

08/18/2003 15:08 FAX 6172899201

DUANE MORRIS BOSTON

004

**EXHIBIT 4**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

FILED  
BY CLERK'S OFFICE

2003 AUG 18 P 2:20

AMGEN INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HOECHST MARION ROUSSEL, INC.

and

TRANSKARYOTIC THERAPIES, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action  
No. 97-10814-WGY

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASS.

**AMGEN INC.'S POST-HEARING MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT  
OF ITS FED. R. CIV. P. 52(C) MOTION THAT '080 CLAIMS 2-4 ARE  
INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS**

08/18/2003 15:08 FAX 6172899201

DUANE MORRIS BOSTON

005

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. AMGEN HAS REBUTTED THE PRESUMPTION OF ESTOPPEL UNDER THE CORRECT <i>FESTO</i> STANDARDS .....	3
A. The particular equivalent in question was indisputably not foreseeable at the time of the application.....	4
B. The rationale underlying Amgen's amendment was not related to the particular equivalent in question.....	9
C. There is "some other reason" suggesting that Amgen could not reasonably be expected to have described the l-165 amino acid equivalent.....	14
III. CONCLUSION.....	16

08/18/2003 16:09 FAX 6172899201

DUANE MORRIS BOSTON

006

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>CASES</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc. and Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc.</i> , 126 F. Supp. 2d 69, 135 (D. Mass. 2001) <i>aff'd in part, vacated in part.</i> 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	10, 14
<i>Application of Ahlbrecht</i> , 435 F.2d 908 (C.C.P.A. 1971) .....	6
<i>Application of Lukach</i> , 442 F.2d 967 (C.C.P.A. 1971) .....	6
<i>Application of Smith</i> , 458 F.2d 1389 (C.C.P.A. 1972) .....	8
<i>Righam v. Godfredsen</i> , 857 F.2d 1415 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	6
<i>Eihicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 93 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	8
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki</i> , 535 U.S. 722 (2002).....	passim
<i>Forssmann v. Matsuo</i> , 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1992) .....	7
<i>Fujikawa v. Wattanasin</i> , 93 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	6
<i>In re Ruschig</i> , 379 F.2d 990 (C.C.P.A. 1967) .....	6
<i>In re Vickers</i> , 141 F.2d 522 (C.C.P.A. 1944) .....	8
<i>In re Vogel</i> , 422 F.2d 438 (C.C.P.A. 1970) .....	13
<i>In re Wako Pure Chem. Indus. Ltd.</i> , 4 Fed. Appx. 853 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	6
<i>Quad Envtl. Techs. Corp. v. Union Sanitary Dist.</i> , 946 F.2d 870 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	14

08/18/2003 15:08 FAX 6172899201

DUANE MORRIS BOSTON

007

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont'd)**

**PAGE NO.**

*Yamada v. Aggarwal*,  
57 U.S.P.Q.2d 2002 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 2000) ..... 7

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 101 ..... 13

35 U.S.C. § 120 ..... 5

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2163 ..... 5

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 608 ..... 5

08/18/2003 15:08 FAX 6172899201

DUANE MORRIS BOSTON

008

## I. INTRODUCTION

Prosecution history estoppel does not bar Amgen's claims for infringement of its '080 patent under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Amgen "could not reasonably be expected to have described the insubstantial substitute in question," either in its application as originally filed or in any claim amendment. In addition, the rationale underlying Amgen's amendment of its claims — to avoid a double-patenting rejection over the EPO glycoprotein claims in its '933 patent — bears "no more than a tangential relation" to the particular 165 amino acid equivalent in question. Finally, the record demonstrates that Amgen did not intend the sequence amendment to exclude or distinguish over EPO having the 1-165 amino acid sequence of Figure 6 ("165 human EPO"). For all of these reasons, the presumption of estoppel has been rebutted.

During the July 28 hearing, the Court questioned whether Amgen could have amended its '080 claims to expressly recite the 1-165 amino acid sequence of Figure 6.<sup>1</sup> As Amgen's counsel stated at the hearing, the answer to that question is no. When Amgen drafted and filed its patent application, it was unknown and unforeseeable that the human EPO product of example 10 in the patent had 165 amino acids rather than the deduced 166 amino acid sequence shown in Figure 6. Because this fact was unknown in 1984 when the written description of Amgen's specification was drafted and submitted, the specification did not expressly recite an EPO having the 1-165 sequence. As explained more fully in Section II(A) below, the absence of an express description of that specific sequence in Amgen's application made a later claim amendment reciting that specific sequence impermissible.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., 7/31/03 Hearing Transcript at p. 81, lines 4-9.