

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

David L. Cavanaugh (Reg. No. 36,476)	Adam R. Brausa (Reg. No. 60,287)
Owen K. Allen (Reg. No. 71,118)	Daralyn J. Durie (<i>Pro Hac Vice to be filed</i>)
Robert J. Gunther, Jr. (<i>Pro Hac Vice to be filed</i>)	DURIE TANGRI LLP
Lisa J. Pirozzolo (<i>Pro Hac Vice to be filed</i>)	217 Leidesdorff Street
Kevin S. Prussia (<i>Pro Hac Vice to be filed</i>)	San Francisco, CA 94111
Andrew J. Danford (<i>Pro Hac Vice to be filed</i>)	
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING	
HALE AND DORR LLP	
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW	
Washington, DC 20006	

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PFIZER, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01489
Patent 6,407,213

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	4
A. Antibody “Variable” And “Constant” Domains	4
B. “Humanized” Antibodies.....	5
III. THE ’213 PATENT.....	8
A. The Invention.....	8
B. Advantages Of The ’213 Invention	10
C. Prosecution History	11
IV. PFIZER’S ASSERTED REFERENCES.....	12
A. Queen 1989.....	12
B. Queen 1990.....	12
C. PDB Database.....	14
D. Tramontano.....	15
E. Kabat 1987.....	16
F. Hudziak.....	16
V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	17
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	17
VII. ARGUMENT.....	19
A. The Board Should Deny Grounds 2, 3, 4, And 7 Because Neither Queen 1990 Nor Tramontano Is Prior Art.	19

1.	The inventors produced and tested humanized 4D5 antibodies using the '213 invention before July 26, 1990.....	19
a)	Consensus sequence	19
b)	Humanized 4D5 antibody sequences	21
c)	Production and testing of humanized 4D5 antibodies	24
(i)	First humanized 4D5 variable domain fragment	26
(ii)	First humanized 4D5 full-length antibody.....	28
(iii)	Other humanized 4D5 variants	29
2.	The challenged claims were reduced to practice before July 26, 1990.	31
a)	HuMAb4D5-5 and HuMAb4D5-8 embody the challenged claims.	31
(i)	Common limitations.....	31
(ii)	Additional limitations for certain claims	36
b)	The inventors determined that HuMAb4D5-5 and HuMAb4D5-8 would work for the intended purpose of the challenged claims before July 26, 1990.	38
c)	Contemporaneous records from non-inventors corroborate the invention of the challenged claims.....	39
3.	Queen 1990 and Tramontano are not prior art.	39
a)	Limitations common to all claims.....	40
b)	Additional limitations for certain claims	41
B.	Pfizer's Proposed Grounds Fail On The Merits.	42

1.	Grounds 1, 3, 5, and 6: Queen 1989 in view of the PDB database does not render the challenged claims obvious.....	43
a)	Queen 1989 contradicts Pfizer's obviousness theory.	44
b)	Queen 1989 does not disclose or suggest substituting residues within about 3 angstroms of a CDR.....	45
c)	Pfizer's proposed combination of Queen 1989 with the PDB database results in a broad genus that would not have led to the claimed substitutions.....	45
2.	Grounds 2, 4, and 7: Queen 1990 in view of the PDB database does not render the challenged claims obvious.....	47
a)	Queen 1990 contradicts Pfizer's obviousness theory.	47
b)	Pfizer's proposed combination of Queen 1990 with the PDB database results in a broad genus that would not have led to the claimed substitutions.....	49
3.	Grounds 1 and 2: Queen 1989 and Queen 1990 do not render obvious claim 63.	50
4.	Grounds 1-4: Queen 1989 and Queen 1990 do not render obvious claim 65.	51
5.	Grounds 2, 5, and 7: Pfizer's asserted references do not render obvious the "consensus" sequence limitations of claims 4, 33, 62, 64, and 69.	53
a)	Grounds 2 and 7: Queen 1990 does not render obvious the claimed "consensus" sequence.....	53
b)	Ground 5: Queen 1989 in view of Kabat 1987 does not render obvious the claimed "consensus" sequence.....	55
6.	Grounds 3 and 4: Claims 75-77 and 79 would not have been obvious in view of Pfizer's proposed combinations.	57
a)	Claim 75	57

b)	Claims 76-77 and 79	59
7.	Grounds 6 and 7: Claims 30, 31, 33, 42, and 60 would not have been obvious in view of Pfizer's proposed combinations.....	60
C.	Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness Confirm The Patentability Of The Challenged Claims.	61
1.	Unexpected results	61
2.	Commercial success	64
D.	<i>Inter Partes</i> Review Proceedings Are Unconstitutional.	65
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	66

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.