

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 IPR2017-01374
U.S. Patent No. 6,407,213

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO STRIKE
PURSUANT TO PAPER NO. 57**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PETITIONER'S EVOLVING INVALIDITY ARGUMENTS	2
III. PETITIONER'S NEW ARGUMENTS ARE FORECLOSED BY FEDERAL CIRCUIT PRECEDENT, STATUTE, AND THE BOARD'S REGULATIONS.....	3
A. Applicable Law	3
B. Petitioner's Reliance on Foote 1989 is Improper.....	4
1. Petitioner's arguments and testimony regarding Foote 1989 present a new theory of unpatentability	4
2. The prejudice to Patent Owner outweighs any marginal relevance of Foote 1989 to unexpected results.....	5
3. Petitioner Should Have Been Aware of Foote 1989 at the Time the Petition Was Filed.....	7
IV. CONCLUSION.....	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. e-Watch Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00412, Paper 50 (PTAB May 6, 2016)	4, 9
<i>Cox Comms., Inc. v. AT&T Intellectual Prop. II, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01187, Paper 59 (PTAB Nov. 15, 2016).....	5
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litigation</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7
<i>Dexcom, Inc. v. Waveform Techs, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01679, Paper 53 (PTAB Feb. 28, 2018).....	4
<i>Intelligent-BioSystems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4
<i>Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Cont'l Auto. Sys., Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	4, 7
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)	4
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	7
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 42.23 (b)	3, 4
<i>Patent Trial Practice Guide</i> , 77 Fed. Reg. 48,612, 48,620 (Aug. 14, 2012)	3

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Paper No. 57, Patent Owner files this motion to strike evidence and argument pertaining to Petitioner's new obviousness theory that a new exhibit, Foote 1989 (Ex. 1193) discloses using a "consensus" sequence as described in claims of the '213 patent. Specifically, Patent Owner seeks to strike Exhibit 1193 and the arguments and testimony that rely on this exhibit, including the first full paragraph of page 18 of the Reply, Ex. 1143 ¶30, and Ex. 1138 at 176:25 to 178:23.

Petitioner chose to file a copycat petition based on the petition filed by Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. in IPR2016-01693 (the "Mylan IPR"). (*Compare Paper 2 with Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, IPR2016-01693 (Paper 1).) In doing so, Petitioner's experts submitted nearly word-for-word copies of the analysis for the proposed grounds in the declarations from the Mylan IPR. (*See* Ex. 2062 (redline comparing Dr. Riechmann's declaration with Mylan's expert's declaration); Ex. 1004 at ¶4 (Dr. Leonard stating he repeated the statements of Mylan's expert and "revised only as necessary.")) Having made that strategic choice, Petitioner should not now be permitted to deviate from the arguments made in the Petition and shoehorn in a new reference to support its obviousness case and better suit its experts here.

Petitioner's new evidence and argument principally relies on Exhibit 1193 ("Foote 1989")—a publication titled "Humanized Antibodies" authored by Jefferson Foote, the petitioners' expert in the companion cases brought by Pfizer. As set forth in more detail below, Foote 1989 was submitted by Petitioner in reply to backdoor in a new ground for unpatentability and fill in the gaps in its *prima facie* case. Petitioner has no excuse for failing to identify Foote 1989 in the Petition because its own expert, Dr. Riechmann, now claims that Foote 1989 discloses a consensus sequence that Dr. Riechmann himself used in his own work. Patent Owner therefore respectfully requests that the Board grant its motion to strike.

II. PETITIONER'S EVOLVING INVALIDITY ARGUMENTS.

Claims 4, 33, 62, 64, and 69 require the use of a "consensus" sequence. The '213 patent provides a specific definition of the claimed human "consensus" sequence, "which comprises the most frequently occurring amino acid residues at each location in all human immunoglobulins of any particular subclass or subunit structure." (Ex. 1001, 11:32-38; Paper 15 at 7-8.) The Petition argued that the "consensus" limitation was met by Queen 1990's (Ex. 1050) disclosure of "us[ing] a consensus framework from many human antibodies." (*See, e.g.*, Paper 2 at 34-36, 42-45, 47, 58.) Although Dr. Riechmann's declaration describes his work on humanizing an anti-body called CAMPATH-1, that discussion (i) is not mentioned

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.