

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COHERUS BIOSCIENCES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

HOFFMANN-LAROCHE INC.,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,163,522

PETITION

**to Institute an *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,163,522
under 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 et seq.**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Submitted Electronically via the PTAB E2E

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	vi
EXHIBIT LIST.....	viii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES	7
A. Real Party-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(1)).....	7
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(2)).....	7
C. Lead and Back-up Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(3)).....	7
D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8 (b)(4))	8
III. PAYMENT OF FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.103).....	8
IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	8
A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)	8
B. Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b); Relief Requested.....	9
V. THE '522 PATENT	9
A. The '522 Patent Only Generically Encompasses Fusion Proteins Comprising the 75-kDa TNFR, and Does Not Specifically Disclose Etanercept.....	9
B. The Claims of the '522 Patent Cover Standard Methods for Expressing a Fusion Protein in a Host Cell, Applied to 75-kDa TNFR:hinge IgG Fusions.....	11
C. The Priority Date of the '522 Patent Is No Earlier Than August 31, 1990.	12
D. The Prosecution History of the '522 Patent.....	14

1.	The Board Found the Related '182 Patent Nonobvious Based Solely on Alleged Evidence of Unexpected Results, Which the Examiner Did Not Substantively Address	14
2.	Prosecution of the '522 Patent Tracked that of the '182 Patent	16
3.	CFAD's Prior Petition for IPR Challenging the '522 Patent Relied on Different Prior Art than Coherus' Petition, and Failed to Substantively Address Unexpected Results	17
VI.	LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART	19
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 42.104(b)(3).....	20
A.	“all of the domains of the constant region...other than the first domain of said constant region”	20
B.	“TNF receptor” and “about”	21
VIII.	Patents and printed publications relied on in this petition.....	21
A.	U.S. Patent No. 5,395,760 (“Smith”) – May 10, 1990.....	21
B.	Watson et al., “A Homing Receptor-IgG Chimera as a Probe for Adhesive Ligands of Lymph Node High Endothelial Venules” (“Watson”) – June 1990	23
C.	Zettlmeissl et al., “Expression and Characterization of Human CD4:Immunoglobulin Fusion Proteins” (“Zettlmeissl”) – June 1990.....	25
D.	Prior Art Informing the General Knowledge of the POSA.....	26
IX.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER THE PRIOR ART	27
A.	Ground 1: The Claims of the '522 Patent Are Obvious Over Watson in view of Smith '760	28

1.	Applying Watson’s General Method for Efficiently Expressing Fusion Proteins in Host Cells to the TNFR Sequences Taught by Smith Results in the Exact Methods and Nucleotides Claimed in the ’522 Patent.....	29
2.	The Prior Art Motivated the POSA to Combine Watson and Smith	33
3.	The POSA Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Preparing the Fusion Proteins Recited in the ’522 Patent Claims	36
4.	Nothing in the Prior Art “Teaches Away” from Preparing TNFR:HINGE IgG Fusion Proteins	38
5.	The Claimed Methods and Polynucleotides Were Obvious (Claims 1, 4, 7).....	40
6.	The Use of Mammalian CHO Cells Was Obvious (Claims 2, 6, 9, 10)	41
7.	The Use of an IgG1 Heavy Chain Was Obvious (Claims 3, 8).....	42
8.	The Vector of Claim 5 Was Obvious.....	42
B.	Ground 2: The Claims of the ’522 Patent Are Obvious Over Smith in view of Zettlmeissl and Watson	43
1.	Modifying Smith’s TNFR:IgG Fusion Proteins As Taught By Zettlmeissl and Watson Results in the Exact Fusion Proteins Recited in the ’522 Patent Claims.....	43
2.	Zettlmeissl and Watson Motivated the POSA to Modify Smith’s Fusion Proteins to Optimize Expression	46
3.	The POSA Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Preparing the Fusion Proteins Recited in the ’522 Patent Claims	48

4.	The Claimed Polynucleotides and Host Cell Culturing Methods Were Obvious (Claims 1, 4, 7)	49
5.	The Use of CHO Cells Was Obvious (Claims 2, 6, 9, 10).....	50
6.	The Use of an IgG1 Heavy Chain Was Obvious (Claims 3, 8).....	51
7.	The Vector of Claim 5 Was Obvious.....	51
C.	Any Objective Indicia Cannot Overcome the Strong Showing of Obviousness.....	51
1.	Increased Binding Affinity for TNF Compared to the Soluble Receptor Was Expected, and Motivated the POSA to Make the Claimed Fusion Proteins.....	53
2.	Superior Neutralization of TNF Compared to the Soluble Receptor Was Expected, and Motivated the POSA to Make the Claimed Fusion Proteins.....	55
3.	Differences Between the Claimed Fusion Proteins and Antibodies Were Expected, and Patent Owner Has Not Demonstrated Any Surprisingly Superior Results.....	57
a.	Lack of CDC Was Expected.....	58
b.	Patent Owner’s Evidence Regarding ADCC Is Unreliable	59
c.	Lack of Aggregation Was Not Unexpected.....	62
d.	Patent Owner Has Not Compared the Closest Prior Art and Has Not Shown that Any Unexpected Results are Significant.....	62
X.	CONCLUSION	64

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.