

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PFIZER, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

CHUGAI PHARMACEUTICAL CO. LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01357
Patent 7,332,289

**PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO
PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. The Objected-To Exhibits Were Properly Presented at Deposition.....	3
A. Articles Describing Ways for Making Citrate Buffer (EX2201-EX2205)	3
B. Dr. Przybycien’s Articles Describing a Solution as Being “Clouded” (EX2206-EX2207)	8
II. A Motion to Exclude Is Not the Proper Vehicle for Striking the Challenged Exhibits on the Basis of Scope or Timeliness	11
III. Pfizer’s Relevance Arguments Are Misplaced.....	12
IV. Conclusion	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>ABB, Inc. v. Roy-G-Biv Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00063, Pap. 71 (May 16, 2014).....	11
<i>Argentum Pharm. LLC v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00204, Pap. 85 (Mar. 22, 2017)	2
<i>Arris Int’l PLC v. Sony Corp.</i> , IPR2016-00834, Pap. 54 (Sept. 28, 2017).....	13
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , IPR2013-00047, Pap. 84 (May 1, 2014).....	11
<i>Elbit Sys. of Am., LLC v. Thales Visionix, Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	13
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00527, Pap. 41 (May 18, 2015).....	10
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Software Rights Archive, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00478, Pap. 58 (Feb. 2, 2015).....	11
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00472, Pap. 64 (Apr. 18, 2018).....	13
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2
<i>Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Chrimar Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01389, Pap. 69 (Jan. 23, 2018).....	13
<i>Mastercard Int’l Inc. v. Grecia</i> , IPR2017-00791, Pap. 11 (July 27, 2017)	11
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Bradium Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2015-01432, Pap. 51 (Dec. 21, 2016).....	7

Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.,
IPR2015-02001, Pap. 41 (Mar. 17, 2017) 12

Reactive Surfaces Ltd. v. Toyota Motor Corp.,
IPR2016-01462, Pap. 30 (May 31, 2017)..... 9

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC,
IPR2014-00407, Pap. 48 (July 20, 2015) 11, 12

Toyota Motor Corp. v. Blitzsafe Tex., LLC,
IPR2016-00418, Pap. 16 (Aug. 2, 2016) 11

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)..... 2

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) 2

37 C.F.R. § 42.53(d)(5)(ii)..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.53(f)(3) 1

37 C.F.R. §42.64 14

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)..... 8

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS

<u>Patent Owner's Exhibits</u>	<u>Description</u>
2001	Excerpt of European Prosecution History of Application No. 03795400.5
2002	Declaration of Megan Raymond dated August 31, 2017
2003	Todd M Przybycien <i>et al.</i> , <i>Alternative Bioseparation Operation: Life Beyond Packed-bed Chromatography</i> , Current Opinion in Biotechnology, Vol. 15, pp. 469-478 (Sept. 11, 2004)
2004	Mili Pathak <i>et al.</i> , <i>Re-use of Protein A Resin: Fouling and Economics</i> , BioPharm Int'l, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Mar. 1, 2015)
2005	M. Roth, <i>Automated Amino Acid Analysis with Sensitive Fluorescence Detection</i> , Journal of Clinical Chemistry and Clinical Biochemistry, Vol. 14, No. 7, pp. 361-364 (1976)
2006	Leslie A. Khawli <i>et al.</i> , <i>Charge Variants in IgG1: Isolation, Characterization, In Vitro Binding Properties and Pharmacokinetics in Rats</i> , MAbs, Vol. 2, No. 6, pp. 613-624 (Nov. 2010)
2007	A. Singla <i>et al.</i> , <i>Aggregation Kinetics for IgG1-Based Monoclonal Antibody Therapeutics</i> , American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp.689-702 (May 2016).
2008	Paolo Arosio <i>et al.</i> , <i>Aggregation Mechanism of an IgG2 and two IgG1 Monoclonal Antibodies at low pH: From Oligomers to Larger Aggregates</i> , Pharmaceutical Research, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Oct. 9, 2012)
2009	CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 5-72 (Electrical Conductivity of Aqueous Solutions) (W. M. Hayes ed., CRC Press 96th ed., 2015)
2010	Yinges Yigzaw <i>et al.</i> , <i>Exploitation of the Adsorptive Properties of Depth Filters for Host Cell Protein Removal during Monoclonal Antibody Purification</i> , Biotechnology Progress, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp.288-296 (Jan. 6, 2006)

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.