

Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude

Filed on behalf of Patent Owner Genentech, Inc. by:

David L. Cavanaugh (Reg. No. 36,476)  
Lauren V. Blakely (Reg. No. 70,247)  
Robert J. Gunther, Jr. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Lisa J. Pirozzolo (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Kevin S. Prussia (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Andrew J. Danford (*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

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

CELLTRION, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01373  
U.S. Patent No. 6,407,213

---

**PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO  
PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
I. PATENT OWNER'S ANTEDATION EVIDENCE IS ADMISSIBLE.....	1
A. Exhibits 2001-2009 Are Properly Authenticated And Are Accurate Copies Of Patent Owner's Official Records.....	1
1. Exhibits 2001-2009 are properly authenticated.....	1
2. Petitioner's best evidence objection is baseless.....	2
B. The Lab Notebooks (Exhibits 2001-2009) Are Properly Admitted As Business Records Under Rules 902(11) And 803(6). ....	6
C. Exhibits 2014 And 2015 Are Properly Admitted.....	9
D. Dr. Carter's, Dr. Presta's, And Mr. Brady's Testimony Is Properly Admitted (Exhibits 2016-2018).....	10
II. PETITIONER'S RELEVANCE ARGUMENTS FAIL.....	11
III. PETITIONER'S REMAINING CHALLENGES ARE WITHOUT MERIT.....	13
A. Exhibits 2055 And 2061 Are Admissible. ....	13
B. Exhibit 2029 Is Admissible. ....	13
C. Exhibit 2062 Is Admissible. ....	14
D. Exhibit 2041 Is Admissible. ....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Actelion Pharms. Ltd. v. ICOS Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00561, Paper 50 (Aug. 3, 2016) .....	11
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369, Paper 40 (June 17, 2016) .....	11
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc., v. Delta Resins &amp; Refractories, Inc.</i> , 776 F.2d 281 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	12
<i>Bouygues Telecom, S.A. v. Tekelec</i> , 472 F. Supp. 2d 722 (E.D.N.C. 2007) .....	14
<i>Dura Auto. Sys. of Indiana, Inc. v. CTS Corp.</i> , 285 F.3d 609 (7th Cir. 2002) .....	14
<i>Knorr v. Pearson</i> , 671 F.2d 1368 (C.C.P.A. 1982) .....	8, 10
<i>LG Chem, Ltd. v. Celgard</i> , LLC, IPR2014-00692, Paper 76 (Oct. 5, 2015) .....	10, 11
<i>United States v. Franks</i> , 939 F.2d 600 (8th Cir. 1991).....	7
<i>United States v. Komsa</i> , 767 F.3d 151 (2d Cir. 2014) .....	7
<i>United States v. Reyes</i> , 157 F.3d 949 (2d Cir. 1998).....	7
<b>Statutes, Rules, and Regulations</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....	10
37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).....	3
Fed. R. Evid. 803(6).....	<i>passim</i>
Fed. R. Evid. 807 .....	14
Fed. R. Evid. 901 .....	<i>passim</i>
Fed. R. Evid. 1002 .....	2, 3

Patent Owner’s Opposition to Petitioner’s Motion to Exclude

Fed. R. Evid. 1003 .....3

*Patent Trial Practice Guide*, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....3, 8, 15

**Treatises**

30B Fed. Prac. & Proc. Evid. § 6862 (2018 ed.) .....7

1 Weinstein’s Evidence Manual § 9.02 (2018) .....4

1 Weinstein’s Evidence Manual § 16.07 (2018) .....7

**I. PATENT OWNER'S ANTEDATION EVIDENCE IS ADMISSIBLE.****A. Exhibits 2001-2009 Are Properly Authenticated And Are Accurate Copies Of Patent Owner's Official Records.***1. Exhibits 2001-2009 are properly authenticated.*

The core of Petitioner's objection is that Exhibits 2001 to 2009 are copies of Patent Owner's lab notebooks and there is a second set of copies of those lab notebooks not in evidence. But the existence of a second copy of the underlying notebooks in the form of a microfilm is not a basis to exclude the high-resolution color scans submitted as Exhibits 2001-2009. As explained by Patent Owner's records custodian, Ms. Loeffler, the original lab notebooks are Genentech's official record of the research (Ex. 1141 at 42:22-25), and Exhibits 2001-2009 are copies of the original notebooks (Ex. 2019, ¶4). The microfilms are also copies of the original notebooks and exist for "disaster recovery" purposes. (Ex. 1141 at 42:13-21.) But that does not make a high-resolution, color scan of the same notebook inadmissible. Indeed, Ms. Loeffler testified that Genentech uses the color scans for the same purpose as the microfilms. (*Id.* at 42:16-43:13.)

Specifically, Petitioner argues that Patent Owner has not authenticated Exhibits 2001-2006 because the authors of those lab notebooks could not definitively say which copy was submitted—a microfilm copy or a high-resolution scan copy. (Paper 63 at 2-3.) As an initial matter, the authors' inability to identify whether the exhibits were the microfilmed notebooks or the scans only proves that

# 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.