

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the *Inter Partes* Review of:

Trial Number: To Be Assigned

U.S. Patent No. 6,407,213

Filed: November 17, 1993

Issued: June 18, 2002

Inventor(s): Paul J. Carter, Leonard G. Presta

Assignee: Genentech, Inc.

Title: Method for making humanized antibodies Panel: To Be Assigned

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Review

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,407,213
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1) AND (B)	2
A. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1): Real Party-In-Interest	2
B. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2): Related Matters	2
C. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3): Lead and Back-Up Counsel	3
D. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4): Service Information.....	3
III. PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.103	4
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)	4
V. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b).....	4
A. '213 Patent Background	8
B. Summary of the Argument.....	10
C. Prosecution History and Related Proceedings	14
D. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	15
E. Claim Construction	16
F. Prior Art.....	19
VI. THE PRIOR ART RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE.....	27
A. Ground 1: Claims 1–2, 25, 29, 63, 66, 67, 71–72, 75–76 and 80–81 Are Anticipated by Kurrle.....	28
B. Ground 2: Claims 1, 2, 4, 29, 62–64 and 80–81 Are Anticipated by Queen 1990.....	34

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,213

C.	Ground 3: Claims 1–2, 4, 25, 29, 62–64, 66–67, 69, 71–72, 75–76, 78 and 80–81 Are Unpatentable as Obvious over Queen 1990 and Kurrle.....	41
D.	Ground 4: Claim 12 Is Obvious over Queen 1990, Kurrle, and Furey.....	51
E.	Ground 5: Claims 73 and 77 Are Obvious over Queen 1990, Kurrle and Chothia & Lesk.....	52
F.	Ground 6: Claim 74 Is Obvious over Queen 1990, Kurrle and Chothia 1985.....	54
G.	Ground 7: Claims 79 and 65 Are Obvious over Queen 1990, Kurrle, Chothia & Lesk and Chothia 1985.....	54
H.	Ground 8: Claims 30–31, 33 and 42 Are Obvious over Queen 1990 in View of Hudziak.....	56
I.	Ground 9: Claim 42 Is Obvious over Queen 1990, Hudziak and Furey.....	61
J.	Ground 10: Claim 60 Is Obvious over Queen 1990, Hudziak and Chothia & Lesk.....	62
K.	Secondary Considerations Cannot Overcome Obviousness.....	62
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Adair v. Carter</i> , 101 U.S.P.Q.2d 1625 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	15, 16
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	31, 34, 38, 51
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.</i> , 91 F.3d 169 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	17
<i>Ex Parte Takeshi Shimono</i> , 2015 WL 1952506, Appeal 2013–003410 (PTAB Apr. 29, 2015)	63, 64
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	16, 17, 18
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	64
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	65
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	56
<i>In re Skoll</i> , 523 F.2d 1392 (C.C.P.A. 1975)	17
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	63
<i>Norgren Inc. v. ITC</i> , 699 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	66
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	67
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	63

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,213

Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters, Inc.,
632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011)63

Torrent Pharms. Ltd. v. Novartis AG,
2015 WL 5719630 (PTAB Sep. 24, 2015)63

Statutes

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 1034
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)7
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)7
35 U.S.C. § 135(b)(1).....15
35 U.S.C. § 3111
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)7
35 U.S.C. § 3154

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1) and (b)2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2).....2
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....3
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....4
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)1, 4
37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a).....1, 4
37 C.F.R. § 42.1001
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)16
37 C.F.R. § 42.1031, 4
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....4

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.