

No. 21-1566

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

JUNO THERAPEUTICS, INC.; SLOAN KETTERING
INSTITUTE FOR CANCER RESEARCH,

Petitioners,

v.

KITE PHARMA, INC.,

Respondent.

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Federal Circuit**

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*
MARK D. JANIS AND TIMOTHY R. HOLBROOK
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS**

MARK D. JANIS
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW
211 South Indiana Avenue
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 855-1205
mdjanis@indiana.edu

TIMOTHY R. HOLBROOK
Counsel of Record
EMORY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF LAW
1301 Clifton Rd., NE
Atlanta, GA 30322
(404) 712-0353
tholbrook@emory.edu

COCKLE LEGAL BRIEFS (800) 225-6964
WWW.COCKLELEGALBRIEFS.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Contents	i
Table of Authorities	iii
Interests of <i>Amici Curiae</i>	1
Summary of the Argument	1
Argument	2
I. This Court Has Underscored the Patent System’s Delicate Balance of Interests, and the Federal Circuit’s Adoption of a Written Description Requirement Puts that Balance at Risk.....	2
A. Patent Statutes Must Balance the Public Benefits of Thorough Disclosure Against the Private Costs of Providing It	4
B. The U.S. Patent Statute Includes Several Provisions that Together Set the Cost/Benefit Balance Regarding Disclosure.....	6
II. Neither the Text of the Patent Statute nor this Court’s Jurisprudence Supports the Federal Circuit’s Independent Written Description Requirement.....	8
A. The Text of Section 112 Establishes an Enablement Requirement but not a Written Description Requirement.....	8
B. This Court Has Not Adopted an Independent Written Description Requirement.....	10

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
III. This Court’s Intervention Is Critical to Restore the Appropriate Balance within the Patent System.....	13
A. The Federal Circuit Is Applying Its Written Description Requirement Aggressively to Strike Down Patents	13
1. The Federal Circuit Has Extended the Reach of the Written Description Requirement.....	14
2. The Federal Circuit Has Aggrandized the Power to Invalidate Patents at the Appellate Level through the Written Description Requirement.....	16
B. The Federal Circuit Has Never Adequately Distinguished Its Written Description Requirement from the Statutory Enablement Requirement	18
C. This Case Is an Appropriate Vehicle for Review	23
Conclusion.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	21
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , No. 21-757	23
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Biogen Int’l GmbH v. Mylan Pharms., Inc.</i> , 18 F.4th 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	13, 16
<i>Biogen Int’l GmbH v. Mylan Pharms., Inc.</i> , 28 F.4th 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	17
<i>Biogen Int’l GmbH v. Mylan Pharms., Inc.</i> , No. 21-1567	23
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989)	3
<i>Brenner v. Manson</i> , 383 U.S. 519 (1966)	7
<i>Capon v. Eshhar</i> , 418 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	20
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.</i> , 323 F.3d 956 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	21
<i>Evans v. Eaton</i> , 20 U.S. 356 (1822)	11, 12
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.</i> , 535 U.S. 722 (2002)	10, 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
<i>Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berklinc Corp.</i> , 134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	14
<i>In re Barker</i> , 559 F.2d 588 (C.C.P.A. 1977).....	10, 19
<i>In re DiLeone</i> , 436 F.2d 1404 (C.C.P.A. 1971).....	21
<i>In re Rasmussen</i> , 650 F.2d 1212 (C.C.P.A. 1981).....	7, 15
<i>In re Ruschig</i> , 379 F.2d 990 (C.C.P.A. 1967).....	14
<i>In re Wands</i> , 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	20
<i>Juno Therapeutics, Inc. v. Kite Pharma, Inc.</i> , 10 F.4th 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	3, 16, 17, 20
<i>Kennecott Corp. v. Kyocera Int’l, Inc.</i> , 835 F.2d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	19
<i>Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.</i> , 416 U.S. 470 (1974)	4, 5
<i>LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	19
<i>Markman v. Westview Inst., Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	12
<i>McRO, Inc. v. Bandai Namco Games Am., Inc.</i> , 959 F.3d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	21
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instr., Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014)	7, 12

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.