

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GLAXOSMITHKLINE BIOLOGICALS SA,
Petitioner,

v.

PFENEX INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00962
Patent No. 8,530,171

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES REVIEW*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	REQUIREMENTS FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. 42.104.....	3
	A. Grounds for Standing	3
	B. Identification of Challenges	3
III.	THE '171 PATENT.....	3
	A. The Challenged Claims	4
	B. Patent Owner's Admissions in the Specification.....	6
	C. Prosecution of the '171 Patent	7
	D. The '171 Patent is Not Entitled to Its Alleged Priority Dates.....	7
IV.	BACKGROUND	12
	A. Expression of Diphtheria Toxin Proteins Including CRM 197	12
	B. <i>P. fluorescens</i> Was Known as A Superior Platform for High- Level Expression of Soluble and Active Recombinant Proteins	15
V.	ASSERTED PRIOR ART	19
	A. Blais.....	19
	B. Squires	25
	C. Choi	27
	D. Ramseier I.....	27
	E. Ramseier II	29
	F. Maunsell	29
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	30

VII. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21-24, 27, 29, 32, AND 33 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES.....	30
A. Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious Over Blais in View of Squires	32
1. Blais Discloses the Expression of Soluble and Active CRM197 at the Claimed Levels in An <i>E. coli</i> Bacterial Host	32
a. <i>ligating into an expression vector a nucleotide sequence encoding CRM197</i>	33
b. <i>transforming the Pseudomonad host cell with the expression vector</i>	34
c. <i>culturing the transformed Pseudomonad host cell in a culture media suitable for the expression of CRM197</i>	34
d. <i>wherein the recombinant protein is produced at a yield of soluble or active CRM197 protein of about 0.2 g/L to about 12 g/L</i>	35
2. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Modify Blais Based on the Teachings of Squires	36
3. The Combination of Blais and Squires Would Have Provided A Reasonable Expectation of Achieving the Claimed Method.....	39
B. Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious.....	41
C. Claims 2 and 22 Would Have Been Obvious.....	42
D. Claims 3, 7, 9, 23, 24, 27, and 29 Would Have Been Obvious	42
E. Claims 15, 17, 32, and 33 Would Have Been Obvious	45
F. Claims 11 and 12 Would Have Been Obvious	46

VIII.	GROUND 2: CLAIMS 13, 14, 30, AND 31 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES AND CHOI.....	47
IX.	GROUND 3: CLAIMS 4, 5, 8, 10, 16, 18-20, 25, 28, AND 34-36 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES AND RAMSEIER I	51
	A. Claims 4, 10, and 20 Would Have Been Obvious	51
	B. Claims 5, 8, 25 and 28 Would Have Been Obvious	53
	C. Claims 16, 18, 19, and 34-36 Would Have Been Obvious	56
X.	GROUND 4: CLAIMS 6 AND 26 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES, RAMSEIER I, RAMSEIER II, AND MAUNSELL.....	58
XI.	THE EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN THIS PETITION WAS NOT PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE.....	61
XII.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.8.....	62
	A. Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1))	62
	B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2)).....	62
	C. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(3)).....	62
XIII.	CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R §42.24(d).....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Acorda Therapeutics, Inc. v. Roxane Labs., Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	39
<i>Adang v. Fischhoff</i> , 286 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	12
<i>Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.</i> , 520 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	41
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	51
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	45
<i>Amazon.com Inc. v. Customplay, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01496, Paper 34 (PTAB March 4, 2020)	22
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	8, 9
<i>Chiron Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 363 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8
<i>In re Chu</i> , 66 F.3d 292 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	8
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	22
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Brenner</i> , 248 F. Supp. 402 (D.D.C 1965), <i>rev’d</i> , 375 F.2d 599 (D.C. Cir. 1967)	22
<i>In re Hilmer</i> , 359 F.2d 859 (C.C.P.A. 1966)	19, 20, 21

Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.,
107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995)11

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir, 2007)39

PGS Geophysical AS v. Iancu,
891 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018)36

PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.,
491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)6

Rasmusson v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.,
413 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005)9

Senju Pharm. Co. v. Lupin Ltd.,
780 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2015)40

Ex Parte Zemla,
142 U.S.P.Q. 499 (B.P.A.I. 1964)21

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)25, 27, 29

35 U.S.C. § 102(d)19

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)(2).....22

35 U.S.C. § 102(g)21

35 U.S.C. § 10342

35 U.S.C. § 1128, 11, 12

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)62

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.862

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....62

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2).....	62
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....	62
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a).....	64
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1)(i)	64
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d)	64
37 C.F.R. § 42.104	3

Other Authorities

Gordon R. Lindeen III, <i>In re Hilmer and the Paris Convention: An Interpretation of the Right of Foreign Priority for Patents of Invention</i> , 18 Calif. W. Int’l L. J. 335, 340 (1988).....	20
Harold C. Wegner, <i>TRIPS Boomerang—Obligations for Domestic Reform</i> , 29 Vand. J. Transnat’l L. 535, 556 (1996).....	20
Heinz Bardehle, <i>A New Approach to Worldwide Harmonization of Patent Law</i> . 81 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc’y 303, 310 (1999).....	20
Reinhard Wieczorek, <i>Convention Applications as Patent-Defeating Prior Rights</i>	21
Robert A. Armitage, <i>Understanding the America Invents Act and Its Implications for Patenting</i> , 40 AIPLA Q.J. 1, 63 (2012).....	21
Toshiko Takenaka, <i>Rethinking the United States First-to-Invent Principle from A Comparative Law Perspective: A Proposal to Restructure §102 Novelty and Priority Provisions</i> , 39 Hous. L. Rev. 621, 659 (2002)	20, 21, 22

I. INTRODUCTION

U.S. Patent No. 8,530,171 (“the ’171 patent”) claims methods of producing a known protein, CRM197, in a known bacterial host, a *Pseudomonad* host cell, at yields of about 0.2 to about 12 g/L of soluble and/or active protein. ’171 patent (EX1001), 145:42-54 (claim 1). These methods would have been obvious over the prior art as of the filing date of the ’171 patent (March 28, 2011),¹ as well as its alleged priority date (March 30, 2010).

Long before the ’171 patent, those skilled in the art had been actively attempting to improve the expression of CRM197, a well-characterized protein routinely used in commercial vaccines, in different bacterial expression systems. Blais had achieved high-level expression of soluble and active CRM197 at yields of over 3 g/L in *E. coli* cells. *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (“*P. fluorescens*”), a

¹ Petitioner notes that it previously filed a petition on May 7, 2020 challenging the ’171 patent in IPR2020-00890. Petitioner files this second petition to account for a potential dispute regarding the prior art status of the Blais reference (EX1004). This second petition is substantially the same as the first petition but adds a new section (*see* Section III.D. below) establishing that the ’171 patent is not entitled to any of its priority dates; thereby, further establishing that Blais qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Pseudomonad strain, was known to be unusually well suited for high-level production of soluble and active recombinant proteins, and had been proven to be superior to *E. coli* for high-level expression of a variety of therapeutic proteins. Squires further disclosed that *P. fluorescens* could tolerate a wide range of cultivating conditions and that large-scale fermentation conditions had been routinely optimized for high-level expression of recombinant proteins in *P. fluorescens*. In view of Blais's high-level production of soluble and active CRM197 in *E. coli* and Squires's express teaching that *P. fluorescens* was "a compelling alternative" to *E. coli* and particularly suitable for high-level protein expression, a POSA would have had a strong motivation to use *P. fluorescens* as a host for expressing soluble and active CRM197 from Blais's successful FlgI-CRM197 expression vector, and would have reasonably expected to achieve a yield falling within the range recited in claim 1.

The dependent claims recite well-known limitations that also would have been obvious to a POSA in view of the prior art, including signal sequences, tags, promoters, induction conditions, protease-deficient hosts, and codon optimization. Because these additional limitations were routinely used in the art, as reflected by Choi, Raimseier I, Raimseier II, and Maunsell, claims 2-36 also would have been obvious.

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. 42.104

A. Grounds for Standing

Petitioner certifies that (1) the '171 patent is available for IPR and (2) Petitioner is not barred or estopped from requesting review on the grounds identified.

B. Identification of Challenges

Petitioner requests review and cancellation of claims 1-36 of the '171 patent pursuant to the following challenges:

Ground	Claims	Basis	References
1	1-3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21-24, 27, 29, 32 and 33	103	Blais (EX1004) in view of Squires (EX1005)
2	13, 14, 30 and 31	103	Blais in view of Squires and Choi (EX1006)
3	4, 5, 8, 10, 16, 18-20, 25, 28 and 34-36	103	Blais in view of Squires and Ramseier I (EX1007)
4	6 and 26	103	Blais in view of Squires, Ramseier I, Ramseier II (EX1008), and Maunsell (EX1009)

III. THE '171 PATENT

The '171 patent is entitled “High Level Expression of Recombinant Toxin Proteins.” EX1001, (54). The '171 patent states that the alleged invention “relates

to the field of recombinant toxin protein production in bacterial hosts” and in particular “relates to production processes for obtaining high levels of a recombinant CRM197” and other recombinant toxin proteins “from a bacterial host.” *Id.*, Abstract.

A. The Challenged Claims

Claim 1, the only independent claim of the '171 patent, recites:

A method for producing a recombinant toxin protein in a *Pseudomonad* host cell, said method comprising:

ligating into an expression vector a nucleotide sequence encoding the toxin protein;

transforming the *Pseudomonad* host cell with the expression vector; and

culturing the transformed *Pseudomonad* host cell in a culture media suitable for the expression of the recombinant toxin protein;

wherein the recombinant toxin protein is CRM 197, and

wherein the recombinant protein is produced at a yield of soluble or active CRM197 protein of about 0.2 grams per liter to about 12 grams per liter.

EX1001, 145:42-54; EX1003, ¶45. Dependent claim 2 recites ranges of CRM197 protein yield that entirely overlap with the range of “about 0.2 grams per liter to about 12 grams per liter” recited in claim 1. *Compare*, EX1001, 145:56 (“0.2 grams per liter to about 12 grams per liter”) *with* 145:57 (“about 0.2 g/L”).

The other challenged dependent claims additionally require:

- soluble and active CRM197 protein (claim 21 and its dependent claims)²
- secretion signal sequences that direct periplasmic expression of CRM197 (claims 3, 7, 9, 10, 23, 24, 27 and 29)
- a tag sequence adjacent to the coding sequence of the secretion signal sequence (claims 4 and 20)
- a host cell defective in the expression of protease(s) (claims 5, 6, 8, 25, 26 and 28)
- a lac promoter (claims 14 and 31)
- induction conditions (claims 13 and 30)
- activity levels measured in an activity assay (claims 11 and 12)
- a *Pseudomonas* or *Pseudomonas fluorescens* host cell (claims 16, 17, 32 and 33)

² Like dependent claim 2, dependent claim 22 recites ranges of CRM197 protein yield that entirely overlap with the range of “about 0.2 grams per liter to about 12 grams per liter” recited in claim 21. *Compare* EX1001, 148:16-17 (“about 0.2 gram per liter to 12 grams per liter”) *with* 148:24 (“about 12 g/L”).

- codon optimized CRM197-encoding nucleotide sequences (claims 16, 18, 19 and 34-36)

EX1001, claims 3-36; EX1003, ¶46.

B. Patent Owner's Admissions in the Specification

“Admissions in the specification regarding the prior art are binding on the patentee for the purposes of a later inquiry into obviousness.” *PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.*, 491 F.3d 1342, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2007). The '171 patent discloses that multiple elements of the alleged invention were known in the art. These prior art admissions are binding on the Patent Owner.

The '171 patent admits that the claimed nucleotide sequence “may be prepared using known techniques of recombinant DNA technology.” EX1001, 11:24-35 (citing laboratory manuals published in 1989 and 1993). The '171 patent further admits that methods for optimizing the nucleic acid sequence to improve expression in a bacterial host “are known in the art and described in the literature” and that “optimization of codons for expression in a *Pseudomonas* host strain is described” in the prior art. *Id.*, 16:67-17:6. In addition, the '171 patent admits that the claimed activity assays used to measure the produced CRM197 “are known in the art.” *Id.*, 40:41-42. The '171 patent also admits that host cell proteases, including degP1 and AprA, “were known in the art.” *Id.*, 25:33-26:9. These admissions are consistent with the common knowledge that multiple limitations

recited in the '171 patent claims, such as codon optimization and activity assays, were known or routine as of the filing date of the '171 patent. EX1003, ¶48.

C. Prosecution of the '171 Patent

The original independent method claim of the '171 patent did not recite any CRM197 expression levels. EX1002, 90. During prosecution, the Examiner rejected the claims over prior art references not relied on in this petition. *Id.*, 405-08. In response, Patent Owner amended claim 1 to recite a yield of soluble and/or active CRM197. *Id.*, 426.

D. The '171 Patent is Not Entitled to Its Alleged Priority Dates

The '171 patent was filed on March 28, 2011, as a **continuation-in-part (“CIP”)** of PCT/US2010/030573 filed on April 9, 2010, and also claims priority to Provisional Application Nos. 61/325,235 and 61/319,152, filed April 16, 2010, and March 30, 2010, respectively. EX1001, (22), (63), (60), 1:7-14. These three alleged priority documents provided only one example of actual data for the broad range of recombinant protein yields covered by independent claim 1 and all other claims in the '171 patent. Due to the large amount of data added as new subject matter in the '171 patent application filed on March 28, 2011, Patent Owner had no choice but to file the '171 patent as a CIP rather than a continuation of the PCT priority application. The new matter in the CIP application highlights the lack of support for the full scope of the claims of the '171 patent in the data disclosed in the three

priority applications. Thus, the '171 patent is not entitled to claim priority to any application filed prior to March 28, 2011, as the cited priority applications fail to satisfy the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

“It is elementary patent law that a patent application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of an earlier filed application only if the disclosure of the earlier application provides support for the claims of the later application, as required by 35 U.S.C. §112.” *In re Chu*, 66 F.3d 292, 297 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Thus, the '171 patent is only entitled to a priority date earlier than its actual filing date if the priority documents provide sufficient written description and enabling support for the claims of the '171 patent. As detailed below, none of the priority documents provide such support for the limitation in claim 1 which recites: “wherein the recombinant protein is produced at a yield of soluble or active CRM197 protein of about 0.2 grams per liter to about 12 grams per liter.” All other claims in the '171 patent depend from claim 1. Thus the '171 patent is not entitled to any of its priority dates for failure to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

It is well established that “generic claim language appearing *in ipsius verbis* in the original specification does not satisfy the written description requirement if it fails to support the scope of the genus claimed.” *Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2010); *Chiron Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 363 F.3d 1247, 1256-57 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (claims covering both murine and chimeric

antibodies not entitled to priority when earlier application does not enable chimeric antibodies).

Yet other than a generic repetition of the claimed CRM197 yield ranges, the specifications of the '171 patent's priority documents provide no evidence that the inventors actually possessed or had enabled methods for achieving yields of CRM197 spanning the full scope of the claimed ranges. *Ariad Pharm.*, 598 F.3d at 1351 (“the test for sufficiency is whether the disclosure of the application relied upon reasonably conveys to those skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter as of the filing date.”); *see also Rasmusson v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.*, 413 F.3d 1318, 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (no entitlement to priority because the priority application does not “provide experimental proof” for the claimed method).

The priority documents contain only two examples, one example with actual data and one prophetic example, that describe the production of CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* cells, neither of which comes anywhere close to providing adequate written description support for the full scope of the claimed range of yields. EX1030,

Examples 1 and 2; EX1031, Examples 1 and 2; EX1032, Examples 1 and 2³. Example 1 discloses expression of CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* in 96-well plates, with each well containing 500 µl of HTP medium. EX1030, [0079]; EX1003, ¶50. The highest yield achieved among all of the tested strains in Example 1 was 1.263 g/L. EX1030, [0083]; EX1003, ¶50. Example 2 is prophetic and does not describe any *actual* production of CRM197. Rather, it merely concludes that “[b]ased on the HTP expression data above, large-scale fermentation yields from about 0.5 to at least 10 g/L are expected.” EX1030, [0087]. In other words, rather than disclosing any actual yields above 1.263 g/L, the inventors merely speculated that higher levels of production within the claimed range of 0.2 to 12 g/L could be achieved. EX1003, ¶51.

However, this speculation directly contradicts the common knowledge in the art at the time that scalability of the results from small- to large-scale production was unpredictable. EX1003, ¶¶52-55; EX1033, 454, 462; EX1035, 1128. It was well known that large-scale fermentation requires a culture environment and incubation conditions different from those for small-scale production, which “lead[s] to a less

³ The three priority documents contain substantially identical Examples 1 and 2.

To avoid citation redundancy, Petitioner refers to the provisional application filed on March 30, 2010 (EX1030).

favourable mixing behaviour and to impaired physiological reaction conditions which in turn may lead to a decreased process constance and reproducibility, to reduced specific yields and to an increase in unwanted side products.” EX1034, 425; EX1033, 453-54; EX1035, 1128; EX1003, ¶¶52, 54. Thus, “the results obtained from [] screening studies are often difficult to reproduce at conventional laboratory and pilot scales,” and “[i]n general, processes at the larger scale show inferior performances, such as *reduced yields* and productivity.” EX1033, 453-454 (emphasis added), 462; EX1034, 425; EX1003, ¶¶53-54.

Thus, those skilled in the art would have understood that the yields from large-scale fermentation may not even reach the levels from small-scale production, much less achieve yields several-fold higher than those of small-scale production, as speculated in Example 2 of the priority documents. EX1003, ¶55. In other words, absent actual testing, one could not predict whether large-scale fermentation would reproduce the same level of protein yield as that of the small-scale production, and certainly would not expect to see substantially increased yields compared to small-scale production. *Id.*

Because the speculation in the prophetic (hypothetical) Example 2 of the priority documents that higher yields within the claimed ranges (e.g., “at least 10 g/L”) “are expected” directly contradicts the common knowledge in the art at the time, it cannot provide sufficient written description or enabling support for methods

that achieve CRM197 production at yields of up to “*about 12 grams per liter*” as recited in all of the challenged claims. *Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (“It is not sufficient for purposes of the written description requirement of §112 that the disclosure, when combined with the knowledge in the art. would lead one to *speculate* as to modifications that the inventor might have envisioned, but *failed to disclose.*”) (emphases added); *see also Adang v. Fischhoff*, 286 F.3d 1346, 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (finding no entitlement to priority when “the specification [of the earlier application] contains no more than a belief that the [claimed] method might be of use.”). The highest yield based on actual data disclosed in the priority documents of 1.263 g/L cannot sufficiently support a yield that is an order of magnitude greater, 12 g/L, as recited in the claims of the ’171 patent. EX1003, ¶¶13, 18, 49, 56.

Accordingly, the ’171 patent is not entitled to any of its alleged priority dates because the priority documents fail to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

IV. BACKGROUND

A. Expression of Diphtheria Toxin Proteins Including CRM 197

Decades before the ’171 patent was filed, it was known that the diphtheria toxin protein, secreted by *Corynebacterium diphtheriae*, causes the symptoms of diphtheria infection. EX1010, 69-70; EX1003, ¶19. As “one of the most extensively studied and well understood bacterial toxins,” diphtheria toxin had “occupied a

central focus of the field of toxicology” since its discovery in the late 1800s. EX1012, 1793; EX1003, ¶21. The toxin molecule is synthesized as a single-chain protein containing a signal peptide that directs the toxin to the bacterial periplasmic space. EX1011, 343; EX1003, ¶20. The toxin molecule has two subunits, an amino-terminal fragment A, and a carboxy-terminal fragment B, that are linked by a peptide bond and a disulfide bond. EX1010, 70-71; EX1012, 1795; EX1003, ¶20. Fragment B is required for the recognition of specific surface receptors on cells, while fragment A shuts down protein synthesis in an infected cell, thereby causing the symptoms of diphtheria infection. EX1012, 1795; EX1010, 70-71; EX1004, 1:15-19; EX1003, ¶20.

Long before the '171 patent was filed, several diphtheria toxin mutants had been isolated. EX1010, 81; EX1003, ¶21. Those mutated *tox* genes produced proteins that cross-reacted with diphtheria antitoxin (and therefore were termed “cross-reacting materials” or “CRMs”), but were either completely nontoxic or had greatly reduced toxicity. EX1010, 81; EX1003, ¶21. One such protein, CRM197, has a single amino acid mutation that eliminates the toxin’s ADP-ribosyltransferase activity and toxicity. EX1004, 1:30-38; EX1012, 1795; EX1010, 81-82; EX1003, ¶22. CRM197 is otherwise immunogenically indistinguishable from the wild type diphtheria toxin protein. EX1013, 560; EX1012, 1795; EX1010, 81-82; EX1003, ¶22.

CRM197 enhances the immunogenicity of poorly-immunogenic molecules when chemically coupled to such molecules. EX1013, 560; EX1003, ¶23. Accordingly, CRM197 had been used in multiple commercially-available conjugate vaccines prior to 2010. EX1004, 1:46:49; EX1003, ¶¶23, 47.

Diphtheria toxoid, including CRM197, had been produced in bacterial host cells, including Gram-negative bacteria, long before the '171 patent was filed. EX1004, 1:51, EX1003, ¶24. Gram-negative bacteria contain a periplasm, which is a space between the outer surface of the cytoplasmic membrane and the inner surface of the lipopolysaccharide membrane. EX1014, 75, 68 (Fig. 3.29); EX1003, ¶24. *E. coli* and *P. fluorescens* are Gram-negative bacterial cells that can express recombinant proteins in the cytoplasm or the periplasm. EX1014, 68 (Fig. 3.29); EX1004, 12:51-65; EX1003, ¶24. Early studies had reported certain difficulties in producing high levels of soluble and active diphtheria toxoid proteins in *E. coli*. EX1003, ¶25. However, Blais solved these problems and achieved successful production of soluble and active CRM197 at high yields by generating an optimized CRM197-expression construct having an upstream FlgI signal sequence under the control of a *lac* promoter, transforming the construct into *E. coli* cells, and achieving periplasmic expression of soluble and active CRM197 at “unprecedented” levels of over 3 g/L. EX1004, Examples 3 and 9; EX1003, ¶25. Blais also taught that

Pseudomonad cells could be used as suitable hosts instead of *E. coli*. EX1004, 12:54, 14:39; EX1003, ¶25.

Thus, before the filing date of the '171 patent, high-level expression of soluble and active CRM197 had been achieved in *E. coli*, which opened the door for those skilled in the art to further test the expression of Blais's successful construct in other bacterial cells known to be suitable for high-level expression of heterologous proteins. EX1003, ¶26.

B. *P. fluorescens* Was Known as A Superior Platform for High-Level Expression of Soluble and Active Recombinant Proteins

Long before the '171 patent was filed, those skilled in the art had developed robust bacterial host cell platforms to achieve high-level expression of recombinant proteins. EX1003, ¶27 (citing EX1015, 45-46). Among the existing bacterial hosts, *P. fluorescens* was known to have “an impressive capacity for producing heterologous proteins at high levels” and to be “unusually well suited for high level expression.” EX1015, 60-61; EX1003, ¶27.

It was understood that the superior performance of the *P. fluorescens* platform was “due to the combination of a robust host strain and the availability of extensive molecular biology and bioinformatics tools,” and a “well-optimized, high-cell-density (HCD) fermentation process.” EX1015, 46-47; EX1003, ¶28. It was also known that *P. fluorescens* strains “are stable, amenable to genetic or molecular

manipulations, and can be cultivated to high cell densities in fully defined mineral salts media in standard fermentors, without oxygen enrichment.” EX1015, 52; EX1005, 54-55; EX1003, ¶28.

Various promoters, including *tac* and *lacUV5* promoters, which permit induction of expression by isopropyl-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) just like in *E. coli*, had been used to drive the expression of heterologous proteins in *P. fluorescens*. EX1015, 52; EX1005, 55; EX1003, ¶29. *P. fluorescens* was known to “tolerate a wide range of conditions,” and large-scale culturing conditions for *P. fluorescens* were known to be simple and easy to control, without requiring additional animal components, antibiotics, organic nitrogen, or supplemental oxygen. EX1015, 61; EX1016, 2; EX1005, 55, 58; EX1003, ¶29. Additionally, recovery and downstream purification procedures for *P. fluorescens* were considered “standard, and consistent with those employed with *E. coli*.” EX1015, 61; EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶29. Culturing conditions for *P. fluorescens* had been successfully developed “for the commercial production of a number of heterologous proteins.” EX1015, 47; EX1003, ¶29.

P. fluorescens was known to possess “many favorable properties” for “higher volume applications,” including “rapid and efficient expression” of “high volumetric and specific expression of a broad range of therapeutic proteins.” EX1015, 47, 61; *see also* EX1016, 2; EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶30. *P. fluorescens* routinely achieved

expression of recombinant proteins at high cell densities and high biomass levels through “well characterized” fermentation techniques. EX1015, 47, 61; EX1005, 55; EX1016, 2; EX1003, ¶30.

Comparing the production of various recombinant therapeutic proteins in *P. fluorescens* and *E. coli* side-by-side, POSAs had concluded that “[i]n each case, *P. fluorescens* was equivalent to, or had some advantages over the commonly used T7 system in *E. coli*.” EX1015, 55; EX1003, ¶31. In fact, “[i]n most cases the *P. fluorescens* strain produced up to five[-]fold more protein (on a g L⁻¹ basis) than the *E. coli* strain.” EX1015, 60; EX1003, ¶32. And in multiple cases, production of soluble and active recombinant proteins was only achieved by *P. fluorescens*, but not *E. coli*. EX1015, 59; EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶33.

For instance, human growth hormone (hGH) was expressed cytoplasmically in both *P. fluorescens* and *E. coli* at a 20-L fermentation scale, and *P. fluorescens* produced 1.6-fold more hGH per gram dry biomass than *E. coli*. EX1015, 55; EX1003, ¶31. Indeed, cytoplasmic expression of hGH in *E. coli* had led to formation of insoluble inclusion bodies, and so a *P. fluorescens* signal sequence, Pbp, was used to express soluble and active hGH in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens*, reaching a yield of more than 5 g/L. EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶31.

The comparative expression of human gamma interferon (γ -IFN) in *P. fluorescens* and *E. coli* likewise “revealed a significant advantage for recovery of

the active cytokine in the *P. fluorescens* expression system.” EX1015, 56; EX1003, ¶32. Compared to *E. coli*, which produced 2-4 g/L of insoluble γ -IFN protein at the 20-L scale, *P. fluorescens* produced about 4 g/L of γ -IFN in a 20-L fermentation, with 95% of the expressed protein being found in the soluble fraction. EX1015, 56; EX1003, ¶32. Additionally, γ -IFN protein expressed in *P. fluorescens* was as active as the commercially available protein in a viral inhibition assay. EX1015, 56; EX1003, ¶32.

Even when *P. fluorescens* was used to express antibody proteins, known to be challenging to produce in bacterial cells, it still achieved superior results compared to *E. coli*. EX1017, 350; EX1015, 56; EX1003, ¶33. For instance, a cytoplasmically-expressed anti- β -galactosidase single chain antibody, Gal13, had been expressed at 8-fold greater levels in *P. fluorescens* than in *E. coli*. EX1015, 56-57; EX1003, ¶33. And whereas only 48% of the Gal13 produced in *E. coli* was soluble, 96% was soluble when produced in *P. fluorescens*. EX1015, 56, 58 (Figure 3.5); EX1003, ¶33. Thus, it was noted that “significant savings in purification costs can be achieved” by using *P. fluorescens* rather than *E. coli*. EX1015, 60; EX1003, ¶33.

Thus, it is unsurprising that prior to the '171 patent, those skilled in the art had concluded that “[t]he combination of high volumetric and specific expression of a broad range of therapeutic proteins, coupled with a potential for soluble, active,

and secreted products, makes *P. fluorescens* a compelling alternative for the microbial expression of biologicals for human health,” providing strong motivation to use *P. fluorescens*. EX1015, 61; EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶34.

V. ASSERTED PRIOR ART

A. Blais

Blais is a PCT application filed in English on October 7, 2010, designating the U.S., and published in English as WO 2011/042516. EX1004, (22), (25), (26), (81). Thus, Blais is prior art to the '171 patent under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) at least because the '171 patent is not entitled to any of its priority dates and, at best, is only entitled to its filing date of March 28, 2011. *See* Section III.D., *supra*.

To the extent that the Board determines the '171 patent benefits from its priority claims, Petitioner alternatively argues that Blais qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on its foreign priority date of October 8, 2009. EX1004, (30); EX1029. The AIA statutorily abolished the *Hilmer* doctrine (which held that a foreign priority date serves as a “shield” not a “sword”) from applying to AIA patents, and the USPTO has the discretion to determine that *Hilmer* likewise should not apply to pre-AIA patents. AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(d); *In re Hilmer*, 359 F.2d 859 (C.C.P.A. 1966). Indeed, the AIA merely codified what the United States had already agreed to do by treaty—eliminate favoritism between U.S. inventors and foreign inventors in application of U.S. patent laws.

In contrast, the *Hilmer* doctrine, created by the CCPA in 1966, arguably violates Article 27(1) of the TRIPS Agreement, adopted by the U.S. on January 1, 1996, which states that “patents shall be available and patent rights enjoyable without discrimination as to the place of invention.” Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299, 33 I.L.M. 1197 (1994); *see also* Heinz Bardehle, *A New Approach to Worldwide Harmonization of Patent Law*, 81 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc’y 303, 310 (1999) (arguing that the Hilmer doctrine violates the TRIPS Agreement).

The *Hilmer* doctrine also arguably violates the national treatment principle set forth in Article 2 of the Paris Convention because the disparate treatment regarding foreign and domestic priority disadvantages foreign applicants. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, as last revised at the Stockholm Revision Conference, Mar. 20, 1883 21 U.S.T. 1583; 828 U.N.T.S. 305; *see also* Harold C. Wegner, *TRIPS Boomerang—Obligations for Domestic Reform*, 29 Vand. J. Transnat’l L. 535, 556 (1996) (noting the *Hilmer* doctrine “unfairly denies foreign patentees their patent-defeating right guaranteed by the Paris Convention”); Gordon R. Lindeen III, *In re Hilmer and the Paris Convention: An Interpretation of the Right of Foreign Priority for Patents of Invention*, 18 Calif. W. Int’l L. J. 335, 340 (1988) (concluding the *Hilmer* doctrine violates Article 4 of the Paris Convention); Toshiko

Takenaka, *Rethinking the United States First-to-Invent Principle from A Comparative Law Perspective: A Proposal to Restructure §102 Novelty and Priority Provisions*, 39 Hous. L. Rev. 621, 659 (2002) (noting the *Hilmer* doctrine “violates the priority right provision under the Paris Convention, as well as the non-discrimination policy provision regarding the place of invention under the TRIPS Agreement.”); Reinhard Wieczorek, *Convention Applications as Patent-Defeating Prior Rights*, 6 IIC: Int’l Rev. of Indus. Prop. & Copyright L. 135, 156–65 (1975).

Even before the AIA, the USPTO had eliminated a major element of such discrimination—the inability to rely on foreign activities in interference proceedings. Robert A. Armitage, *Understanding the America Invents Act and Its Implications for Patenting*, 40 AIPLA Q.J. 1, 63 (2012) (“[u]nder pre-AIA law, whenever necessary to prevent identical patents from issuing to rival inventors, pre-AIA §102(g) would effectively trump the *Hilmer* limitation of pre-AIA §102(e) by—in effect—treating the foreign patent filing priority date as the relevant patentability-defeating date. Indeed, such trumping was routine in patent interference contests.”); *see also* Takenaka, 39 Hous. L. Rev. at 659.

In fact, it was the USPTO’s practice to give prior art effect to foreign filing dates prior to *Hilmer*. *See e.g. Ex Parte Zemla*, 142 U.S.P.Q. 499 (B.P.A.I. 1964) (concluding that sections 102(e) and 119 “must be read together and the filing date of the foreign application becomes the effective date of the United States reference

patent.”). The *Hilmer* court expressly acknowledged such practice and the agreement by district courts with the USPTO on this issue. *Hilmer*, 359 F.2d 859, 863 (C.C.P.A. 1966) (discussing *Ex Parte Zemla* and *Eli Lilly & Co. v. Brenner*, 248 F. Supp. 402, 433 (D.D.C 1965), *rev'd*, 375 F.2d 599 (D.C. Cir. 1967)).

Petitioner calls upon the USPTO to renew its efforts to honor U.S. treaty obligations in this IPR proceeding involving a pre-AIA patent, by again adopting procedures to eliminate anomalous results between domestic and foreign patent applicants by recognizing a patent applicant’s foreign priority date as the relevant patent defeating date under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Takenaka, 39 Hous. L. Rev. at 659 (2002) (“A removal of the Hilmer doctrine will better serve U.S. inventors” by “eliminat[ing] the illogical problems caused by the doctrine that U.S. legal commentators extensively criticize”).

Thus, even if the ’171 patent is entitled to one or more of its priority dates, Blais is prior art under §102(e) because Blais’s underlying priority application supports at least one claim of Blais, as demonstrated in the following table. *See Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1378-79 (Fed. Cir. 2015); *see also Amazon.com Inc. v. Customplay, LLC*, IPR2018-01496, Paper 34 at 46-47 (PTAB March 4, 2020) (“Nothing in *Dynamic Drinkware* indicates a departure from” the reasoning that “if the patent is shown to have at least one claim to an invention that is supported by the disclosure of a provisional application, ...

the patent may be considered prior art as of the filing date of the provisional under §102(e)(2).”). Accordingly, because the Blais GB application was filed before each of the ’171 patent’s priority applications, Blais is prior art to the ’171 patent under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) even if the ’171 patent is entitled to one or more of its priority dates.

Claim Language in Blais	Support in GB Application No. 0917647.0
38. A process for periplasmic expression of a recombinant polypeptide	“the present application provides an improved process for making a bacterial toxin by periplasmic expression” (EX1031, 3; <i>see also id.</i> , 4, 16, 33).
by A. Growing a culture of a gram-negative host cell;	“In a sixth aspect of the invention there is provided a process for making a bacterial toxin comprising the steps of a) growing a culture of the bacterial host cell of the invention” (<i>id.</i> , 4; <i>see also</i> 16, 30). “Representative examples of appropriate hosts include gram negative bacterial cells” (<i>id.</i> , 15).
B. Inducing expression of a polypeptide such that a protein is expressed periplasmically;	“In a sixth aspect of the invention there is provided a process for making a bacterial toxin comprising the steps of ... b) inducing expression of the polypeptide a such that a bacterial toxoid is expressed periplasmically” (<i>id.</i> , 4; <i>see also</i> 16, 33-34, Table).
wherein one or more of the following steps is actioned during expression: i. The pH of step a) is lower than the pH of step b);	“In a second embodiment the pH of step a) is lower than the pH of step b)” (<i>id.</i> , 16; <i>see also</i> 17, 33).

<p>ii. The temperature of step a) is higher than the temperature of step b); or iii. The substrate feed rate of step a) is higher than the substrate feed rate of step b).</p>	
--	--

Blais discloses “methods related to periplasmic expression of...CRM197....” EX1004, Abstract; EX1003, ¶45. Blais acknowledges prior reported difficulties of expressing soluble and active diphtheria toxin proteins (including mutant forms, such as CRM197) and discloses improved processes for the expression and manufacture of bulk cultures of such toxins in bacterial hosts. EX1004, 1:5-7, 2:4-18; EX1003, ¶¶60-61. Blais discloses that representative examples of appropriate hosts include gram negative bacteria, such as *E. coli* and *Pseudomonas*. EX1004, 12:51-54, 14:35-39. Example 1 describes the construction of periplasmic CRM197 expression vectors containing various signal sequences, and Example 3 describes the design of an optimized CRM197 expression vector that contains an FlgI signal sequence fused to the N-terminus of the CRM197-encoding sequence. EX1004, Examples 1 and 3; EX1003, ¶62. Example 7 describes transforming BLR(DE3) *E. coli* cells with the construct produced in Example 3, culturing those transformed cells, and inducing production of CRM197 “at an easily detectable” level. EX1004, 21:45-57; EX1003, ¶62.

Example 8 describes pre-culturing the *E. coli* cells transformed with the FlgI-CRM197 construct for large-scale production. EX1004, Example 8. Example 9 describes a detailed process for a 20-liter scale fermentation and production of CRM197, extracting soluble CRM197 from the periplasm of the *E. coli* cells by osmotic shock, and measuring the yield of soluble and active CRM197 by ELISA. *Id.*, 22:15-24:12; 24:13-15; EX1003, ¶63. Table 4 shows that periplasmic CRM197 expression reached yields of 3180 mg/L (3.18 g/L) and that cytoplasmic CRM197 expression reached yields of 394 mg/L (0.394 g/L). EX1004, Table 4; EX1003, ¶63. Blais concluded that its CRM197 production technique “demonstrated unprecedented levels of expression and efficiency of secretion.” EX1004, 24:20-21.

B. Squires

Squires is a scientific article that was published in December 2004. EX1005, 54. Thus, Squires is prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Squires describes *P. fluorescens* as a superior heterologous expression platform that is “amenable to genetic or molecular manipulations and can be cultivated at high cell densities.” EX1005, 54; EX1003, ¶64. Squires teaches that *P. fluorescens* “has many favorable properties” for “rapid, efficient expression of therapeutic molecules” and can “routinely achieve[]” high cell density and high-level protein production yield “in standard fermentation.” EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶66. Squires emphasizes that *P. fluorescens* “is unusually well suited for high-level

expression and will tolerate a wide range of fermentation conditions” and that “[r]ecovery and downstream purification procedures are standard and consistent with those used for molecules expressed by *E. coli*.” EX1005, 58.

Squires discloses that, unlike *E. coli*, *P. fluorescens* can be cultivated to high densities using relatively simple conditions and can produce heterologous protein biomass levels of greater than 100 g/L dry weight, which account for more than 50% of the total cell proteins. EX1005, 54-55, 58; EX1003, ¶64. Squires further emphasizes the advantages of periplasmic expression in *P. fluorescens* over cytoplasmic expression in *E. coli* and discloses that the native Pbp *P. fluorescens* signal sequence “has been found effective at efficiently transporting” various disulfide-bonded heterologous proteins into the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* in their mature and properly folded forms. EX1005, 55; EX1003, ¶¶64-65.

Squires demonstrated successful expression of soluble and active heterologous disulfide-bonded proteins, including Gal2, interferon- γ , and hGH, in the periplasm (by using the Pbp signal sequence) and cytoplasm of *P. fluorescens* at levels of 1.02 g/L to 5 g/L. EX1005, 56, 58; EX1003, ¶65. Squires concluded that “[h]igh-volumetric and specific expression of a range of therapeutic molecules as soluble, active, and secreted products makes *P. fluorescens* a compelling alternative for the microbial expression of biologicals for human health.” EX1005, 58.

C. Choi

Choi is a scientific article published in June 2000. EX1006, 640. Thus, Choi is prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Choi describes using a *Bacillus* signal sequence for secretory production of soluble recombinant alkaline phosphatase in *E. coli* by high cell density cultivation. *Id.*, Abstract; EX1003, ¶67. Choi discloses that although IPTG induction at low cell density (OD₆₀₀=50) led to formation of insoluble inclusion bodies, induction at high cell density (OD₆₀₀=150) produced soluble periplasmic alkaline phosphatase at concentrations of 5.2 g/L. EX1006, 643-44; EX1003, ¶68. Using a different *E. coli* strain, Choi also achieved periplasmic expression of soluble alkaline phosphatase at a level of 2.7 g/L when expression was induced at high cell density (OD₆₀₀=100). EX1006, 644; EX1003, ¶69.

Choi concluded that “IPTG induction at high cell density (OD₆₀₀=150) resulted in the formation of soluble proteins and a high efficiency of fractionation (Fig. 4),” which “demonstrated that alkaline phosphatase could be efficiently secreted in high-cell- density fed-batch fermentation.” EX1006, Abstract, 645; EX1003, ¶69.

D. Ramseier I

Ramseier I is a U.S. Patent Application published on October 30, 2008. EX1007, 1. Thus, Ramseier I is prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Acknowledging that “the presence of specific host cell proteases may degrade the protein of interest and thus reduce the final yield” of recombinant proteins in a host cell, Ramseier I describes methods of generating “a population of *P. fluorescens* cells that has been genetically modified to reduce the expression of at least one target gene involved in protein degradation.” EX1007, [0008]; EX1003, ¶70. Ramseier I discloses that the target gene in some embodiments is a protease selected from hslV, hslU, clpA, clpB and clpX. EX1007, [0034]. Ramseier I further discloses that “[t]he modification can also be to more than one protease.” *Id.*, [0049].

Example 5 of Ramseier I describes construction of *P. fluorescens* strains with genomic deletions of protease genes. *Id.*, Example 5; EX1003, ¶71. Example 6 reports high-throughput growth of *P. fluorescens* strains that are defective in various proteases, including degP2 and prc1, for expression of the heterologous protein Gal2. EX1007, Example 6; EX1003, ¶71. Ramseier I also discloses that expression of Gal2 in strains including Δ prc1 and Δ degP2 “were all 2.4-fold or more higher than the control strains, which was statistically significant ($p < 0.5$)” and that fully assembled active Gal2 protein was detected in the soluble fraction of the Δ prc1 and Δ degP2 strains but not in the control. EX1007, [0211].

Ramseier I further discloses that expression vectors may include a polypeptide tag-encoding sequence adjacent to the coding sequence for the protein or polypeptide of interest to “facilitate[] identification, separation, purification, and/or

isolation of an expressed polypeptide.” *Id.*, [0124]; EX1003, ¶72. Ramseier I also discloses optimizing the coding sequence of the heterologous proteins by synthesizing the gene of interest to reflect the codon use preferences of *P. fluorescens*. EX1007, [0123], [0149]; EX1003, ¶73.

E. Ramseier II

Ramseier II is a U.S. Patent Application published on May 25, 2006. EX1008,

1. Thus, Ramseier II is prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Ramseier II relates to “the field of protein production, and in particular [discloses] a process for improving the production levels of recombinant proteins or peptides or improving the level of active recombinant proteins or peptides expressed in host cells.” *Id.*, [0002]. Ramseier II discloses that known “approaches have been taken to avoid degradation during recombinant protein production,” including the use of previously described *E. coli* host strains that are deficient in proteases DegP and Prc. *Id.*, [0012]; EX1003, ¶74.

F. Maunsell

Maunsell is a scientific article that was published in January 2006. EX1009, 29. Thus, Maunsell is prior art to the ’171 patent under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Maunsell discloses that *aprA*, a serralyisin-type metalloprotease gene, “was identified and found to encode the major, if not only, extracellular protease produced by [*P. fluorescens* strain M114].” EX1009, Abstract, 39; EX1003, ¶75.

VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

A POSA working in the field of the '171 patent at the relevant time, would have possessed a Ph.D. in Biology, Microbiology, Molecular Biology, or Genetic Engineering, with several years of post-doctoral research experience focused on molecular cloning, designing expression constructs for recombinant proteins, including diphtheria toxins, and expression of recombinant proteins in a bacterial host cell. EX1003, ¶58. The POSA may have worked as a team member or through collaborations with others to develop or utilize molecular cloning techniques, or to research potential therapeutic or diagnostic molecules for expression in bacterial systems.

VII. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21-24, 27, 29, 32, AND 33 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES

Each element of claims 1-3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21-24, 27, 29, 32, and 33 is taught by Blais and Squires. Blais describes processes for the expression and manufacture of bulk cultures of bacterial toxins, including CRM197, in Gram-negative bacteria, including *Pseudomonas*. EX1004, 1:5-9, 12:54, 14:39. Blais created expression vectors comprising a CRM197-encoding sequence fused to an FlgI signal sequence, and successfully used those vectors to achieve periplasmic expression of soluble and active CRM197 in *E. coli* at levels over 3 g/L, as measured by ELISA. EX1004, Example 9, Table 4; EX1003, ¶77. Thus, Blais establishes that

a POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully achieving high levels of periplasmic expression of CRM197 in bacterial cells. EX1003, ¶77.

Squires discloses the *P. fluorescens* bacterial strain as being “unusually well suited for high-level expression” of recombinant proteins, making it a “compelling alternative” to *E. coli*. EX1005, 54-55, 58; EX1003, ¶¶66, 90. Squires further discloses using a Pbp signal sequence to successfully produce various soluble and active disulfide-bonded recombinant proteins at high levels in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens*, and discloses the routineness and predictability of achieving reproducibly high yields of recombinant protein expression through well-characterized fermentation techniques. EX1005, 56, 58; EX1003, ¶¶98-99.

Thus, based on the successful expression of Blais’s FlgI-CRM197 construct in *E. coli* and the successful expression of various recombinant proteins in *P. fluorescens* disclosed by Squires, a POSA would have been motivated to express CRM197 in *P. fluorescens*, as claimed in the ’171 patent. EX1003, ¶95. Furthermore, Blais’s expression of more than 3 g/L of CRM197 in *E. coli*, combined with Squires’s disclosure of the expression of various recombinant proteins at similar levels in *P. fluorescens* would have provided a reasonable expectation of successfully achieving levels of soluble and active CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* within the claimed range. *Id.*, ¶100.

A. Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious Over Blais in View of Squires

Claim 1, the only independent claim, recites a method for producing CRM197 in a *Pseudomonad* host cell by (1) ligating a nucleotide sequence encoding CRM197 into an expression vector, (2) transforming a *Pseudomonad* host cell with the expression vector, and (3) culturing the transformed *Pseudomonad* host cell to produce a yield of soluble or active CRM197 protein of about 0.2 g/L to about 12 g/L. EX1001, 145:41-54; EX1003, ¶76. As discussed below, Blais discloses all the elements of claim 1. EX1003, ¶¶14, 77. A POSA would have been motivated to improve CRM197 production by expressing Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct in Squires's *Pseudomonad* cells, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in arriving at the method recited in claim 1. *Id.*, ¶¶15-16, 77.

1. Blais Discloses the Expression of Soluble and Active CRM197 at the Claimed Levels in An *E. coli* Bacterial Host

Methods of producing CRM197 were known in the art prior to the filing date of the '171 patent. EX1004, 1:51; EX1003, ¶24. Although the field initially experienced difficulties in producing CRM197, Blais provided an efficient solution to that problem by describing an improved process for making bacterial toxin proteins, such as CRM197, by transforming bacterial cells with a vector encoding a signal sequence fused to the bacterial toxin such that the bacterial toxin is expressed periplasmically. EX1004, 2:12-18, 13:43; EX1003, ¶25. Blais demonstrates high-

level expression of CRM197 in *E. coli*, and specifically discloses *Pseudomonas* as a representative example of another suitable host that could be used in the improved process. EX1004, 12:54, 14:39, 24:18-21; EX1003, ¶77. Thus, Blais discloses all of the limitations of claim 1.

a. ligating into an expression vector a nucleotide sequence encoding CRM197

Example 3 and Figure 3 of Blais describe how to ligate an FlgI signal sequence to a CRM197-encoding sequence and then insert this FlgI-CRM197 fragment into a pRIT 16669 expression vector. EX1004, 20:22-34, Figure 3; EX1003, ¶¶78-79. Specifically, Blais discloses that “[a] region of DNA containing the FlgI signal sequence fused to the N-terminal part of the CRM197 sequence was amplified using standard PCR techniques.” EX1004, 20:25-26. Blais also discloses the sequences of the primers (SEQ ID NOs:29 and 30) and the PCR conditions, and states that the amplified CRM197-encoding fragment “was inserted into plasmid pRIT 16669 using standard molecular biology techniques through digestion of the PCR product and plasmid pRIT 16669 with the restriction enzymes NdeI and AatII.” *Id.*, 20:26-30, 20:32-34. Blais discloses that “[t]he resulting plasmid contains the complete mature N-terminus of CRM197 (SEQ ID NO:31) and the FlgI signal sequence terminating at the signalase binding site (SEQ ID NO:23) and was named pRIT

16681.” *Id.*, 20:34-36. As such, Blais expressly discloses the “ligating” step of claim 1 and the challenged dependent claims. EX1003, ¶78.

b. transforming the Pseudomonad host cell with the expression vector

Example 3 of Blais discloses that the pRIT 16681 plasmid containing the FlgI signal sequence and CRM197-encoding sequence was “transformed into Novablue chemically competent cells” having a Novagen catalog number of 70181-3 (corresponding to a K-12 *E. coli* strain). EX1004, 20:38-39. Blais confirmed the presence of the FlgI-CRM197 sequence in the plasmids by sequencing, and then transforming the confirmed plasmids into B834(DE) chemically competent cells (Novagen Cat. 69041-3) for expression. *Id.*, 20:41-42, 22:1-5. Thus, Blais describes the “transforming” step of claim 1. EX1003, ¶¶80-81.

c. culturing the transformed Pseudomonad host cell in a culture media suitable for the expression of CRM197

Blais describes culturing the transformed *E. coli* cells in LBT medium supplemented with 1% glucose, and inducing expression of CRM197 by addition of 1mM IPTG. EX1004, 20:47-48, 21:10-15. Example 7 of Blais discloses that the “BLR(DE3) *E. coli* cells were transformed with the construct produced in Example 3, cultured and expression [was] induced as described in the optimised protocol of example 5.” *Id.*, 21:46-47. For large scale production, Blais further prepared the transformed CRM197-expressing *E. coli* cells for fermentation and then cultured the

cells under specified conditions, including pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen level, induction time, and IPTG concentration. *Id.*, Examples 8 and 9. Thus, Blais expressly discloses the “culturing” step of claim 1. EX1003, ¶¶82-83.

d. wherein the recombinant protein is produced at a yield of soluble or active CRM197 protein of about 0.2 g/L to about 12 g/L

After culturing the transformed *E. coli* cells and inducing the production of CRM197, Blais used osmotic shock to extract CRM197 from the cells. EX1004, 24:13-14; EX1003, ¶84. Blais’s osmotic shock method collected the supernatant fraction of the host cell lysate, which contains only soluble proteins. EX1003, ¶84; EX1024, 212.

Blais then measured the amounts of CRM197 in the periplasmic and cytoplasmic fractions by ELISA, which revealed a yield of 3180 mg/L (3.180 g/L) and 394 mg/L (0.394 g/L), respectively. EX1004, 24:15-19; EX1003, ¶84. Because the soluble protein retained its ability to bind to anti-CRM197 antibodies in the ELISA, a POSA would have understood that Blais’s CRM197 protein was active, as that term is used in the ’171 patent. EX1003, ¶¶85-86; ’171 patent, 41:42-22 (“Activity assays include ... antibody binding assays, e.g., ... ELISA”); EX1005, 58 (using ELISA to measure the activity of the soluble periplasmic Gal2 in *P. fluorescens* and reporting that the purified soluble protein “was found to be active”).

Thus, whether assessing the periplasmic or cytoplasmic fractions (or adding the fractions together), Blais's yields of soluble and active CRM197 protein fall within the range of about 0.2 g/L to about 12 g/L recited in claim 1. EX1003, ¶84. In view of Blais's successful expression of soluble and active CRM197 in *E. coli*, a POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar success with the other bacterial host strains described therein, including *Pseudomonas*. EX1003, ¶87.

2. A POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Modify Blais Based on the Teachings of Squires

Blais discloses using *E. coli* as a host cell to perform every step recited in claim 1. However, as Squires highlights, a POSA at the relevant time would have been strongly motivated to switch to *P. fluorescens* host cells. *PGS Geophysical AS v. Iancu*, 891 F.3d 1354, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (“The motivation to modify a reference can come from the knowledge of those skilled in the art, from the prior art reference itself, or from the nature of the problem to be solved.”); EX1003, ¶¶88, 95.

As exemplified by the prior art, *P. fluorescens* was developed and used as a powerful manufacturing platform for high-yield production of recombinant proteins years before the '171 patent. EX1015, 46, 52; EX1003, ¶89. *P. fluorescens* was known to be particularly suitable for high-yield production of therapeutic proteins because it was known to have a robust protein production capacity. EX1003, ¶79;

EX1015, 46. In addition to being stable and amenable to genetic and molecular manipulations, *P. fluorescens* strains were also known to be superior to *E. coli* in that they could “be cultivated to high cell densities.” EX1015, 52; EX1003, ¶¶28, 89. Extensive molecular biological tools were available to engineer and optimize *P. fluorescens* strains for recombinant protein expression, and production conditions had been optimized for expressing recombinant proteins in *P. fluorescens* in 20-liter fermenters. EX1003, ¶¶29-30, 89; EX1015, 45, 46.

Indeed, Squires expressly teaches that *P. fluorescens* “has many favorable properties” for “rapid, efficient” and “higher-volume” production of therapeutic molecules. EX1005, 54, 58; EX1003, ¶90. Squires emphasizes multiple advantages of *P. fluorescens* over *E. coli* as a high-yield bacterial host for recombinant protein production. EX1005, 55; EX1003, ¶90. Squires concludes that *P. fluorescens* “is ***unusually well suited for high-level expression*** and will tolerate a wide range of fermentation conditions.” EX1005, 58 (emphasis added).

Squires compares production of various heterologous proteins in *E. coli* and *P. fluorescens* and demonstrates that problems associated with *E. coli* expression can be overcome by using *P. fluorescens*. EX1003, ¶90. For example, Squires reports that whereas interferon- γ produced from *E. coli* was insoluble and inactive, *P. fluorescens* successfully produced interferon- γ in a soluble form, with a total yield of about 4 g/L. EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶91. Squires concludes that “[t]he increased

overall yield and dramatically improved expression of soluble and active protein seen in *P. fluorescens* **clearly highlights the advantages** it can offer in producing recombinant proteins.” EX1005, 58 (emphasis added).

Squires further demonstrates that whereas the disulfide-bonded human growth hormone (hGH) formed insoluble inclusion bodies when expressed in *E. coli*, fusing a Pbp signal sequence to hGH achieved more than 5 g/L of soluble hGH in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* that was properly processed and active. EX1005, 55; EX1003, ¶93. Squires also discloses that when the Pbp signal sequence was fused to an anti-β-galactosidase single chain antibody, Gal2, a properly-processed Gal2 protein was expressed at levels of 3 g/L in *P. fluorescens*, with 34% of the protein being soluble and active in an anti-β-galactosidase ELISA. EX1005, 56, 58. Thus, Squires achieved about 1 g/L of soluble, fully processed, and active Gal2. EX1003, ¶92. Accordingly, Squires concluded that “[h]igh-volumetric and specific expression of a range of therapeutic molecules as **soluble, active, and secreted** products makes *P. fluorescens* a **compelling alternative** for the microbial expression of biologicals for human health.” EX1005, 58. (emphasis added); EX1003, ¶94.

In view of Squires’s express conclusion that *P. fluorescens* was “unusually well-suited” for high-level protein production and “a compelling alternative” to *E. coli*, combined with Blais’s identification of *Pseudomonas* as a suitable host for improved CRM197 production, a POSA would have been motivated to express

Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct in *P. fluorescens* to produce soluble and active CRM197 at yields falling within the claimed range. *Acorda Therapeutics, Inc. v. Roxane Labs., Inc.*, 903 F.3d 1310, 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (finding a motivation to pursue a claimed method when the prior art taught the desirability of the claimed method); EX1003, ¶95.

3. The Combination of Blais and Squires Would Have Provided A Reasonable Expectation of Achieving the Claimed Method

Claim 1 requires a “yield of soluble or active CRM197 protein of about 0.2 grams per liter to about 12 grams per liter.” Blais's successful production in the *E. coli* periplasm of over 3 g/L of soluble and active CRM197, combined with Squires's demonstration of the superiority of *P. fluorescens* over *E. coli* in achieving high-level expression of multiple soluble and active proteins, would have provided a reasonable expectation of success in achieving expression of soluble and active CRM197 at levels falling within the scope of the claimed range. *Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 480 F.3d 1348, 1364 (Fed. Cir., 2007) (finding it obvious to substitute amlodipine maleate with amlodipine besylate when prior art taught superiority of amlodipine besylate and expectation that besylate salt would show improved physicochemical characteristics over maleate salt); EX1003, ¶¶96, 100.

As Blais explains, once the expression construct is built, recombinant CRM197 protein “may be prepared by processes well known to those skilled in the

art from genetically engineered host cells comprising expression systems.” EX1004, 12:28-30. Blais also acknowledges that methods for introducing CRM197-encoding constructs into host cells had been described in many standard laboratory manuals. *Id.*, 12:44-50 (citing manuals published in the 1980s). Thus, it would have been routine for a POSA to introduce Blais’s FlgI-CRM197 construct into a *P. fluorescens* host cell. EX1003, ¶97. In addition, production conditions in *P. fluorescens* had been “routinely optimized in 20-L fermentors” for commercial production of various heterologous proteins. EX1003, ¶¶29-30; EX1015, 47; EX1016, 1. Squires emphasized that *P. fluorescens* “will tolerate a wide range of fermentation conditions” and “[r]ecovery and downstream purification procedures are standard and consistent with those used for molecules expressed by *E. coli*.” EX1005, 58; EX1003, ¶98. Thus, achieving a level production of CRM197 within the claimed range by expressing Blais’s construct in *P. fluorescens* would have involved no more than routine optimization, and therefore, would have been obvious. *Senju Pharm. Co. v. Lupin Ltd.*, 780 F.3d 1337, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (invalidating a claim that was directed to “a product of routine optimization that would have been obvious to one of skill in the art.”).

Indeed, Squires discloses actual successful expression in *P. fluorescens* of multiple soluble and active recombinant proteins at levels of 1-5 g/L, which is well within the claimed range. EX1005, 56, 58. Such successes would have further

boosted the confidence of those skilled in the art to achieve such levels of soluble and active CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* by using Blais's construct, which had already produced over 3 g/L of soluble and active CRM197 in *E. coli*. EX1003, ¶¶99.

Accordingly, based on the teachings of Blais and Squires, alone or in combination, a POSA would have had a strong motivation to express Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct in a *P. fluorescens* host cell with a reasonable expectation of achieving soluble and active CRM197 with a yield falling within the scope of the claimed range. *See Agrizap, Inc. v. Woodstream Corp.*, 520 F.3d 1337, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2008); EX1003, ¶¶96, 100. For at least these reasons, claim 1 would have been unpatentable as obvious over Blais in view of Squires.

B. Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious

Whereas independent claim 1 recites producing soluble *or* active CRM197, dependent claim 21 recites producing soluble *and* active CRM197. *Compare* EX1001, 145:53 *with* 148:12-15. As discussed above, Blais discloses production of soluble *and* active CRM197 with a yield of 3.18 g/L. *Supra*, §VII.A.1.d; EX1003, ¶¶101-102. Squires discloses expression of various soluble and active recombinant proteins in *P. fluorescens* at yields of 1-5 g/L. *Supra*, §VII.A.3; EX1003, ¶103. Thus, the teachings of Blais and Squires would have provided a strong motivation to express Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct in a *P. fluorescens* host, with a reasonable expectation of achieving soluble and active CRM197 at a yield falling within the

scope of the claimed range, thereby rendering claim 21 unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. *Supra*, §VII.A.; EX1003, ¶103.

C. Claims 2 and 22 Would Have Been Obvious

As explained above in Section III.A., claims 2 and 22 recite ranges of yields that entirely overlap with the ranges recited in claims 1 and 21. Thus, claims 2 and 22 would have been obvious for at least the reasons discussed above for claims 1 and 21. Specifically, Blais discloses expressing CRM197 in the periplasm of *E. coli* at levels over 3 g/L, and Squires discloses expressing various recombinant proteins in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* at levels of 1-5 g/L. *Supra*, §VII.A.3. Thus, the teachings of Blais and Squires would have provided a POSA with a strong motivation to express Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct in a *P. fluorescens* host with a reasonable expectation of producing soluble and active CRM197 with a yield falling within the scope of the claimed ranges, thereby rendering claims 2 and 22 unpatentable as obvious. EX1003, ¶¶17, 107.

D. Claims 3, 7, 9, 23, 24, 27, and 29 Would Have Been Obvious

Claims 3 and 23, which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, recite that the CRM197-encoding sequence is fused to a secretion signal coding sequence that directs transfer of CRM197 to the periplasm when expressed. These claims would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires. EX1003, ¶¶17, 108, 114.

Blais expressly discloses fusing a CRM197-encoding sequence to an FlgI signal sequence, ligating the FlgI-CRM197 fragment into an expression vector, transforming *E. coli* cells with the CRM197 expression vector, and achieving periplasmic expression of soluble and active CRM197 at a level of 3.18 g/L. *Supra*, §VII.A.1; EX1003, ¶109. Squires encouraged expressing recombinant proteins in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens*, stating that disulfide-bonded proteins, like CRM197, “should be secreted at least to the periplasmic space” to facilitate the proper formation of the disulfide bonds, consistent with the common knowledge of those skilled in the art at the time. EX1005, 55; EX1003, ¶¶35-38, 110. Squires also discloses that expression in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* has the advantage of producing proteins “in a soluble and active form,” unlike cytoplasmic expression in *E. coli*. EX1005, 58. Thus, Blais and Squires would have motivated a POSA to use Blais’s FlgI-CRM197 construct to express soluble and active CRM197 in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens*. EX1003, ¶110.

The combination of Blais and Squires also would have provided a reasonable expectation of success in expressing soluble and active CRM197 in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* at a level within the claimed ranges. EX1003, ¶111. Blais discloses achieving periplasmic expression of soluble and active CRM197 at levels over 3 g/L from its FlgI-CRM197 construct. *Supra*, §VII.A.1. Squires further highlighted the routineness and predictability of achieving high-level periplasmic production in *P.*

fluorescens. EX1003, ¶111. Particularly, Squires taught that several recombinant proteins had been successfully secreted to the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* using signal sequences, which “led to discovery of disulfide-bonded proteins in their native, active conformations.” EX1005, 55; EX1003, ¶113. Squires further acknowledged that Blais’s osmotic shock technique effectively releases periplasmic proteins at “commercially relevant scales.” EX1005, 55. Squires additionally discloses using a signal sequence to express soluble and active hGH and Gal2 at levels of 1-5 g/L in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens*. See §VII.A.3, *supra*. Thus, the teachings of Blais and Squires would have rendered claims 3 and 23 unpatentable as obvious. EX1003, ¶111.

Dependent claims 7, 9, 24, 27, and 29 further recite that the secretion leader is Azu, Pbp, IbpS31A, CupA2, or PbpA20V. EX1003, ¶112. As the ’171 patent admits, Pbp was a well-known native signal sequence from *P. fluorescens*. EX1001, 42:53-55, Table 8. Squires explicitly discloses that the *P. fluorescens* Pbp signal sequence “in particular has been found effective at efficiently transporting” various recombinant proteins into the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* in their “native and active conformations.” EX1005, 55; EX1003, ¶113. Thus, Squires would have motivated a POSA to improve CRM197 production in *P. fluorescens* by substituting the *E. coli* FlgI signal sequence in Blais’s construct with the *P. fluorescens* Pbp signal sequence that had already been shown to be effective for guiding periplasmic expression of

soluble and active proteins in *P. fluorescens*, with a reasonable expectation of likewise achieving successful periplasmic expression of CRM197. EX1003, ¶114.

Accordingly, claims 7, 9, 24, 27, and 29 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires. *Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.*, 754 F.3d 952, 963 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (the claimed genus is obvious when any of the compounds in the genus were obvious at the time of the invention).

E. Claims 15, 17, 32, and 33 Would Have Been Obvious

Claims 15 and 32, which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, specify a *Pseudomonas* cell. Claims 17 and 33, which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, specify a *Pseudomonas fluorescens* cell. As discussed above, Blais identified *Pseudomonas* as an appropriate host for the expression of CRM197, and Squires discussed successful examples of high-level protein expression in *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. *Supra*, §VII.A. Thus, the teachings of Blais and Squires would have provided a strong motivation to express Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct in a *P. fluorescens* host with a reasonable expectation of achieving soluble and active CRM197 with a yield that falls within the scope of the claimed range, thereby rendering claims 15, 17, 32, and 33 obvious. *Supra*, §VII.A.; EX1003, ¶¶17, 115; *Allergan*, 754 F.3d at 963.

F. Claims 11 and 12 Would Have Been Obvious

Claim 11 recites measuring the activity of CRM197 in an activity assay, wherein about 40% to about 100% of the soluble toxin protein produced is determined to be active. Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and further recites using an activity assay such as an immunological assay. EX1003, ¶104. The '171 patent explains that the term “soluble and/or active” “refers to protein that is determined to be soluble, active, or both soluble and active, by methods known to those of skill in the art and described herein.” EX1001, 40:31-34. The '171 patent further explains that “[t]he ‘activity’ of a given protein can include binding activity, e.g., that represented by binding to a receptor, a specific antibody, or to another known substrate, or by enzymatic activity if relevant.” *Id.*, 40:34-37.

The '171 patent acknowledges that “[a]ctivity assays for evaluating toxins are known in the art and described in the literature,” which “include immunological or antibody binding assays, e.g., Western Blot analysis and ELISA....” *Id.*, 40:41-44. An ELISA measures activity of a protein by detecting its ability to bind to its antibody. EX1003, ¶105. Because only a properly folded and soluble protein can bind to its antibody, a POSA would consider it more likely than not that the protein detected in an ELISA is properly folded and soluble. *Id.*

Blais used osmotic shock to release soluble CRM197 from the periplasmic fraction, and measured the activity of CRM197 in an ELISA to determine

“periplasmic CRM197 productivity.” EX1004, 24:13-15, 24:19. A POSA would have understood that the CRM197 detected in Blais’s ELISA is representative of the total soluble and active CRM197 produced in the *E. coli* cells. EX1003, ¶105. Indeed, Squires similarly used an ELISA to measure the activity of the soluble Gal2 protein expressed in the periplasm of *P. fluorescens* and reported that the purified soluble protein “was found to be active” in the ELISA. EX1005, 58.

Thus, a POSA would have been motivated to produce soluble and active CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* and use an ELISA to measure its activity, as recited in claims 11 and 12. And because Blais’s ELISA demonstrated that the CRM197 protein produced therein was soluble and active, a POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in determining that about 40% to about 100% of the soluble protein produced by expressing Blais’s CRM197 construct in *P. fluorescens* is active, as recited in claims 11 and 12. EX1003, ¶¶17, 104, 106. Accordingly, claims 11 and 12 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires.

VIII. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 13, 14, 30, AND 31 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES AND CHOI

Claims 13 and 30, which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, recite that the expression vector comprises a lac promoter operatively linked to the CRM197 protein coding sequence, and that the culturing comprises induction using

IPTG at a concentration of about 0.02 to about 1.0 mM, the cell density at induction is an optical density of about 40 to about 200 absorbance units (AU), the pH of the culture is from about 6 to about 7.5, and the growth temperature is about 20 to about 35° C. Claims 14 and 31 depend from claims 13 and 30, respectively, and recite a lac promoter selected from tac, trc, Ptac16, Ptac17, PtacII, PlacUV5 and T7lac. These claims would have been obvious in view of Blais, Squires, and Choi. EX1003, ¶¶17, 116, 125.

Blais discloses and illustrates the cloning process for generating an FlgI-CRM197 construct. EX1004, Example 3, Fig. 3. Blais's Figure 3 shows that the expression vector has a lac promoter. *Id.*; EX1003, ¶117. As discussed in Section VII.A.1.d, Blais discloses that after the *E. coli* cells were transformed by this FlgI-CRM197 expression vector, high-level production of soluble and active CRM197 was achieved. EX1004, Example 9. Similarly, Squires discloses that "transcription promoters of varying strengths, such as the *tac* and *lacUV5* promoters derived from *E. coli* sequences" can be used to drive expression of various recombinant proteins in *P. fluorescens*. EX1005, 55. Thus, as of the filing date of the '171 patent, a POSA would have been motivated to use the lac promoter in Blais's FlgI-CRM197 expression vector and would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving levels of CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* that fall within the claimed range. EX1003, ¶¶116, 122.

Blais further discloses that during the CRM197 production stage, “the pH of the medium was readjusted to 6.8” and “maintained at 6.8,” which is within the pH range recited in claims 13 and 30 of “about 6 to about 7.5.” EX1004, 22:17, 24:3; EX1003, ¶118. Blais also discloses that IPTG “was added to a final concentration of 1 mM to induce the bacteria.” EX1004, 24:6. Thus, the IPTG concentration used in Blais was also within the range of “about 0.02 to about 1.0 mM” recited in claims 13 and 30. EX1003, ¶118. In addition, Blais discloses that the growth temperature during CRM197 production “was regulated at 28° C” and “decreased to 23° C” upon induction, which is also within the range of “about 20° C to about 35° C” recited in claims 13 and 30. EX1004, 24:3-4, 24:6-8; EX1003, ¶118. Because Blais’s production conditions including pH, temperature, and IPTG concentration successfully produced yields of soluble and active CRM197 falling within the scope of the claimed ranges, those skilled in the art would have been motivated to use the same promoter and similar conditions in *P. fluorescens*. EX1003, ¶118. Further, Squires taught that growth conditions suitable for *E. coli* are consistent with those for *P. fluorescens* and should be tolerated by *P. fluorescens*. Thus, a POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success in achieving similar levels of production of CRM197 by using Blais’s construct and induction conditions in *P. fluorescens*. EX1005, 58 (*P. fluorescens* “is unusually well suited for high-level expression and will tolerate a wide range of fermentation conditions. Recovery and

downstream purification procedures are standard and consistent with those used for molecules expressed by *E. coli*.”); EX1003, ¶¶122-123.

The recited cell density at induction of an optical density of about 40 to about 200 absorbance units (AU) also would have been obvious. EX1003, ¶¶119-121. Specifically, Choi taught efficient periplasmic production of alkaline phosphatase by high cell density culture of recombinant *E. coli*, noting that IPTG induction at high cell density (OD₆₀₀=150) within the claimed range “resulted in the formation of soluble proteins and a high efficiency fractionation.” EX1006, 245; EX1003 ¶¶68, 119-120. According to Choi, “[t]hese results demonstrate the possibility of efficient secretory production of recombinant proteins in *E. coli* by high cell density cultivation.” EX1006, Abstract.

Choi’s teachings would have motivated a POSA to perform IPTG induction at a high cell density within the claimed range to achieve efficient production of soluble and active proteins in bacterial cells. EX1003, ¶121. And Squires’s disclosure that *P. fluorescens* “can be cultivated at high cell densities” would have provided a reasonable expectation of success in achieving levels of expression of CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* that fall within the claimed range by using Blais’s construct and induction conditions, as modified by Choi. EX1005, 54 (noting that *P. fluorescens* is a superior expression platform because it is “amenable to genetic

or molecular manipulations and can be cultivated at high cell densities.”), 55 (“*P. fluorescens* can be cultivated to high densities”); EX1003, ¶¶116, 124-125.

Accordingly, claims 13, 14, 30, and 31 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires and Choi. *Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.*, 687 F.3d 1362, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (“if prior art discloses a portion of the claimed range, the entire claim is invalid.”)

IX. GROUND 3: CLAIMS 4, 5, 8, 10, 16, 18-20, 25, 28, AND 34-36 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES AND RAMSEIER I

Claims 4, 5, 8, 10, 16, 18-20, 25, 28, and 34-36, which all depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, recite additional elements such a tag sequence adjacent to the coding sequence for the secretion signal, a host cell being defective in the expression of at least one protease, or an optimized CRM197-encoding sequence. These additional limitations would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires and Ramseier I. EX1003, ¶¶17, 126-142.

A. Claims 4, 10, and 20 Would Have Been Obvious

Claims 4, 10, and 20 recite that the expression vector further comprises a tag sequence adjacent to the coding sequence for the secretion signal. This additional feature would have been obvious. EX1003, ¶126.

It would have been obvious to improve expression of CRM197 from Blais’s FlgI-CRM197 construct by using Squires’s *P. fluorescens* cells to achieve a yield of

soluble and active CRM197 in *P. fluorescens* within the claimed range. See §VII.A, *supra*. Ramseier I, which relates to identifying host cells for large-scale production of recombinant proteins including CRM197, discloses that “heterologous protein or polypeptide can be expressed in a manner in which it is linked to a tag protein and the ‘tagged’ protein can be purified from the cell.” EX1007, [0092]. Ramseier I further teaches that in some embodiments:

[T]he expression vector further comprises a tag sequence adjacent to the coding sequence for the protein or polypeptide of interest. In one embodiment, this tag sequence allows for purification of the protein. The tag sequence can be an affinity tag, such as a hexa-histidine affinity tag...a glutathione-5-transferase molecule...[or] a fluorescent molecule, such as YFP or GFP, or analogs of such fluorescent proteins.

Id., [0125]. According to Ramsier I, “tag sequences, such as nucleotide sequence ‘tags’ and ‘tag’ polypeptide coding sequences” can be used to facilitate “identification, separation, purification, and/or isolation of an expressed polypeptide.” *Id.*, [0124]; EX1003, ¶127. Ramseier I reflects the common understanding that it would have been both desirable and routine to add a tag sequence adjacent to the coding sequence of a heterologous protein for expression in a host cell. EX1003, ¶128.

Thus, a POSA would have been motivated by the teachings in Ramseier I to add a tag sequence to Blais's successful CRM197 expression vector, and would have had a reasonable expectation of arriving at the methods recited in claims 4, 10, and 20. EX1003, ¶129. Accordingly, claims 4, 10, and 20 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires and Ramseier I.

B. Claims 5, 8, 25 and 28 Would Have Been Obvious

Claims 5 and 25, which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, recite the use of a host cell that is defective in the expression of at least one protease or a host cell that overexpresses at least one folding modulator, or a combination thereof. Claims 8 and 28, which also depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, recite a host cell that is defective in the expression of a protease that is Serralysin, HslU, HslV, Prc1, DegP1, DegP2, or AprA, or a combination thereof, or wherein the host cell overexpresses folding modulators DsbA, DsbB, DsbC, and DsbD, and further wherein the recombinant toxin protein is fused to the Azu, Pbp, or native secretion leader. These claims also would have been obvious over Blais, Squires, and Ramseier I. EX1003, ¶¶130-137.

It would have been obvious to improve CRM197 production by expressing Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct in Squires's *P. fluorescens* cells and achieve the claimed yield of soluble and active CRM197. See §VII.A, *supra*. Moreover, protease-deficient bacterial host strains had been routinely generated to optimize

recombinant protein production decades before the '171 patent. EX1003, ¶¶39-42, 121; EX1021, 81 (reporting in 1998 that the use of protease-deficient strains had been “shown to be a successful approach to improve the yield of fully active, expressed proteins”); EX1020, Abstract, EX1008, [0012]. Indeed, Blais successfully used a protease-deficient *E. coli* strain, B834(DE), to achieve high-level expression of soluble and active CRM197 from its FlgI-CRM197 construct. EX1004, 22:1-5; EX1027, 662, Table 3; EX1003, ¶132.

A POSA would have been motivated to likewise reduce or eliminate the activity of one or more proteases in Squires’s *P. fluorescens* strains to achieve improved yield of soluble and active CRM197 based on Ramsier I’s disclosure of various protease-deficient *P. fluorescens* strains. EX1003, ¶¶132-133. Specifically, Ramsier I acknowledges that “the presence of specific host cell proteases may degrade the protein of interest and thus reduce the final yield.” EX1007, [0008]. Ramseier I identifies exemplary protein folding modulators in *P. fluorescens* in Table 1 and exemplary *P. fluorescens* proteases in Table 2, and “provides an array for rapidly identifying a host cell population capable of producing a heterologous protein with improved yield and/or quality.” EX1007, Abstract, [0033], [0034], Tables 1 and 2. Using this array, Ramseier I generated populations of *P. fluorescens* cells that have been genetically modified to reduce the expression of at least one target gene involved in protein degradation and/or to increase the expression of at

least one target gene involved in protein production. EX1007, [0024]; EX1003, ¶¶71, 133.

Ramseier I provided further guidance on generating protease-deficient *P. fluorescens* strains, and demonstrated that reducing the activity of proteases or overexpressing protein folding modulators in *P. fluorescens* cells improved the yield and quality of various heterologous proteins. EX1007, Abstract; EX1003, ¶134. Ramseier I describes the construction of various *P. fluorescens* strains that have genomic deletions of different protease genes. EX1007, Example 5. Ramseier I then describes expressing a recombinant protein, Gal2, in sixty-three different *P. fluorescens* strains “carrying either a directed gene deletion or pDOW2247 carrying a folding modulator for co-expression,” and reports that expression of soluble Gal2 in multiple protease-deficient strains (including Δ prc1, Δ degP2, Δ La2, Δ clpP, Δ prc2, Δ tig, Δ clpX, and Δ lon strains) and in the grpEdnaKJ co-expression strain “were all 2.4-fold or more higher than the control strains” that express wild type proteases and that the increase in expression was statistically significant. *Id.*, [0211].

Blais’s successful production of soluble and active CRM197 in a protease-deficient *E. coli* host and Ramseier I’s improved yield of various heterologous proteins in protease-deficient *P. fluorescens* strains would have provided a reasonable expectation of achieving a yield of soluble and active CRM197 that falls within the claimed range by using a protease-deficient *P. fluorescens* strain, as

recited in claims 5 and 25. EX1003, ¶135. Accordingly, claims 5 and 25 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires and Ramseier I.

It would have been obvious to improve CRM197 periplasmic production in *P. fluorescens* by substituting the FlgI signal sequence in Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct with the *P. fluorescens* Pbp signal sequence disclosed in Squires. See §VII.D, *supra*. And in view of Ramseier I's success in improving the yield of multiple recombinant proteins by expressing them in protease-deficient *P. fluorescens* strains, including a Δ DegP2 strain, a POSA would have been motivated to further improve CRM197 yields by expressing a Pbp-CRM197 construct in the periplasm of a *P. fluorescens* cell that is defective in at least the expression of DegP2, with a reasonable expectation of successfully achieving a protein yield that falls within the scope of the range recited in claims 8 and 28. EX1003, ¶¶136-137.

Accordingly, claims 5, 8, 25 and 28 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires and Ramseier I as of the filing date the '171 patent.

C. Claims 16, 18, 19, and 34-36 Would Have Been Obvious

Claims 16, 18, 19, and 34-36, which depend from claims 1 and 21 directly or indirectly, recite an optimized nucleotide sequence for expressing CRM197 in the host cell. These claims also would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires and Ramsier I. EX1003, ¶138.

It would have been obvious to transform Squires's *P. fluorescens* cells with Blais's FlgI-CRM197 construct to achieve the claimed yield of soluble and active CRM197 in *P. fluorescens*. See §VII.A, *supra*. Ramseier I, which relates to improving recombinant protein expression in modified *P. fluorescens* strains, discloses that the coding sequence for the to-be-expressed recombinant protein "will more preferably be a coding sequence that has been selected, improved, or optimized for use in an expressible form in the strains of the array: for example, by optimizing the gene to reflect the codon use bias of a *Pseudomonas* species such as *P. fluorescens*." EX1007, [0149]; EX1003, ¶139. Ramseier I then provides specific guidance on how to optimize the codons of a recombinant protein, stating that

For gene optimization, one or more rare codons may be removed to avoid ribosomal stalling and minimize amino acid misincorporation. One or more gene-internal ribosome binding sites may also be eliminated to avoid truncated protein products. Long stretches of C and G nucleotides may be removed to avoid RNA polymerase slippage that could result in frame-shifts. Strong gene internal stem-loop structures, especially the ones covering the ribosome binding site, may also be eliminated.

EX1007, [0149]; EX1003, ¶141.

Codon optimization for protein expression in *P. fluorescens* had been routine as of the filing date of the '171 patent. EX1003, ¶¶43-44, 140, 142. Multiple tools,

including various software programs, had been designed and were available to researchers for generating codon-optimized sequences for any gene based on knowledge of highly expressed genes in the host of interest. EX1022, 247; EX1023, [0045]-[0047], [0055], [0059]; EX1003, ¶142. As the '171 patent admits, those skilled in the art had published and claimed methods of codon optimization and heterologous expression in *P. fluorescens* years before the patent was filed. EX1001, 16:67-17:6 (citing EX1023); EX1023, Abstract, claim 36; EX1003, ¶142.

In view of this common knowledge and Ramseier I's teachings, a POSA seeking to improve CRM197 expression in *P. fluorescens* would have been motivated to optimize the CRM197-coding sequence in Blais's construct to adapt to the codon use bias of *P. fluorescens* and achieve expression at levels falling within the claimed range with a reasonable expectation of success. EX1003, ¶¶140, 142.

Accordingly, claims 16, 18, 19, and 34-36 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires and Ramseier I.

X. GROUND 4: CLAIMS 6 AND 26 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER BLAIS IN VIEW OF SQUIRES, RAMSEIER I, RAMSEIER II, AND MAUNSELL

Claims 6 and 26, which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, recite a host cell that is defective in the expression of the proteases HslU, HslV, Prc1, DegP1, DegP2, and AprA. These claims would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires, Ramseier I, Ramseier II, and Maunsell. EX1003, ¶¶17, 143, 151.

Ramseier I provides express guidance on generating protease-deficient *P. fluorescens* strains for improved expression of recombinant proteins. See §IX.B, *supra*. Ramseier I discloses that because proteases can negatively affect protein yield and/or quality, *P. fluorescens* cells “have been genetically engineered to decrease the expression of one or more those protease enzymes.” EX1007, [0049]. Ramseier I expressly discloses that the proteases “can be selected from hslV, hslU, clpA, clpB and clpX.” *Id.*, [0034]. As such, a POSA would have been motivated by Ramseier I to delete multiple proteases in *P. fluorescens* simultaneously to increase the likelihood of reducing degradation and improving yield. EX1003, ¶¶144, 149. Indeed, Ramseier I reported that expression of soluble Gal2 in multiple protease-deficient strains including Δ DegP2 “were all 2.4-fold or more higher than the control strains” that express wild type proteases and that the increase in expression was statistically significant. EX1007, [0211]; EX1003, ¶145.

Although Ramseier I does not specifically disclose deleting DegP1 and AprA, the '171 patent admits that DegP1, as well as other recited proteases, “were known in the art and described in e.g., U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2006/0110747 [Ramseier II].” EX1001, 25:33-26:2. Ramseier II further describes that *E. coli* strains deficient in DegP proteases had been generated as an approach “to avoid degradation during recombinant protein production.” EX1008, [0012]; EX1003, ¶146. It was common knowledge that the DegP protease family contains two related proteases named

DegP1 and DegP2. EX1003, ¶147; EX1028, 429. Thus, a POSA would have understood Ramseier II's disclosure of DegP-deficient strains as referring to bacterial strains that are deficient in both DegP1 and DegP2. EX1003, ¶147. Because Ramseier I had successfully produced DegP2-deficient *P. fluorescens* strains and Ramseier II discloses DegP1- and DegP2-deficient *E. coli* strains, a POSA would be motivated to improve production of CRM197 from Blais's construct in a *P. fluorescens* cell by similarly deleting both DegP1 and DegP2 from the *P. fluorescens* cells, with a reasonable expectation of success. EX1007, [0211]; EX1003, ¶147.

The '171 patent further admits that “Apr A, an extracellular serralyisin-type metalloprotease metalloproteinase, is described by, e.g., Maunsell, et al., 2006.” EX1001, 26:2-9. As Manusell reported, “[a] serralyisin-type metalloprotease gene, *aprA*, was identified and found to encode the major, if not only, extracellular protease produced by [the *P. fluorescens*] strain.” EX1009, Abstract. Thus, based on the teachings of Manusell, a POSA would have been motivated to delete this “major, if not only,” extracellular protease from *P. fluorescens* cells and would have reasonably expected to effectively reduce degradation of CRM197 expressed from Blais's construct in those cells. EX1003, ¶148.

In view of (1) Blais's use of an *E. coli* strain deficient in multiple proteases, (2) Ramseier I's express disclosure that HslU and HslV may be deleted to improve

yield in *P. fluorescens*, (3) Ramseier I's successful improvement of protein yield using Prc1- and DegP2-deficient *P. fluorescens* strains, (4) Ramseier I's recommendation to delete one or more proteases in *P. fluorescens* to improve yield, and (5) the prior knowledge of HslU, HslV, Prc1, DegP1, DegP2, and AprA and their roles in protein degradation as reflected in Ramseier II and Maunsell, a POSA would have been motivated to express the Blais FlgI-CRM197 construct in a *P. fluorescens* cell that is defective in the expression of the proteases HslU, HslV, Prc1, DegP1, DegP2, and AprA as recited in claims 6 and 26, and would have reasonably expected to achieve expression of soluble and active CRM197 having a yield within range recited in those claims. EX1003, ¶¶150-151.

Accordingly, claims 6 and 26 would have been obvious over Blais in view of Squires, Ramseier I, Ramseier II, and Maunsell.

XI. THE EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN THIS PETITION WAS NOT PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE

The evidence identified in this Petition was either not before the Examiner or not fully considered during prosecution. The Examiner did not cite Blais, Squires, Choi, Ramseier I, Ramseier II, or Maunsell in any Office Action. *See generally* EX1002. The Examiner also did not have the benefit of Dr. Collier's declaration, which explains what a POSA would have understood from the prior art as of the filing date of the '171 patent.

Accordingly, Petitioner submits that any argument for a discretionary denial of institution under 35 U.S.C. §325(d) is misplaced, and respectfully requests that the Board institute *inter partes* review.

XII. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.8

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.8, Petitioner states as follows:

A. Real Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1))

GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals SA is the real party-in-interest.

B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2))

Petitioner previously filed a petition against the '171 patent in IPR2020-00890 (see footnote 1).

C. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(3))

Lead Counsel	Backup Counsel
Charles E. Lipsey, Reg. No. 28,165 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP Two Freedom Square 11955 Freedom Drive Reston, VA 20190-5675 (571) 273-2755 charles.lipsey@finnegan.com	Rich B. Racine, Reg. No. 30,415 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001 (202) 408-4038 rich.racine@finnegan.com Joann Neth, Reg. No. 36,363 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001 (202) 408-4028 joann.neth@finnegan.com

	<p>Trenton Ward, Reg. No. 59,157 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 271 17th Street, NW Suite 1400 Atlanta, GA 30363 (404) 653-6441 trenton.ward@finnegan.com</p> <p>Amanda Murphy, Reg. No. 59,387 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001 (202) 408-4114 amanda.murphy@finnegan.com</p> <p>Yieyie Yang, Reg. No. 71,923 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 901 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001 (202) 216-5170 Yieyie.yang@finnegan.com</p>
--	--

XIII. CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R §42.24(d)

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.24(a)(1)(i), the foregoing PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW contains 13,783 words, excluding parts of this Petition exempted under §42.24(a), as measured by the word-processing system used to prepare this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 27, 2020

By: /Charles E. Lipsey/
Charles E. Lipsey, Lead Counsel
Registration No. 28,165

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§42.6(e) and 42.105(a), the undersigned certifies that on May 27, 2020, a copy of the foregoing PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW and associated Power of Attorney were served by FedEx on the correspondence address of record indicated in the Patent Office's public PAIR system for U.S. Patent No. 8,530,171:

Douglas J. Clark
Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050

Date: May 27, 2020

By: /William Esper/
William Esper
Legal Assistant

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP