Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-LaRoche LTD et al

Case 1:05-cv-12237-WGY

Document 1342-2 Filed 10/10/2007 Page 1 of 3

Doc. 1342 Att. 1

EXHIBIT A

4.14 FACTORS INDICATING OBVIOUSNESS

Additionally, other objective evidence may favor a finding of obviousness. For example the simultaneous or near simultaneous invention by others of the patented subject matter is a secondary consideration supporting a conclusion of obviousness. Independent making of the invention by persons other than the inventor at about the same time may be evidence that the invention would have been obvious.¹ Also, others skilled in the art working toward the same solution to the same problem, or working on a finite number of predictable solutions to the same problem is also evidence supporting a conclusion of obviousness.²

_

AIPLA Model Jury Instruction 7.8; Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co, 227 F.3d 1361, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2000); Monarch Knitting Machinery Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH, 139 F.3d 877, 883-84 (Fed. Cir. 1998); Stewart-Warner Corp. v. City of Pontiac, 767 F.2d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1985); Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984); In re Farrenkopf, 713 F.2d 714 (Fed. Cir. 1983); Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States, 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983); Simmonds Precision Prods., Inc. v. United States, 153 U.S.P.Q. 465 (Ct. Cl. 1967).

² KSR Intern. Co., 127 S.Ct. at 1742.