

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC AND FRESENIUS KABI SWISSBIOSIM
GmbH.,
Petitioners

v.

AMGEN INC. and AMGEN MANUFACTURING, LIMITED,
Patent Owners

Case IPR2020-00314
Patent 9,856,287

**PATENT OWNERS' PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

LIST OF EXHIBITS¹

Exhibit	Description
EX2001	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent 9,856,287
EX2002	Declaration of Sayem Osman
EX2003	Excerpt of Joint Claim Construction Chart (<i>Amgen Inc., et al. v. Kashiv Biosciences, LLC</i> , No 2:18-cv-03347-CCC-MF, DE 101, at Appx. D (D.N.J. March 22, 2019))
EX2004	<i>Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC et al. v. Amgen Inc. et al.</i> , IPR2019-00971, EX3001 (Dec. 27, 2019)
EX2005	<i>Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC et al. v. Amgen Inc. et al.</i> , IPR2019-00971, EX3002 (Dec. 27, 2019)
EX2006	Declaration of Megan Raymond
EX2007	<i>Adello Biologics, LLC et al. v. Amgen Inc. et al.</i> , PGR2019-00001, Docket Sheet
EX2008	Excerpt of <i>Adello Biologics, LLC et al. v. Amgen Inc. et al.</i> , PGR2019-00001, Pap. 8 (Jan. 23, 2019)
EX2009	<i>Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC et al. v. Amgen, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00971, Docket Sheet
EX2010	<i>Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC et al. v. Amgen, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00971, Pap. 17 (Dec. 4, 2019)
EX2011	Excerpt of <i>Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC et al. v. Amgen, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00971, Pap. 8 (July 17, 2019)
EX2012	Excerpt of <i>Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC et al. v. Amgen, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00971, Pap. 12 (Sept. 5, 2019)
EX2013	Excerpt of <i>Adello Biologics, LLC et al. v. Amgen Inc. et al.</i> , PGR2019-00001, Pap. 3 (Oct. 1, 2018)
EX2014	Excerpt of <i>Adello Biologics, LLC et al. v. Amgen Inc. et al.</i> , PGR2019-00001, EX1002 (Oct. 1, 2018)

¹ EX2008 and EX2011-EX2015 are included for comparison purposes to show overlap between proceedings and/or availability of information to the Petitioners.

They are not submitted as substantive evidence.

Exhibit	Description
EX2015	Excerpt of <i>Adello Biologics, LLC et al v. Amgen Inc. et al</i> , PGR2019-00001, Pap. 19 (July 26, 2018)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	2
II. The Challenged Claims Of The '287 Are Directed To A Novel Invention.....	7
III. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion And Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. §314(a).....	8
A. The General Plastic Factors Support Denial Of Institution	11
1. Factor 1: Whether Petitioner Previously Filed A Petition Directed To The Same Claims Of The Same Patent.....	12
2. Factor 2: Whether At The Time Of Filing Of The First Petition The Petitioner Knew Of The Prior Art Asserted In The Second Petition Or Should Have Known About It.....	18
3. Factor 3: Whether At The Time Of Filing Of The Second Petition The Petitioner Already Received The Patent Owner's Preliminary Response To The First Petition Or Received The Board's Decision On Whether To Institute Review In The First Petition.....	19
4. Factor 4: The Length Of Time That Elapsed Between The Time The Petitioner Learned Of The Prior Art Asserted In The Second Petition And The Filing Of The Second Petition	24
5. Factor 5: Whether The Petitioner Provides Adequate Explanation For The Time Elapsed Between The Filings Of Multiple Petitions Directed To The Same Claims Of The Same Patent.....	25
6. Factors 6 and 7: Board's Considerations Of Finite Resources/One-Year Time Line	27
7. Additional Factors Warrant Denial	29
IV. Petitioners Failed To Provide Sufficient Claim Construction Analysis Of Key Claim Terms.....	30

V. The Petition Failed To Establish Anticipation Or Obviousness Of Any Challenged Claim	37
A. Petitioners Failed To Show That Claims 1, 4, 8–10, 12, 14–16, 19, 23–26, And 20–30 Are Anticipated By Vallejo (Ground 1).....	38
1. Petitioners Failed To Show Vallejo Teaches The Limitation “Thiol-Pair Buffer Strength To Maintain The Solubility Of The Preparation/Solution”	38
2. Petitioners Improperly Mix And Match Disclosures From Different Embodiments.....	41
3. Petitioners Failed To Present Any Argument Applying Their Assumed Construction Of “Is Calculated” And Cited To Art Other Than Vallejo In Arguing “Anticipation”	43
B. Petitioners Failed To Establish That Claims 16, 19–21, 23–26, And 29–30 Are Anticipated By Ruddon (Ground 2)	45
1. Petitioners Failed To Show Ruddon Discloses A Process That Properly Refolds Proteins Into Biologically Active Forms.....	45
2. Petitioners Failed To Show Ruddon Teaches The Limitation “Thiol-Pair Buffer Strength To Maintain The Solubility Of The Solution”	46
3. Petitioners Failed To Present Any Argument Applying Their Assumed Construction Of “Is Calculated” And Cited To Art Other Than Ruddon In Arguing “Anticipation” (Claims 23–25 And 30).....	47
C. Petitioners’ Obviousness Grounds Are Unclear, Confusing, and Legally Insufficient (Grounds 3 And 4).....	48
1. Grounds 3 And 4 Are A Combination Of Multiple Poorly-Delineated Grounds.....	51
2. Petitioners Did Not Clearly Identify Which “Gilbert” Reference Was Intended To Be Part Of Grounds 3 And 4	53

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.