# 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.: IPR2017-02140

\_\_\_\_

# 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.	INTR	RODUCTION1				
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES					
	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	S (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a))				
IV.	REQUIREMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.1043					
	A.	Grou	nds 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				
VI.	THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART6					
	A.	A. Antibodies and Humanization6				
	B. Prior Art Cited in this Petition					
		1.	Queen 1989	10		
		2.	Queen 1990	11		
		3.	PDB Database	14		
		4.	Tramontano	17		
		5.	Kabat 1987	18		
		6.	Hudziak	19		
VII.	THE	'213 I	PATENT	20		
VIII.	CLA	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION				
IX.	DETAILED STATEMENT OF GROUNDS FOR INVALIDITY25					
	A. Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29, 62-67, 69, and are obvious over Queen 1989 (Ground 1) or Queen 1990 (C2) in view of the PDB Database					
		1.	Ground 1: Claim 1 is obvious over Queen 1989 in view the PDB Database	of 27		



	2.	the PDB Database		
	3.	Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 2, 12, 25, and 29 are obvious over Queen 1989 and the PDB Database or Queen 1990 and the PDB Database		
	4.	Ground 2: Claim 4 is obvious in view of Queen 1990 and PDB Database		
	5.	Ground 2: Claim 62 is obvious in view of Queen 1990 and PDB Database		
	6.	Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 63, 64, and 66 are obvious over Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and the PDB Database		
	7.	Ground 2: Claim 69 is obvious in view of Queen 1990 and PDB Database		
	8.	Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 67, 71-74, and 78 are obvious in view of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and PDB Database44		
	9.	Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 75-77 and 79 are obvious in view of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and PDB Database45		
	10.	Grounds 1 and 2: Claim 65 is obvious in view of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and the PDB Database49		
	11.	Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 80 and 81 are obvious in view of Queen 1989 or Queen 1990 and the PDB Database50		
В.	Grounds 3 and 4: Claims 75-77, 79, and 69 are obvious over Queen 1989 and/or Queen 1990 in view of PDB Database and Tramontano			
C.		Ground 5: Claims 4, 62, 64, and 69 are obvious over Queen 1989 in view of the PDB Database and Kabat 198753		
D.	Grounds 6 and 7: Independent claim 30 and dependent claims 31, 33, 42, and 60 are obvious over Queen 1989 (Ground 6) and/or Queen 1990 (Ground 7) in view of the PDB Database and Hudziak			
Е.	Secondary Considerations Cannot Overcome Obviousness59			
	1.	The Challenged Claims of the '213 patent produced no unexpected results		
	2.	The '213 patent did not satisfy a long-felt, but unmet need .63		



	3.	There is no nexus between the commercial success of	
		Genentech drugs and the Challenged Claims of the '213	
		patent	64
X.	CONCLUS	ION	65



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## **Cases**

Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	39, 51
Cubist Pharms., Inc. v. Hospira, Inc., 75 F. Supp. 3d 641 (D. Del. 2014), aff'd 805 F.3d 1112 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	60, 61
Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	22
Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co., 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 13330 (Fed. Cir. June 5, 1996)	23
Endo Pharms., Inc. v. Depomed, Inc., IPR2014-00652, Paper 38 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2015)	64
In re GPAC Inc., 57 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	64
In re Hall, 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	14
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	62
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	50
Merck & Cie v. Gnosis S.P.A., 808 F.3d 829 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	64
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)	63
Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc. 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	
Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc., 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	
Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enters., Inc., 632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	



# DOCKET

# 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.

