

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CELLTRION, INC.
Petitioner,
v.

GENENTECH, INC.
Patent Owner.

IPR2017-01374
U.S. 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 (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	1
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
C. Identification of Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)) and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	2
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING AND PROCEDURAL STATEMENT	2
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE AND STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	3
V. STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE RELIEF REQUESTED	5
A. Summary of the Argument.....	5
B. '213 Patent—Background	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. EP 0403156 (“Kurrle”) [Ex. 1071]	16
2. Queen 1990 [Ex. 1050]	17
3. Furey [Ex. 1125]	20
4. Chothia & Lesk [Ex. 1062]	21
5. Chothia 1985 [Ex. 1063].....	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. Ground 1: Claims 1, 2, 25, 29, 63, 66, 71, 75, 76, 78, 80 and 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	27
3. Independent Claim 63 is Anticipated by Kurrle	28
4. Independent Claim 66 and Dependent Claims 71, 72, 75 and 76 are Anticipated by Kurrle.....	29
5. Independent Claim 80 and Dependent Claim 81 Are Anticipated by Kurrle	30
H. Ground 2: Claims 1, 2, 4, 29, 62, 63, 64, 80 and 81 are Anticipated by Queen 1990.....	31
1. Independent Claim 1 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	31
2. Queen 1990 Anticipates Dependent Claims 2, 4 and 29	33
3. Independent Claim 62 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	34
4. Independent Claim 63 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	35
5. Independent Claim 64 is Anticipated by Queen 1990	36
6. Claims 80 and 81 are Anticipated by Queen 1990	37
I. Ground 3: Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62–64, 66–67, 69, 80 and 81 Are Unpatentable As Obvious over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	38
1. Claim 1 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	38
2. Claims 2, 25 and 29 are Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	41
3. Claim 4 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	42
4. Claim 62 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	43
5. Claim 63 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	43
6. Claim 64 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	44
7. Claim 66 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	45
8. Claims 67, 71, 72, 75, 76 and 78 are Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle	46
9. Claim 69 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	47
10. Claims 80 and 81 are Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle ..	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
J. Ground 4: Claim 12 Is Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle, in View of Furey	49
K. Ground 5: Claims 73, 74, 77, 79, and 65 are Obvious Over Queen 1990 and Kurrle, In View of Chothia & Lesk and Chothia 1985	50
L. Ground 6: Claims 30, 31 and 33 Are Obvious Over Queen 1990 in View of Hudziak	54
M. Ground 7: Claim 42 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 in view of Furey and Hudziak.....	59
N. Ground 8: Claim 60 is Obvious Over Queen 1990 In view of Chothia & Lesk and Hudziak.....	59
O. Secondary Considerations Cannot Preclude Obviousness.....	60
1. The Methods Recited in the '213 Patent Produced No Relevant Unexpected Results.....	61
2. The '213 Patent Satisfied No Long-Felt But Unmet Need.....	62
3. No nexus/commercial success to Herceptin.	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Adair v. Carter,
101 U.S.P.Q.2d 1625 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 12

Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.,
190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 28, 30, 35, 48

Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. BenVenue Labs, Inc.,
246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 28, 35, 43, 53

Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC v. Lee,
136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)..... 13

Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.,
91 F.3d 169 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 14

Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA,
395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 60

Norgren Inc. v. ITC,
699 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 62

In re PepperBall Techs., Inc.,
469 F. App'x 878 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 62

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 60

Ex Parte Takeshi Shimono,
Appeal 2013-003410 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 29, 2015) 60

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102 3

35 U.S.C. § 103 3

35 U.S.C. § 112 13

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.