

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD., Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC., Patent Owner.

United States Patent No. 6,407,213
Title: Method for Making Humanized Antibodies

Case No.: IPR2017-02139

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,407,213**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES	1
	A. Petitioner and Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	1
	B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
	C. Counsel and Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and (4))..	2
III.	FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a))	3
IV.	REQUIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	3
	A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	3
	B. Statement of relief requested (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	4
V.	THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE RELEVANT ART	5
VI.	THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	6
	A. Antibodies and Humanization.....	6
	B. Prior Art Cited in this Petition.....	10
	1. Kurrle	10
	2. Queen 1990	12
	3. Furey	14
	4. Chothia & Lesk	16
	5. Chothia	18
	6. Hudziak	19
VII.	THE '213 PATENT	20
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	22
IX.	DETAILED STATEMENT OF GROUNDS FOR INVALIDITY	25
	A. Ground 1: Kurrle anticipates claims 1, 2, 25, 29, 63, 66, 67, 71, 72, 75, 76, 80, and 81	26
	1. Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 25, and 29 ...	26
	2. Independent claim 63	28
	3. Independent claim 66 and dependent claims 67, 71, 72, 75, 76, and 78.....	29

4.	Independent claim 80 and dependent claim 81.....	30
B.	Ground 2: Queen 1990 anticipates claims 1, 2, 4, 29, 62, 63, 64, 80, and 81	32
1.	Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 4, and 29	32
2.	Independent claim 62	35
3.	Independent claim 63	35
4.	Independent claim 64.....	36
5.	Independent claim 80 and dependent claim 81.....	37
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-64, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 75, 76, 78, 80, and 81 are obvious over Kurrle and Queen 1990.....	38
1.	Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 4, 25, and 29	38
2.	Independent claim 62	43
3.	Independent claim 63	44
4.	Independent claim 64.....	45
5.	Independent claim 66 and dependent claims 67, 69, 71, 72, 75, 76, and 78	46
6.	Independent claim 80 and dependent claim 81.....	48
D.	Ground 4: Claim 12 is obvious over Queen 1990 and Kurrle in view of Furey.....	49
E.	Grounds 5-7: Claims 73, 74, 77, 79, and 65 are obvious over Queen 1990 and Kurrle in view of Chothia & Lesk and Chothia 1985	50
1.	Ground 5: Dependent claims 73 and 77.....	50
2.	Ground 6: Dependent claim 74.....	52
3.	Ground 7: Independent claim 79 and dependent claim 65	52
F.	Ground 8: Claims 30, 31, 33, and 42 are obvious over Queen 1990 in view of Hudziak	54
G.	Ground 9: Claim 42 is obvious over Queen 1990 in view of Hudziak and Furey	60
H.	Ground 10: Claim 60 is obvious over Queen 1990 in view of Chothia & Lesk and Hudziak	60
I.	Secondary Considerations Cannot Overcome Obviousness	61

1.	The Challenged Claims of the '213 patent produced no unexpected results	62
2.	The '213 patent did not satisfy a long-felt, but unmet need .	64
3.	There is no nexus between the commercial success of Genentech drugs and the Challenged Claims of the '213 patent	65
X.	CONCLUSION.....	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adair v. Carter</i> , 668 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	22
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	28, 31, 36
<i>Cubist Pharms., Inc. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 75 F. Supp. 3d 641 (D. Del. 2014), <i>aff'd</i> 805 F.3d 1112 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	61
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	22
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.</i> , 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 13330 (Fed. Cir. June 5, 1996).....	23
<i>Endo Pharms., Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00652, Paper 38 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2015)	65
<i>In re GPAC Inc.</i> , 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	65
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	63
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	54
<i>In re Skoll</i> , 523 F.2d 1392 (C.C.P.A. 1075).....	23
<i>Merck & Cie v. Gnosis S.P.A.</i> , 808 F.3d 829 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	65
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	61
<i>Norgren Inc. v. ITC</i> , 699 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	64
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	65
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	61

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.