

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CELLTRION, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01373
Patent 6,407,213 B1

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, ZHENYU YANG, and
ROBERT A. POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

YANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

INTRODUCTION

Celltrion, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29–31, 33, 42, 60, 62–67, 69, and 71–81 of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,213 B1 (“the ’213 patent,” Ex. 1001). Paper 2 (“Pet.”). Genentech, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) timely filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 9 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We review the Petition, Preliminary Response, and accompanying evidence under 35 U.S.C. § 314.

For the reasons provided below, we determine Petitioner has satisfied the threshold requirement set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Because Petitioner has established a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in showing the unpatentability of at least one challenged claims, we institute an *inter partes* review of the challenged claims.

Related Proceedings

Petitioner has concurrently filed IPR2017-01374, challenging the same claims of the ’213 patent based on different prior art references. Paper 3, 4.

The ’213 patent is the subject of IPR2016-01693 and IPR2016-01694, filed by Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. Paper 3, 4. Those two proceedings were terminated before institution due to settlement. *Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, IPR2016-01693 (PTAB March 10, 2017) (Paper 24); IPR2016-01694 (PTAB March 10, 2017) (Paper 23).

The ’213 patent is also the subject of the following pending matters: IPR2017-01488 and IPR2017-01489, brought by Pfizer, Inc.; IPR2017-02031 and IPR2017-02032 brought by Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; and IPR2017-02139 and IPR2017-02140, brought by Samsung Bioepis Co., Ltd.

The parties have identified no district court cases involving the '213 patent. We note, however, that the petitioner in IPR2017-01488 represents that the '213 Patent is at issue in *Amgen Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, No. 2-17-cv-07349 (C.D. Cal.); *Genentech, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.*, No. 1-17-cv-01407 (D. Del.); *Genentech, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.*, No. 1-17-cv-01471 (D. Del.). IPR2017-01488, Paper 16, 1. The parties are encouraged to update their mandatory disclosures.

The '213 Patent and Relevant Background

The '213 patent relates to “methods for the preparation and use of variant antibodies and finds application particularly in the fields of immunology and cancer diagnosis and therapy.” Ex. 1001, 1:12–14.

A naturally occurring antibody (immunoglobulin) comprises two heavy chains and two light chains. *Id.* at 1:18–20. Each heavy chain has a variable domain (V_H) and a number of constant domains. *Id.* at 1:21–23. Each light chain has a variable domain (V_L) and a constant domain. *Id.* at 1:23–24.

The variable domains are involved directly in binding the antibody to the antigen. *Id.* at 1:36–38. Each variable domain “comprises four framework (FR) regions, whose sequences are somewhat conserved, connected by three hyper-variable or complementarity determining regions (CDRs).” *Id.* at 1:40–43. The constant domains are not involved directly in binding the antibody to an antigen, but are involved in various effector functions. *Id.* at 1:33–34.

Before the '213 patent, monoclonal antibodies targeting a specific antigen, obtained from animals, such as mice, had been shown to be antigenic in human clinical use. *Id.* at 1:51–53. The '213 patent recognizes

efforts to construct chimeric antibodies and humanized antibodies in the prior art. *Id.* at 1:59–2:52. According to the ’213 patent, chimeric antibodies are “antibodies in which an animal antigen-binding variable domain is coupled to a human constant domain” (*id.* at 1:60–62), whereas “humanized antibodies are typically human antibodies in which some CDR residues and possibly some FR residues are substituted by residues from analogous sites in rodent antibodies” (*id.* at 2:32–35).

The ’213 patent also acknowledges the following as known in the prior art:

1. In certain cases, in order to transfer high antigen binding affinity, it is necessary to not only substitute CDRs, but also replace one or several FR residues from rodent antibodies for the human CDRs in human frameworks. *Id.* at 2:53–61.

2. “For a given antibody[,] a small number of FR residues are anticipated to be important for antigen binding” because they either directly contact antigen or “critically affect[] the conformation of particular CDRs and thus their contribution to antigen binding.” *Id.* at 2:62–3:8.

3. In a few instances, a variable domain “may contain glycosylation sites, and that this glycosylation may improve or abolish antigen binding.” *Id.* at 3:9–12.

4. The function of an antibody is dependent on its three-dimensional structure, and amino acid substitutions can change the three-dimensional structure of an antibody. *Id.* at 3:40–43.

5. The antigen binding affinity of a humanized antibody can be increased by mutagenesis based upon molecular modelling. *Id.* at 3:44–46.

Despite such knowledge in the field, according to the '213 patent, at the time of its invention, humanizing an antibody with retention of high affinity for antigen and other desired biological activities was difficult to achieve using then available procedures. *Id.* at 3:50–52. The '213 patent purportedly provides methods for rationalizing the selection of sites for substitution in preparing humanized antibodies and, thereby, increasing the efficiency of antibody humanization. *Id.* at 3:53–55.

Illustrative Claim

Among the challenged claims, claims 1, 30, 62–64, 66, 79, and 80 are independent. Claim 1 is illustrative and is reproduced below:

1. A humanized antibody variable domain comprising non-human Complementarity Determining Region (CDR) amino acid residues which bind an antigen incorporated into a human antibody variable domain, and further comprising a Framework Region (FR) amino acid substitution at a site selected from the group consisting of: 4L, 38L, 43L, 44L, 58L, 62L, 65L, 66L, 67L, 68L, 69L, 73L, 85L, 98L, 2H, 4H, 36H, 39H, 43H, 45H, 69H, 70H, 74H, and 92H, utilizing the numbering system set forth in Kabat.

Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

Petitioner asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

Claim(s)	Basis	Reference(s)
1, 2, 12, 25, 29, 63, 66, 67, and 71–81	§ 103	Queen 1989 ¹ and Protein Data Bank (PDB database)
1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29, 62–67, 69, and 71–81	§ 103	Queen 1990 ² and PDB database

¹ Queen et al., *A Humanized Antibody that Binds to the Interleukin 2 Receptor*, 86 PRO. NAT'L ACAD. SCI. 10029–33 (1989) (Ex. 1034).

² Queen et al., International Publication No. WO 90/07861 A1, published July 26, 1990 (Ex. 1050).

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.