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

Case 1:05-cv-12237-WGY Document 868-12

Filed 08/24/2007 Page 1 of 5

Doc. 868 Att. 11

## **EXHIBIT** K

08/11/34 13:21

**☎**703 305 3014



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER   FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/113,179 10/23/87 H	_IN	F D-8272
MARSHALL, O'TOOLE, GERSTE MURRAY AND BORUN 6300 SEARS TOWER 233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO, IL 60606-6402	18N2/0811 EIN,	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER  1805  DATE MARLED: 08/11/94
This is a communication from the examiner in charg COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARI	e of your application. (S	)PY
	esponsive to communication filed on	This action is made final.
A shortened statutory period for response to this acti- Failure to respond within the period for response will		ned. 35 U.S.C. 133
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE	PART OF THIS ACTION:	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited by Examiner,</li> <li>Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-14-</li> <li>Information on How to Effect Drawing Ch</li> </ol>	49. 4. 🔲 Noti	ce of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. ce of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. ten/iwww.Summary.Form.PTO-413.
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION  1. Claims 70, 72-75		are pending in the application.
3		are withdrawn from consideration
2. Claims		
3. Claims		
4. Claims 70 , 72-75		
S. Claims		are objected to.
6. Claims	a	re subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal	drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are	acceptable for examination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in response to	this Office action.	27 0
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have be are acceptable; I not acceptable (see	een received on explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Paten	acceptable for examination purposes.  27 0148  Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings t Drawing Review, PTO-948).
The proposed additional or substitute sheet examiner:      disapproved by the examiner		. has (have) been approved by the
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed	, has been 🔲 approv	ved; 🛘 disapproved (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for p  Discentified in parent application, serial no.	riority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified	copy has \$\Pi\$ been received \$\Pi\$ not been received
13. Since this application apppears to be in con-	dition for allowance except for formal matte	ers. prosecution so to the more to the second to

**4003** 

CM1

COPY

Serial No. 06/717,319 Art Unit 1805

5

ΙÚ

15

20

-2-

At the request of the Director of Group 1800 (see Paper No. 40), this application has been withdrawn from issue and prosecution is hereby reopened.

Claims 70 and 72-75 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 4,703,008 in view of Yokota et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,695,542). Yokota et al. teach methods of producing a glycosylated protein (GM-CSF) using DNA encoding a mammalian GM-CSF. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yokota et al. by substituting the instant erythropoietin encoding DNA for the DNA encowing GM-CSF. To do so would be using a known method for its known and expected purpose.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. In re Vogel, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

Claims 70 and 72-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 70 is vague and indefinite in the recitation "an in vivo biologically active erythropoietin polypeptide." Applicant has failed to set forth the metes and bounds of the instantly claimed invention because it is not clear what activity or activities the erythropoietin polypeptide is intended to possess. The specification discloses an assay for measuring an in vivo

AM 27 014814

2004

Serial No. 06/717,319
Art Unit 1805

10

-3-

activity of erythropoietin polypeptides made using the instant method (page 58, example 9). However, the specification also refers to numerous other types of *in vivo* biologically activities contemplated for the erythropoietin polypeptides made with the instantly claimed method (page 86, lines 21-32). It is not clear which of these activities applicant intends the claimed polypeptides to possess. Accordingly, the metes and bounds of the claimed invention are indefinite. It is suggested that applicant may intend to claim a process for the preparation of an erythropoietin polypeptide having the *in vivo* biological property of causing bone marrow cells to increase production of reticulocytes and red blood cells.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1800 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1 (CM1). The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (October 19, 1988) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is (703) 305-3014. NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Hodges whose telephone number is (703) 308-4229. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

AM 27 014815

08/11/34 13:23 \$703 305 3014

CM1

0

Serial No. 06/717,319 Art Unit 1805 COPY

4-

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A. Schwartz, can be reached at (703) 308-1133. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

artikalkanting, alaansa kun ming filondistaj, starp astarantatini jelikulinje. Patra a tama batan Astanika Fi

Effective and comment of the Cost many that a contribute is not a contribute of

at low when many has belong the factor of the month and the

THE COURT CLASSES OF THE PROPERTY OF THE CONTROL OF

the history was the commentary in the state of the first of the first in the contract of the c

10

Robert Hodges
August 10, 1994

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART LINIT 185

AM 27 014816