

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CELLTRION, INC.
Petitioner,
v.

GENENTECH, INC.
Patent Owner.

IPR2017-01373
Patent No. 6,407,213

Title: METHOD FOR MAKING HUMANIZED ANTIBODIES

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,407,213 B1**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES	1
A. Real Parties-In-Interest.....	1
B. Related Matters.....	1
C. Identification of Counsel and Service Information.....	2
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING AND PROCEDURAL STATEMENT	2
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	2
V. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED	4
A. Summary of the Argument.....	4
B. Background of the '213 Patent.....	8
1. The '213 Patent.....	8
2. Brief Overview of the '213 Patent's Prosecution History and Related PTO Proceedings	11
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	12
D. Claim Construction	13
E. Patents and Printed Publications Relied On In This Petition.....	15
1. Queen 1989 [Ex. 1034].....	16
2. Queen 1990 [Ex. 1050].....	17
3. Protein Data Bank (PDB) Database.....	19
4. Tramontano [Ex. 1051].....	22
5. Kabat 1987 [Ex. 1052].....	22
6. Hudziak [Ex. 1021].....	23
F. The Prior Art Renders the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	24
1. Detailed Instructions for Humanizing Antibodies Were Widely Available Before the '213 Patent Filing	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
G. Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29, 62–67 and 71–81 Are Unpatentable as Obvious Over Queen 1989 or Queen 1990, in View of the PDB Database	26
1. Ground 1: Claim 1 is Obvious Over Queen 1989, in View of the PDB Database	26
2. Ground 2: Claim 1 is Obvious over Queen 1990, in view of the PDB Database	32
3. Grounds 1 and 2: Dependent Claims 2, 12, 25 and 29 Are Obvious Over Queen 1989 and the PDB Database or Queen 1990 and the PDB Database	35
4. Ground 2: Dependent Claim 4 Is Obvious in View of Queen 1990 and PDB Database	36
5. Grounds 1, 2: Independent Claims 62–64 and 66 Are Obvious Over Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and PDB Database	37
6. Grounds 1, 2: Dependent Claims 67, 71–74 and 78 Are Obvious Given Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and PDB Database	41
7. Grounds 1, 2: Dependent Claims 75–77 and 79 Are Obvious in View of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and PDB Database	43
8. Grounds 1 and 2: Dependent Claim 65 Is Obvious in View of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and the PDB Database	47
9. Grounds 1, 2: Independent Claim 80 and Dependent Claim 81 Are Obvious in View of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and PDB Database	48
H. Grounds 3 and 4: Claims 75–77, 79 and 65 Are Unpatentable As Obvious over Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and PDB Database and Further in View of Tramontano	49
I. Ground 5: Claims 4, 62, 64 and 69 are obvious in view of Queen 1989 and the PDB database, and further in view of Kabat 1987	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
J. Grounds 6 and 7: Claims 30, 31, 33, 42 and 60 Are Obvious in View of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990; PDB database; and Hudziak.....	52
K. Secondary Considerations Cannot Overcome Obviousness.	57
1. The Methods Recited in the '213 Patent Produced No Relevant Unexpected Results.	58
2. The '213 Patent Satisfied No Long-Felt But Unmet Need.....	59
3. No nexus/commercial success with respect to Herceptin.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Adair v. Carter</i> , 101 U.S.P.Q.2d 1625 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	12
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	38
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. BenVenue Labs, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	37, 47
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	13
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.</i> , 91 F.3d 169 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	14
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	20
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	57
<i>Norgren Inc. v. ITC</i> , 699 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	59
<i>In re PepperBall Techs., Inc.</i> , 469 F. App'x 878 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	59
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	57
<i>Ex Parte Takeshi Shimono</i> , Appeal 2013-003410 (PTAB Apr. 29, 2015)	58
<i>In re Wyer</i> , 655 F.2d 221 (C.C.P.A. 1981)	20

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.