	41
	4.	Claim 62 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	41
	5.	Claim 63 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	42



TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

			Page
	6.	Claim 64 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	42
	7.	Claim 65 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	43
	8.	Claim 66 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	44
	9.	Claims 67, 71, 72, 75, 76 and 78 are Obvious Over Queen 1990, and Kurrle	45
	10.	Claim 69 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	46
	11.	Claims 80 and 81 are Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	46
J.		and 4: Claim 12 Is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and ele, In View of Furey	48
K.	Que	and 5: Claims 73, 74, 77 and 79 are Obvious Over en 1990 and Kurrle, In View of Chothia & Lesk and thia 1985	49
L.		and 6: Claims 30, 31 and 33 Are Obvious Over Queen In View of Hudziak	51
M.		and 7: Claim 42 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 in view arey and Hudziak	56
N.	Ground 8: Claim 60 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 In view of Chothia & Lesk and Hudziak		57
O.	Seco	ondary Considerations Cannot Preclude Obviousness	57
	1.	The Methods Recited in the '213 Patent Produced No Relevant Unexpected Results.	
	2.	The '213 Patent Satisfied No Long-Felt But Unmet Need	
	3.	No nexus/commercial success to Herceptin	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>P</u>	age(s)
CASES	
Adair v. Carter, 101 U.S.P.Q.2d 1625 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	11
Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 27, 29,	34, 47
Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co., 91 F.3d 169 (Fed.Cir. 1996)	14
Ex Parte Takeshi Shimono, Appeal 2013-003410 (PTAB Apr. 29, 2015)	58
In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	
In re PepperBall Techs., Inc., 469 F. App'x 878 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	59
Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	58
Norgren Inc. v. ITC, 699 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	59
Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	58
Torrent Pharms. Ltd. v. Novartis AG, IPR2014-00784 (PTAB Sep. 24, 2015)	58
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103	2
35 U.S.C. § 112	13
35 U.S.C. § 135(b)(1)	11
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	4
RULES	
37 C.F.R. § 42	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(c)	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	2
37 C F R 8 42 8(b)(3)	2.



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

