

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ADELLO BIOLOGICS, LLC,  
APOTEX INC. and APOTEX CORP.,  
Petitioners

v.

AMGEN INC. and AMGEN MANUFACTURING, LIMITED,  
Patent Owners.

---

Case PGR2019-00001  
Patent 9,856,287 B2

---

**PATENT OWNERS' RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.220**

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
EX2026	Expert Declaration of Richard C. Page, Ph.D.
EX2027	Deposition of Anne S. Robinson (Jul 10, 2019)
EX2028	Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement, <i>Amgen Inc., et al. v. Kashiv Biosciences LLC, et al.</i> , No. 2:18-cv-03347 (CCC-MF), DE 101 (March 22, 2019)
EX2029	Gohda, S., et al., “The Superreactive Disulfide Bonds in $\alpha$ -Lactalbumin and Lysozyme,” <i>Journal of Protein Chem.</i> , 14(8): 731-737 (1995)
EX2030	Excerpt of Declaration of Anne S. Robinson, Ph.D. in Support of Defendants’ Opening Claim Construction Brief, <i>Amgen Inc., et al. v. Apotex Inc., et al.</i> , No. 15-cv-61631-CV-COHN, DE 76-4 (Dec. 11, 2015).
EX2031	Excerpt of Declaration of Anne S. Robinson, Ph.D. in Support of Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,940,878, <i>Kashiv Biosciences, LLC v. Amgen Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00791 (EX1002) (March 7, 2019)
EX2032	Declaration of Sayem Osman
EX2033	Pereira, D.A., Williams, J.A., “Origin and Evolution of High Throughput Screening,” <i>Br. Journal of Pharmacology</i> , 152(1): 53-61 (Sep. 2007)
EX2034	Oganesyan, N., et al., “On-Column Protein Refolding for Crystallization,” <i>J. Structural &amp; Functional Genomics</i> , 6:177-182 (2005)
EX2035	Intentionally Omitted
EX2036	Palandra, J., et al., “Flexible Automated Approach for Quantitative Liquid Handling of Complex Biological Samples,” <i>Anal. Chem.</i> , 79, 9010-9015 (2007)
EX2037	Cohen, S. et al., “Fully Automated Screening Systems,” <i>Methods Mol. Biol.</i> , 190:213-228 (2002)
EX2038	Tsumoto, K., et al., “Highly Efficient Recovery of Functional Single-Chain Fv Fragments from Inclusion Bodies Overexpressed in <i>Escherichia Coli</i> by Controlled Induction of Oxidizing Reagent—Application to a Human Single Chain Fv Fragment,” <i>Journal of Immunological Methods</i> , 219:119-129 (1998)

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
EX2039	Lutz, M.W., et al., "Experimental Design for High-Throughput Screening," <i>Drug Discovery Today</i> , 1(7): 277-286 (July 1996)
EX2040	Tye, H., "Application of Statistical 'Design of Experiments' Methods in Drug Discovery," <i>Drug Discovery Today</i> , 9(11): 485-491 (June 2004)
EX2041	Gerami et al., "Co-Solute Assistance in Refolding of Recombinant Proteins," <i>African Journal of Biotechnology</i> , 10(53): 10811-10816 (Sep. 2011)
EX2042	Sethuraman, A. et al., "Protein Structural Perturbation and Aggregation on Homogeneous Surfaces," <i>Biophysical Journal</i> , Vol. 88: 1322-1333 (Feb. 2005)
EX2043	"Explain the four levels of protein structure, indicating the significance of each level," available at <a href="http://www.old-ib.bioninja.com.au/higher-level/topic-7-nucleic-acids-and/75-proteins.html">http://www.old-ib.bioninja.com.au/higher-level/topic-7-nucleic-acids-and/75-proteins.html</a>
EX2044	U.S. Patent No. 5,428,130

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Challenged Claims Of The '287 And The Level Of Skill In The Art .....	6
III.	Claim Construction.....	10
	A. “At Least About 25%” Should Not Be Construed To Require Exactly 25% To 100% Refolding (Claims 1-9 and 16-25).....	10
	B. The Claimed Yields (Refolding Percentages) Relate To The Yield Of Target Protein Not All Protein .....	13
	C. “Wherein The Thiol-Pair Buffer Strength Maintains The Solubility Of The Preparation” And “Wherein The Thiol-Pair Buffer Strength Maintains The Solubility Of The Solution” .....	14
	D. “Is Calculated” (Dependent Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 23, 24, And 25).....	19
IV.	Petitioners Failed To Establish That The '287 Is A Post-AIA Patent.....	20
	A. Petitioners Have Not Established That Claims 1-9 And 16-25 Were Not Fully Disclosed In The '287's Priority Applications Before March 16, 2013.....	21
	1. Petitioners Failed to Demonstrate That The Priority Applications Lack Written Description Support for “At Least About 25% Of The Proteins Are Properly Folded” .....	24
	B. Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Claims 1-9 And 16-25 Were Not Fully Enabled By The '287's Priority Applications.....	33
V.	Petitioners Failed To Establish Lack Of Written Description Or Enablement For Ground 1 And 2 .....	42
VI.	The Challenged Claims Are Not Anticipated By Or Obvious Over Any Prior Art .....	46
	A. Claims 1-4, 7-19, And 22-30 Are Not Anticipated By Vallejo (Ground 3), Nor Are Claims 5, 6, 20, And 21 Obvious Over Vallejo In View Of Hevehan (Ground 7).....	46
	1. Claims 1-4, 7-19, And 22-30 Are Not Anticipated By Vallejo (Ground 3).....	46
	2. Petitioners Have Not Established That Claims 5, 6, 20, And 21 Are Obvious Over Vallejo In View Of Hevehan (Ground 7).....	58

B.	Petitioners Failed To Establish That Claims 1-4, 8-19, And 23-30 Are Anticipated By Schlegl (Ground 4), And That Claims 7 And 22 Are Obvious Over Schlegl In View Of Vallejo (Ground 5).....	61
1.	Petitioners Have Not Established That Claims 1-4, 8-19, And 23-30 Are Anticipated By Schlegl (Ground 4).....	61
2.	Petitioners Have Not Established That Claims 7 And 22 Are Unpatentable Over Schlegl In View Of Vallejo (Ground 5).....	69
C.	Petitioners Have Not Established That Claims 1-4, 7-19, And 22-30 Are Obvious Over Ruddon In View Of Vallejo (Ground 6).....	71
1.	Ruddon Does Not Teach Refolding Protein Expressed In A Non-Mammalian System Into Properly Refolded Biologically Active Protein.....	71
2.	Petitioners Failed To Show How Or Why Ruddon And Vallejo Would Be Combined To Arrive At The Claimed Invention .....	73
3.	POSITA Would Not Reasonably Expect That The Teachings Of Ruddon And Vallejo Could be Successfully Combined.....	74
4.	Neither Ruddon Nor Vallejo Teach The Limitations “Thiol-Pair Buffer Strength Maintains The Solubility Of The Preparation” Or “Thiol-Pair Buffer Strength Maintains The Solubility Of The Solution” .....	76
5.	Neither Ruddon Nor Vallejo Teach “Is Calculated” Under The Correct Construction (Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 23, 24, 25, 30) .....	77
VII.	Petitioners Failed To Establish That Claims 1-15 Are Indefinite (Ground 8) .....	77
VIII.	Petitioners’ Expert Is Not Credible Or Reliable.....	82
IX.	Conclusion .....	86

# 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.