### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Control Nos.: 90/007,542 Group Art Unit: 3991

90/007,859

Confirmation Nos.: 7585 ('542) Examiner: B.M. Celsa

6447 ('859)

Filed: 13 May 2005 ('542)

23 December 2005 ('859)

Patent Owner: Genentech, Inc. and

City of Hope

For: Merged Reexaminations of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,415 (Cabilly et al.)

## RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.550(b)

Mail Stop Ex Parte Reexam COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication responds to the final Office action mailed February 16, 2007, setting a two-month period for response. Owners timely requested an extension of time to respond under 37 C.F.R. § 1.550(c), and in a Decision dated March 21, 2007, the Office granted an extension to May 21, 2007. As this reply is filed within the extended period for response, it is timely.

We believe that no fee is required for this response. Should any fee be required for entry or consideration of this paper, the Director is requested to charge the appropriate amount to our Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Patent Owners ("Owners") respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Copied from 90007859 on 06/23/2007

Sanofi/Regeneron Ex. 1010, pg 310



### **REMARKS**

l.	PR	ELIM	IINARY MATTERS	. 5				
	A.	INTE	RVIEW SUMMARY	. 5				
	B.	DEC	SION ON PETITION	. 5				
	C.	Info	RMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS	. 5				
	D.	With	IDRAWN REJECTIONS	. 5				
	E.	STAT	US OF LITIGATION INVOLVING THE '415 PATENT	. 6				
II. OVERVIEW OF OWNERS' RESPONSE TO NEW REJECTIONS IN FEBRUARY 2007 ACTION								
111.	THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7, 9-10, 14-18, 21, AND 23-36 AS ANTICIPATED BY THE MOORE '545 PATENT IS IMPROPER AND SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN							
	A.		AL STANDARDS GOVERNING THE EFFECTIVE DATE FOR § 102(E) PRIOR ART OF THE MOORE '545	. 8				
	B.	EFFE U.S.	WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THE '414 APPLICATION – THE ONLY APPLICATION FILED PRIOR TO THE CTIVE DATE OF THE '415 PATENT TO WHICH THE MOORE '545 PATENT CLAIMS BENEFIT UNDER 35 C. § 120 – DOES NOT DESCRIBE CO-EXPRESSION OF HEAVY AND LIGHT CHAIN POLYPEPTIDES IN HOST CELL	10				
	C.		OFFICE IS INCORRECTLY INTERPRETING THE CLAIMS OF THE '545 PATENT AS REQUIRING CO- RESSION OF HEAVY AND LIGHT CHAINS IN ONE HOST CELL	14				
	D.		THER EXPERT INDEPENDENTLY CONCLUDED IN 1996 THAT THE SPECIFICATION OF THE '545 PATENT S NOT DESCRIBE CO-EXPRESSION	17				
	E.		'545 PATENT – TO THE LIMITED EXTENT IT CONSTITUTES PRIOR ART – DOES NOT ANTICIPATE THE PATENT CLAIMS.	19				
IV.		HE REJECTION OF CLAIMS BASED ON OBVIOUSNESS PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) IS MPROPER20						
V.	TH	E RE	JECTIONS BASED ON OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING ARE IMPROPER	22				
	A.	SUMI	MARY OF THE FOUR GROUNDS OF REJECTION FOR OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING	22				
	B. GENERAL ISSUES REGARDING THE OFFICE'S MULTIPLE BASES FOR		ERAL ISSUES REGARDING THE OFFICE'S MULTIPLE BASES FOR OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE	23				
		<i>1.</i> (	Overview of Legal Standards of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	23				
			The Correct Perspective for Evaluating Prior Art is a Person of Ordinary Skill In the Art as of Early April of 1983, and the Declarations Submitted by Owners Provide This Perspective	26				
			The Office Ignores Distinctions Between the '567 and '415 Patent Claims Due to an Improper and Incorrect Reading of the '567 Claims and Specification	28				
		(	The Office Improperly Relies on the Disclosures of the '567 Patent and the Utility of Its Claims to Find a Suggestion or Motivation for Co-Expression Required by the '415 Patent Claims	30				
		:	a. The Disclosure and Teachings of the '567 Patent May Not Be Used to Hold the '415 Claims Unpatentable for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	30				
		1	b. The Office Continues to Erroneously Construe Terms In the '567 Claims and to Improperly Use the Patent Disclosure to Find "Motivation"	35				
			The Rationale of In re Keller and In re Merck & Co. Can Not Justify the Office's Failure to Consider Multiple Aspects of the Declarant Statements	38				
			The Office Has Improperly Relied on Testimony of an Interested Third Party, Rather Than Information In Patents or Printed Publications	40				

-2-








C.	THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7, 9-11, AND 13-36 FOR OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING (AT SECTIONS 4-6 OF THE OFFICE ACTION) MUST BE WITHDRAWN BECAUSE IT IS BASED PRIMARILY ON THE OFFICE'S MISUSE AND INCORRECT ANALYSIS OF THE MOORE '545 PATENT										
	ection of Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-18, 21, and 23-36 Is Improper, As It Can Not Be ed by the '545 Patent	43									
	2. Rejection of Claims 19-20 and 22 Is Not Supported by the Additional References Relied Upon by the Office										
D.	THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-36 BASED ON THE '567 CLAIMS, IN VIEW OF AXEL, RICE, OR KAPLAN, IN VIEW OF DALLAS, FURTHER IN VIEW OF DEACON, 1981 VALLE, OR OCHI, AND OPTIONALLY IN VIEW OF THE '545 PATENT IS IMPROPER										
	1.	Axel, Rice, and Kaplan, Considered Alone, Together, or In Combination with Dallas, Would Not Provide a Motivation or Suggestion to Modify the '567 Claims to Transform a Host Cell With, and to Express In That Cell, Exogenous DNA Sequences Encoding Both Light and Heavy Immunoglobulin Chains									
		a.		el Does Not Describe or Suggest Co-Expression of Heavy and Light Antibody Chains In One st Cell, or Production of Intact or Assembled Antibodies	49						
			i.	Clear and Convincing Evidence Supports Owners' Reading of Axel	51						
			ii.	The Presumption of Validity and Enablement Law are Not Implicated	54						
		b.		c Does Not Suggest Production of Exogenous Heavy and Light Chain Genes in a Single Host 1 55							
			i.	Rice Does Not Describe Co-expression of an Exogenous Heavy Chain and an Exogenous Light Chain Gene	57						
			ii.	Rice Would Not Be Viewed as Being Generally Extendable to Expression of Multiple Exogenous Genes in Lymphocytes or Other Host Cell Types	57						
			iii.	Dr. Baltimore's Views Do Not Address the Question of Obviousness							
				Conclusions Regarding Rice							
		c.		olan Does Not Teach or Suggest Co-Expression of Heavy and Light Chains in a Single Host	01						
		d.		las Would Not Have Provided Motivation to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art to Modify Procedures of the '567 Claims Taken in View of Axel, Rice, and/or Kaplan	63						
	2.	Sug	ggest	acon, Valle 1981, and Ochi References Would Not Provide a Further Motivation or ion to Produce an Immunoglobulin Molecule or Immunologically Functional nt Using the Claimed Processes and Methods.	65						
		a.	The	Teachings in Deacon and Valle 1981 Are Greatly Limited and Would Not Set Expectations							
			i.	A Xenopus Oocyte Is Not a "Host Cell" Let Alone a Transformed Host Cell	67						
									ii.	The Differences Between Translation of mRNA in a Xenopus Oocyte and Production of Immunoglobulin Chains by Transformed Host Cells Are Significant	68
			iii.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Have Extrapolated the Results Concerning Assembly of Immunoglobulins in Xenopus Oocyte mRNA Experiments to Transformed Host Cells	70						
			iv.	The Statements in the European Patent Office Opposition Proceedings Are Irrelevant and/or Inadmissable in the Present Reexamination Proceedings	71						
		b.		ni and Oi Would Not Have Set Expectations for Production of an Immunoglobulin from Host Is Transformed with Exogenous Heavy and Light Chain DNA	73						
E.	TH	E OF	FICE	S REJECTION OF THE DEPENDENT CLAIMS IS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE CITED REFERENCES	75						
	I.	Cla	im 5		75						
	<i>2</i> .	Claims 6-8, 19, 20, and 26									
	,	Obstance Once 120									

- 3 -







	4.	Claims 10 and 27-32	78
	<i>5</i> .	Claim 12	78
	6.	Claim 14	79
	7.	Claim 22	79
	8.	Claims 34-36	75
VI	CONC	LUSIONS	80

## Exhibit List to Response Filed Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.550(b)

- -Exhibit A: MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., No. 04-1300/04-1384 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 7, 2007) Order Remanding Case; MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., CV 03-2567 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 12, 2007) Order Setting the Status Conference
- -Exhibit B: U.S. Application No. 06/358,414
- -Exhibit C: Second Supplemental Examiner's Answer mailed January 11, 1996 for U.S. Application No. 08/165,530
- -Exhibit D: Declaration of Geoffrey T. Yarranton filed during prosecution of U.S. Application No. 08/165,530
- -Exhibit E: Office Action mailed May 30, 1997 for U.S. Application No. 08/165,530





### I. Preliminary Matters

### A. Interview Summary

Representatives of Owners participated in an interview with Examiners Celsa, Jones, and Ponnaluri on March 15, 2007. The interview summary form accurately reflects the subject of the discussions between Owners' representative and the representatives of the Office.

#### B. Decision on Petition

Owners filed a petition under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.181 and 1.182 on March 6, 2007, requesting that the Office declare a new reexamination or, in the alternative, withdraw the finality of the outstanding Office Action. In a decision mailed on March 21, 2007, the Office dismissed the petition on procedural grounds. The decision indicated the Owners could file a renewed petition under § 1.182 for a "Request for Continued Reexamination," in accord with the interim policies set forth in the notice regarding changes to reexamination practice published at 1292 Off. Gaz. Pat. & Trademark Office 20 (March 1, 2005). Concurrently with this response, Owners are filing a timely renewed petition under § 1.182, as suggested in the March 21, 2007 decision.

#### C. Information Disclosure Statements


Owners acknowledge the indication that the materials provided in the information disclosure statements filed on December 14, 2007 and January 16, 2007 have been fully considered. A further information disclosure statement accompanies this response.

Owners also note that the Office has determined that the disclosure in U.S. Patent No. 4,642,334 ("the '334 patent") is cumulative to that of U.S. Patent No. 5,840,545 ("the '545 patent"). See February Office Action, pp. 3-4. The '334 patent was considered during the examination of the application that matured into the patent under reexamination. Thus, the Office fully considered the substance of the '334 and '545 patent disclosures in connection with the original examination of the claims of the '415 patent.

### D. Withdrawn Rejections

Owners acknowledge and appreciate the decision of the Office to withdraw all previous grounds of rejection imposed on claims 1 to 36. In particular, the Office no longer is maintaining any rejection based on a determination that the term "or" as it appears in one or







# DOCKET

# 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.

