Filed on behalf of Patent Owner Genentech, Inc. by:

David L. Cavanaugh (Reg. No. 36,476)
Rebecca A. Whitfield (Reg. No. 73,756)
Robert J. Gunther, Jr. (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*)
Lisa J. Pirozzolo (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*)
Kevin S. Prussia (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*)
Andrew J. Danford (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*)
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006

Adam R. Brausa (Reg. No. 60,287)
Daralyn J. Durie (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*)
DURIE TANGRI LLP
217 Leidesdorff Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENENTECH, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-02032
Patent No. 6,407,213

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

Federal Statutes

Regulations

Constitutional Provisions

Genentech, Inc. ("Patent Owner" or "Genentech") submits this Preliminary Response to the Petition that Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. ("Petitioner" or "Boehringer") filed challenging certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,213 ("the '213 patent") (Paper 2).

I. INTRODUCTION

On December 1, 2017, the Board instituted four IPRs in which Celltrion, Inc. (IPR2017-01373 and IPR2017-01374) and Pfizer, Inc. (IPR2017-01488 and IPR2017-01489) have challenged numerous claims of the '213 patent (based on a total of 32 separate grounds). Patent Owner's responses in those proceedings are due on February 15, 2018.

More than three months after Celltrion and Pfizer filed their now-instituted petitions, Boehringer filed the present Petition (and a second petition in IPR2017-02031). The Board should deny institution of the Boehringer petitions for at least two reasons.

First, Boehringer copied Grounds 1-5 of this Petition from IPR2017-01373 (Celltrion) and IPR2017-01489 (Pfizer), and copied Grounds 1-3 and 5 of IPR2017-02031 from IPR2017-01374 (Celltrion) and IPR2017-01488 (Pfizer)—without seeking joinder with those earlier-filed proceedings. Boehringer thus asks the Board to institute its IPRs on the ***same*** grounds ***already instituted*** in the Celltrion and Pfizer proceedings—but on a schedule trailing those proceedings by

several months. This redundancy would waste the Board's and Patent Owner's resources, and also would unfairly allow Boehringer to preview the parties' arguments before having to address them itself. Given this resulting waste and prejudice, institution of Grounds 1-5 of this Petition (and Grounds 1-3 and 5 of IPR2017-02031) should be denied.

Second, Boehringer's remaining Ground 6 in this proceeding is based on U.S. Patent No. 5,530,101 (the "'101 patent") (Ex. 1136). But this ground is not "new" at all. To the contrary, as Boehringer admits, during prosecution of the '213 patent, the Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") raised the '101 patent and in response Patent Owner successfully antedated the '101 patent. This Ground therefore fails on two bases—Boehringer has failed to carry its burden that the '101 patent is prior art as required by *Dynamic Drinkware LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015), and the Board should exercise its discretion pursuant to Section 325(d) to reject Boehringer's invitation to second-guess the PTO's finding that the '101 patent was antedated.

Patent Owner therefore requests that the Board deny institution on all grounds.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The Invention of the '213 Patent

In the early 1990s, the field of therapeutic antibodies was still in its infancy. Although scientists had known since the 1970s how to obtain antibodies from animals (*e.g.*, mice) that would bind to specific targets, those antibodies generally could not be used in humans because, over time, the body's own immune system would attack and inactivate them (known as an "immunogenic" response). (Ex. 1001 at 1:52-58.)

Beginning in the late 1980s, a few scientists created "humanized" antibodies that incorporated the binding site from a non-human antibody into a human antibody framework—which they hoped might address the immunogenicity problem by reducing the amount of non-human amino acid sequences in the antibody. But those early humanized antibodies suffered from reduced binding affinity and/or still produced an immunogenic response. (*Id.* at 2:21-35, 3:50-55.)

The '213 inventors Drs. Paul Carter and Leonard Presta at Genentech developed a new "consensus human sequence" approach to humanizing antibodies that solved the prior art binding and immunogenicity problems of other humanized antibodies. (*Id.* at 11:32-38.) That "consensus" approach involved a single human amino acid sequence that could be used for ***any*** humanized antibody of a particular immunoglobulin subclass or subunit structure (*e.g.*, light chain κ1). (*Id.* at 16:20-

22 ("All of the humanized antibody models of this invention are based on a single three-dimensional computer graphics structure hereafter referred to as the consensus structure.").) Drs. Carter and Presta also identified specific amino acids important to maintaining binding affinity. (*Id.* at 20:32-35.)

The '213 challenged claims are directed to humanized variable domains or humanized antibodies containing certain specified amino acid substitutions identified using the inventors' novel consensus sequence approach.

B. Prosecution History

The '213 patent is a continuation-in-part of an application filed on June 14, 1991. (Ex. 1001, coversheet.) During prosecution, Patent Owner presented, and the PTO considered, a number of references describing humanized antibodies, including each of the references relied upon by Boehringer in its petitions.

For example, the '213 specification discussed at length both Jones and Riechmann (relied upon by Boehringer in IPR2017-02031), including by explaining that the references describe "substitut[ing] rodent CDRs or CDR sequences for the corresponding segments of a human antibody." (Ex. 1001 at 2:20-28.) The specification further contrasts Jones's approach of "substituting CDRs from rodent antibodies for the human CDRs in human frameworks [which was] sufficient to transfer high antigen binding affinity," with Riechmann's

disclosure that it was "necessary to additionally replace one . . . framework region (FR) residue[]." (*Id.* at 2:53-61.)

Moreover, during prosecution, Patent Owner raised Jones in overcoming a written description rejection (Ex. 1002 at 370), and overcame an obviousness rejection based on Riechmann (*id.* at 253-54 (Examiner asserting that Riechmann teaches "altering the sequence of the antibody to restore packing or to increase binding affinity"); *id.* at 372-74 (Patent Owner addressing rejection based in part on Riechmann); *id.* at 508-11 (Examiner no longer raising Riechmann rejection).) The Examiner ultimately allowed the challenged claims to issue over Jones and Reichmann.

During prosecution of the '213 patent, the Examiner also raised the '101 patent as a Section 102(e) reference and initially rejected several '213 claims based on it. (*E.g.*, Ex. 1002 at 739-40.) In response, Patent Owner explained how the Examiner had misconstrued the teachings of the '101 patent and submitted a joint affidavit from Drs. Carter and Presta to antedate the '101 patent. (*Id.* at 793, 802-07.) The Examiner allowed the claims to issue over the '101 patent after accepting that antedation evidence. (*Id.* at 813.)

C. Other IPR Petitions Involving the '213 Patent

In August 2016, Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. challenged the '213 patent in two separate IPRs (IPR2016-01693 and IPR2016-01694), which the Board

terminated after settlement in March 2017. (IPR2016-01693, Paper 24 (Mar. 3, 2017); IPR2016-01694, Paper 24 (PTAB Mar. 3, 2017).) In May 2017, Celltrion and Pfizer each filed "copy-cat" petitions of the two original Mylan petitions. (IPR2017-01373 (Celltrion); IPR2017-01374 (Celltrion); IPR2017-01488 (Pfizer); IPR2017-01489 (Pfizer).)

As shown in the table below, the copy-cat Celltrion IPR2017-01373 and Pfizer IPR2017-01489 proceedings assert identical grounds based on six references, including a 1989 article ("Queen 1989"), a PCT application published on July 26, 1990 ("Queen 1990"), the Protein Data Bank Database ("PDB Database"), a 1990 article ("Tramontano"), a 1987 reference book ("Kabat 1987"), and a March 1989 publication ("Hudziak"):

Ground	**Claims and Basis**	
	IPR2017-01373 (Celltrion)	**IPR2017-01489 (Pfizer)**
1	Claims 1, 2, 12, 25, 29, 63, 66, 67, 69, 71-81 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**	Claims 1, 2, 12, 25, 29, 63, 64, 66, 67, 71-81 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**
2	Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29, 62-67, 69, 71-81 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database**	Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29, 62-64, 66, 67, 69, 71-81 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database**
3	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**

4	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**
5	Claims 4, 62, 64, 69 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Kabat 1987**	Claims 4, 62, 64, 69 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Kabat 1987**
6	Claims 30, 31, 42, 60 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Hudziak**	Claims 30, 31, 42, 60 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Hudziak**
7	Claims 30, 31, 33, 42, 60 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Hudziak**	Claims 30, 31, 33, 42, 60 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Hudziak**

In the other two copy-cat proceedings, Celltrion IPR2017-01374 and Pfizer IPR2017-01488 assert similar grounds based on seven references, including a European patent application published on December 19, 1990 ("Kurrle"), Queen 1990, a 1983 publication ("Furey"), a 1987 publication ("Chothia & Lesk"), a 1985 publication ("Chothia 1985"), and Hudziak:

Ground	**Claims and Basis**	
	IPR2017-01374 (Celltrion)	**IPR2017-01488 (Pfizer)**
1	Claims 1, 2, 25, 29, 63, 66, 71, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81 **Kurrle**	Claims 1, 2, 25, 29, 63, 66, 67, 71, 72, 75, 76, 80, 81 **Kurrle**
2	Claims 1, 2, 4, 29, 62-64, 80, 81 **Queen 1990**	Claims 1, 2, 4, 29, 62-64, 80, 81 **Queen 1990**

3	Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-64, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle**	Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-64, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle**
4	Claim 12 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle** **Furey**	Claim 12 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle** **Furey**
5	Claims 65, 73, 74, 77, 79 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle** **Chothia & Lesk** **Chothia 1985**	Claims 73, 77 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle** **Chothia & Lesk**
6	Claims 30, 31, 33 **Queen 1990** **Hudziak**	Claim 74 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle** **Chothia 1985**
7	Claim 42 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle** **Hudziak** **Furey**	Claims 65, 79 **Queen 1990** **Kurrle** **Chothia & Lesk** **Chothia 1985**
8	Claim 60 **Queen 1990** **Hudziak** **Chothia & Lesk**	Claims 30, 31, 33, 42 **Queen 1990** **Hudziak**
9	N/A	Claim 42 **Queen 1990** **Hudziak** **Furey**
10	N/A	Claim 60

		Queen 1990 **Hudziak** **Chothia & Lesk**

On December 1, 2017, the Board instituted IPRs on all grounds recited in the four Celltrion and Pfizer petitions. (IPR2017-01373 (Paper 16); IPR2017-01374 (Paper 15); IPR2017-01488 (Paper 27); IPR2017-01489 (Paper 27).) Patent Owner's response in those proceedings is due on or before February 15, 2018.

In September 2017, Samsung Bioepis also filed copy-cat petitions of the Mylan/Celltrion/Pfizer petitions (IPR2017-02139 and IPR2017-02140). Unlike Boehringer, however, Samsung filed motions seeking to join its petitions with the earlier-filed Pfizer proceedings. (IPR2017-02139, Paper 3; IPR2017-02140, Paper 3.) Samsung's motions remain pending.

D. The Redundant Boehringer Petitions

Boehringer filed its two petitions on August 31, 2017—*i.e.*, over seven months after Genentech filed its December 2016 Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in the original Mylan proceedings, over three months after Celltrion and Pfizer filed their petitions, and without any explanation as to why it could not have filed its petitions earlier. As shown in the chart below, Boehringer asserts the following grounds of unpatentability in this proceeding:

Ground	Claims and Basis
1	Claims 1, 2, 25, 29, 63, 66-67, 71-73,75-78, 80-81

	Queen 1989 **PDB Database**
2	Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-64, 66-67, 69, 71-73, 75-78, 80-81 **Queen 19990** **PDB Database**
3	Claims 75, 76, 77 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**
4	Claims 75, 76, 77 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**
5	Claims 4, 62, 64, 69 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Kabat 1987**
6	Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-64, 66-67, 69, 71, 73, 75-78, 80-81 **'101 patent**

(Paper 1 at 4.)

III. ARGUMENT

Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d), the Board may exercise its discretion to deny institution where "the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office." *Id.*; *see Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc*., 815 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ("[T]he PTO is permitted, but never compelled, to institute an IPR proceeding."); *Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC*,

IPR2017-00777, Paper 7 (Aug. 22, 2017) (designated as informative) (exercising discretion to deny institution where same prior art and arguments were presented to the PTO).

Where a petitioner raises substantially the same prior art or arguments that were previously raised to the examiner or the Board, the patent owner's interests in avoiding harassment and the Board's interests in conserving resources often outweigh the petitioner's desire to be heard. *See Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc*., IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 at 16-18 (July 27, 2017) (designated as informative) (explaining considerations under Section 325(d)); *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Berman*, IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (Dec. 14, 2016) (designated as informative) (same); *Neil Ziegmann N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens*, IPR2015-01860, Paper 13 at 6-14 (Sept. 6, 2017) (expanded PTAB panel) (explaining the rationale and purpose of § 325(d)).

As detailed below, five of Boehringer's six asserted grounds (1-5) duplicate grounds that the Board has already instituted in the Celltrion and Pfizer proceedings, and the remaining ground (6) asserts a reference that the PTO determined was not prior art. Because the Board's and Patent Owner's interests in avoiding duplicative challenges far outweigh any interest Boehringer has in retreading these grounds, and because Patent Owner would be prejudiced if Boehringer is permitted to proceed separately on the same grounds at issue in other

proceedings, institution of all grounds should be denied pursuant to Section 325(d).[1]

A. The Board Should Deny Institution of Grounds 1- 5 Because the Board is Already Considering Those Same Grounds in the Ongoing Celltrion and Pfizer IPRs

As shown in the chart below, five of Boehringer's grounds (1-5) are essentially identical to those already instituted in the Celltrion and Pfizer IPRs (the few minor differences are underlined):

Ground	IPR2017-02032 (Boehringer)	IPR2017-01373 (Celltrion)	IPR2017-01489 (Pfizer)
1	Claims 1, 2, 25, 29, 63, 66, 67, 71-73,75-78, 80-81 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**	Claims 1, 2, 12, 25, 29, 63, 66, 67, 69, 71-73, 74, 75-78, 79, 80-81 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**	Claims 1, 2, 12, 25, 29, 63, 64, 66, 67, 71-73, 74, 75-78, 79, 80-81 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**
2	Claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-64, 66, 67, 69, 71-73, 75-78, 80-81 **Queen 19990** **PDB Database**	Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29, 62-64, 65, 67, 69, 71-73, 74, 75-78, 79, 80-81 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database**	Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 25, 29, 62-64, 66, 67, 69, 71-73, 74, 75-78, 79, 80-81 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database**
3	Claims 75-77 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database**

[1] For this preliminary response, Patent Owner has only presented argument under Section 325(d). Should the Board institute any aspect of this Petition, Patent Owner will present arguments on the merits at that time.

	Tramontano	**Tramontano**	**Tramontano**
4	Claims 75-77 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**	Claims 65, 75-77, 79 **Queen 1990** **PDB Database** **Tramontano**
5	Claims 4, 62, 64, 69 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Kabat 1987**	Claims 4, 62, 64, 69 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Kabat 1987**	Claims 4, 62, 64, 69 **Queen 1989** **PDB Database** **Kabat 1987**

Specifically, Boehringer's Grounds 1-5 raise the same prior art (Queen 1989 (Ex. 1034), Queen 1990 (Ex. 1050), the PDB database (Ex. 1030), Tramontano (Ex. 1051), Kabat 1987 (Ex. 1052) and Chothia & Lesk (Ex. 1062)), and challenge the same claims as Celltrion IPR2017-01373 and Pfizer IPR2017-01489 (claims 1, 2, 4, 25, 29, 62-64, 66, 67, 69, 71-73, 75-78, 80, 81). The only difference is that Celltrion and Pfizer assert invalidity of *additional* claims in several grounds.

Thus, because Boehringer's Grounds 1-5 are wholly redundant of the already-instituted grounds in the Celltrion and Pfizer IPRs, instituting an IPR on those same grounds in this proceeding would unnecessarily waste both the Board's and Patent Owner's resources. *See R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings 1 B.V.*, IPR2017-01118 and IPR2017-01119, Paper 8 at 4 (Oct. 4, 2017) (denying institution where "[t]he asserted art is identical to that presented in the earlier inter partes reviews"); *Hospira*, IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 at 18 (recognizing interests

"in conserving the resources of the Office and granting patent owners repose on issues and prior art that have been considered previously" (citation omitted)).

Denying institution also is necessary to protect Patent Owner from the significant prejudice that would result if Boehringer's later-filed petition is instituted. Over the last eighteen months, Boehringer could have sought to join the earlier-filed Mylan, Celltrion, and/or Pfizer petitions, including after the Board instituted the Celltrion and Pfizer decisions on December 1, 2017. But Boehringer declined to do so (offering no explanation for its delay), and the time for joinder has now passed. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.122 (providing that "[a]ny request for joinder must be filed . . . no later than one month after the institution date of any inter partes review for which joinder is requested"); *see also Google Inc. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC*, IPR2014-00980, Paper 10 at 4-5 (Oct. 30, 2014) (denying untimely motion for joinder).

By failing to seek joinder, Boehringer essentially asks for an unfair tactical advantage—one that would allow it to preview all of Patent Owner's arguments and evidence in the Celltrion and Pfizer IPRs (Patent Owner's Responses are due on February 15, 2018) well before they are presented in this proceeding. The Board should not allow Boehringer to engage in that sort of gamesmanship, particularly when coupled with the inherent inefficiency that would result by proceeding on the same grounds already instituted in the Celltrion and Pfizer IPRs.

Patent Owner therefore requests that the Board deny institution of Grounds 1-5 for these reasons as well.

B. The Board Should Deny Institution of Ground 6 Because the PTO Already Determined that the '101 Patent is Not Prior Art.

Boehringer bases Ground 6 on the '101 patent, which Boehringer admits in its Petition was not only specifically raised during prosecution, but antedated by Patent Owner:

> The examiner also raised [the '101 patent] as [a] § 102(e) reference[]. Among other things, the examiner pointed out that the '101 patent disclosed antibody species with a number of claimed [amino acid] substitutions, including at recited position 73H. *See, e.g.*, Ex._1002 at 739-40. However, Genentech ultimately provided an affidavit signed by the inventors, swearing behind the September 1990 priority date of the ['101 patent]. *Id.* at 793, 802-07. They provided pages from a laboratory notebook disclosing proposed sequences for a humanized 4D5 antibody, relying on consensus sequences and at least substitution at site 73H.[] *Id.*
>
> The claims were then allowed.

(Paper 1 at 13-14.) The PTO's decision that the '101 patent is not prior art is fatal to Boehringer's Ground 6 for two reasons.

First, Boehringer failed to meet its burden to establish that the '101 patent is prior art. *See Harmonic Inc*., 815 F.3d at 1363 (explaining that in an IPR "the petitioner has the burden from the onset to show with particularity why the patent it challenges is unpatentable"). The inventors' affidavit submitted during prosecution of the '213 patent is evidence that the '213 invention was reduced to practice prior to the filing date of the '101 patent. Accordingly, Boehringer had the burden "to prove that either the invention was not actually reduced to practice as argued, or that [the '101 patent] was entitled to the benefit of a filing date prior to the date of [the '213 inventors'] reduction to practice." *Dynamic Drinkware*, 800 F.3d at 1380. Boehringer made no such showing, instead simply asserting in a footnote that it "does not concede that the ['213 inventors'] declaration is sufficient to swear behind the genus of species disclosed by the claims of the '213 patent." (Paper 1 at 13 n.1.) Needless to say, a mere refusal to ***concede*** the point cannot carry Boehringer's affirmative burden to ***establish*** the existence of prior art that renders the claims unpatentable. *See Dynamic Drinkware*, 800 F.3d at 1378-79; *Harmonic Inc*., 815 F.3d at 1363.

Second, the Board should reject Boehringer's Ground 6 pursuant to Section 325(d). The PTO considered the validity of the '213 patent claims in light of the '101 patent, and expressly found that the '213 patent claims were entitled to priority over the '101 patent. In Ground 6 of this Petition, Boehringer similarly

asserts that the '213 patent claims are unpatentable under Section 102(e) over the '101 patent, thus raising "the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously [] presented to the Office" as contemplated under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d). The Board should reject Boehringer's request to "second-guess" the PTO. *See Neil Ziegmann, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens*, IPR2015-01860, Paper 12 at 13 (Feb. 24, 2016) (refusing to institute IPR where petition was the equivalent of asking the Board "to second-guess the Office's previous decision on substantially the same issue"); *Hospira*, IPR2017-00739, Paper 16 at 18 (denying institution where examiner already determined that patent owner had antedated prior art).

C. *Inter Partes* Review Proceedings Violate the Constitution.

The Board should terminate this proceeding because it violates Patent Owner's constitutional rights. Because patents are private property rights and disputes concerning their validity were traditionally decided by courts, patent validity must be litigated in an Article III court, not before an executive branch agency. *McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. C. Aultman & Co.*, 169 U.S. 606, 609 (1898). Adversarial challenges to an issued patent—like *inter partes* reviews—are also "Suits at common law" for which the Seventh Amendment guarantees a jury trial. U.S. Const. amend. VII; *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370, 377 (1996). Moreover, even if *inter partes* review

is constitutional in other circumstances, it is unconstitutional for patents—like the '213 patent—that issued before passage of the America Invents Act.

The Supreme Court is currently considering the constitutionality of *inter partes* reviews in *Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene's Energy Group, LLC*, No. 16-712. Patent Owner presents this constitutional challenge now to preserve the issue pending the Supreme Court's decision.

IV. CONCLUSION

Boehringer's Petition raises grounds that the Board is already addressing in other proceedings, and that rest on a reference that the PTO already determined was not prior art. Allowing Boehringer to raise those redundant arguments in a new IPR proceeding would waste the Board's and Patent Owner's resources, and present Boehringer with an unfair tactical advantage. Genentech therefore respectfully requests that the Board exercise its discretion to deny institution of all grounds pursuant to Section 325(d).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2018

/David L. Cavanaugh/
David L. Cavanaugh
Registration No. 36,476
Counsel for Patent Owner

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
TEL: 202-663-6000
FAX: 202-663-6363
EMAIL: david.cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that the foregoing Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, contains 3,567 words as measured by the word processing software used to prepare the document, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 5, 2018

/David L. Cavanaugh/
David L. Cavanaugh
Registration No. 36,476

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on January 5, 2018, I caused a true and correct copy of the following materials:

- Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
- Certificate of Compliance

to be served electronically via electronic mail, as previously agreed by the parties, on the following attorneys of record:

Ira J. Levy
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
620 Eighth Avenue, New York, NY 10018
ILevy@goodwinlaw.com

Brian A. Fairchild
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
100 Northern Avenue Boston, MA 02210
bfairchild@goodwinlaw.com

DG-BI213@goodwinlaw.com

/Rebecca Whitfield/
Rebecca A. Whitfield
Reg. No. 73,756
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109