

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

GENENTECH, INC. and CITY OF HOPE,)

Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants,)

v.)

AMGEN INC.,)

Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff.)

C.A. No. 18-924-CFC

GENENTECH, INC. and CITY OF HOPE,)

Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants,)

v.)

SAMSUNG BIOEPIS CO., LTD,)

Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff.)

C.A. No. 18-1363-CFC

REVISED JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
AGREED-UPON CONSTRUCTIONS	1
DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS	3
I. U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,627,196, 7,371,379, AND 10,160,811	3
1. Plaintiffs’ Introduction	3
2. Defendants’ Introduction	4
A. “An Initial Dose” (’196 Claims 11, 22; ’379 Claims 11, 21; ’811 Claims 6, 7)	5
1. Plaintiffs’ Opening Position	5
2. Defendants’ Answering Position	7
a. Amgen’s Answering Position	7
i. “An initial dose” means “the first dose.”	8
ii. The specification distinguishes between (1) “an initial dose” and (2) “initial doses” or “series of doses.”	9
iii. Amgen’s construction is tied to the asserted claims, which cover only the single initial dose embodiment	11
iv. Claim 16 affirms the distinction between “an initial dose” and “plurality of initial doses.”	13
v. Extrinsic evidence confirms Amgen’s construction.	15

vi.	Genentech’s construction is unworkable.	15
b.	Samsung’s Answering Position	16
3.	Plaintiffs’ Reply Position	19
a.	Defendants’ Construction Of “An Initial Dose” Is Inconsistent With The Intrinsic Evidence.	19
i.	The Intrinsic Record Makes Clear That “An Initial Dose” Can Be A Plurality Of Doses.....	20
ii.	The Intrinsic Record Does Not Require “An Initial Dose” To Be A “First Dose.”	23
b.	Extrinsic Evidence Does Not Support Amgen’s Construction Of “An Initial Dose.”	25
c.	Defendants’ Arguments Regarding Indefiniteness Are Flawed And Premature.	26
d.	Samsung’s Construction Of “An Initial Dose” Impermissibly Narrows The Claims To One Embodiment.....	26
4.	Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position	27
a.	Amgen’s Sur-Reply Position	27
i.	Genentech’s construction ignores the specification’s teaching of two distinct alternatives.....	28
ii.	“Initial dose” is synonymous with “first dose”	30
iii.	Genentech did not counter Amgen’s extrinsic evidence	32
iv.	Genentech does not address indefiniteness	

	problems caused by its construction	32
	b. Samsung’s Sur-Reply Position	33
II.	U.S. PATENT NOS. 7,993,834 AND 8,076,066	34
	1. Plaintiffs’ Introduction.....	34
	2. Defendants’ Introduction	35
A.	“A Method For Increasing Likelihood Of Effectiveness Of Breast Cancer Treatment With Humanized Anti-ErbB2 Antibody huMAb4D5-8” (’834 Claims 2, 5).....	39
	1. Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....	39
	2. Defendants’ Answering Position	40
	a. The preamble of the ’834 patent renders the claims indefinite	40
	b. Genentech’s proposed construction does not resolve indefiniteness	43
	3. Plaintiffs’ Reply Position.....	44
	4. Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position	48
B.	“Wherein The Patient’s Cancer Cells Express HER2 At A 0 Or 1+ Level By Immunohistochemistry” (’066 Claims 2, 6)	49
	1. Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....	50
	2. Amgen’s Answering Position	52
	3. Plaintiffs’ Reply Position.....	56
	4. Amgen’s Sur-Reply Position	60
III.	U.S. PATENT NO. 8,574,869	62

1.	Plaintiffs’ Introduction.....	62
2.	Defendants’ Introduction	63
A.	“Following Fermentation” (Claims 5, 8)	63
1.	Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....	64
2.	Defendants’ Answering Position	67
a.	Amgen’s Answering Position.....	68
b.	Samsung’s Answering Position.....	72
3.	Plaintiffs’ Reply Position.....	76
a.	Plaintiffs’ Reply to Amgen’s Position.....	76
b.	Plaintiffs’ Reply to Samsung’s Position.....	81
4.	Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position	82
a.	Amgen’s Sur-Reply Position.....	82
b.	Samsung’s Sur-Reply Position	84
B.	“Pre-Harvest [Culture Fluid]” (Claims 5, 8).....	84
1.	Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....	85
2.	Samsung’s Answering Position	86
3.	Plaintiffs’ Reply Position.....	87
4.	Samsung’s Sur-Reply Position	88
IV.	U.S. PATENT NOS. 8,512,983 AND 9,714,293	89
1.	Plaintiffs’ Introduction.....	89
2.	Defendants’ Introduction	90

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.