



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT



THE GEORGE  
WASHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY  
LAW SCHOOL  
WASHINGTON DC

## MIPLC Studies

Edited by

Prof. Dr. Christoph Ann, LL.M. (Duke Univ.)

Technische Universität München

Prof. Robert Brauneis

The George Washington University Law School

Prof. Dr. Josef Drexler, LL.M. (Berkeley)

Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property,  
Competition, and Tax Law

Prof. Dr. Thomas M.J. Möllers

University of Augsburg

Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus,

Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property,  
Competition, and Tax Law

Volume 6

Martina Schuster

# Patenting Proteomics

Patentability and Scope of Protection of  
Three-Dimensional Protein Structure Claims  
under German, European and US Law



**Nomos**

**MIPLC**

Munich  
**Intellectual  
Property**  
Law Center

Augsburg  
München  
Washington DC

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung des Förderungs- und Beihilfefonds  
Wissenschaft VG Wort  
Printed with support by "Förderungs- und Beihilfefonds  
Wissenschaft VG Wort".

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in  
der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische  
Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the  
Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data  
is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: München, Univ., Diss., 2009

ISBN 978-3-8329-4748-4

1. Auflage 2010

© Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2010. Printed in Germany. Alle Rechte, auch  
die des Nachdrucks von Auszügen, der fotomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Über-  
setzung, vorbehalten. Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part  
of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, re-use of  
illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machine or similar means,  
and storage in data banks. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are  
made for other than private use a fee is payable to »Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort«,  
Munich.

## Acknowledgements

This dissertation was accepted by the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich for the degree of doctor juris in March of 2009. It takes into account the law until the end of 2008.

The thesis would not have been written without the help and support of many different people from diverse backgrounds. The most sincere appreciation goes to my advisor Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Joseph Straus for his continuing help and encouragements, and to Prof. Dr. Michael Lehmann for his efforts as second referee.

I am also very grateful to the Honorable Judge Randall R. Rader for his advice and the deep insights into U.S. and comparative patent law during my time as a Visiting Scholar at the Federal Circuit Court in Washington, DC. Many thanks also to Professor Robert Brauneis and his wife for helping me and my family to settle in in Washington, DC, to Professor John Duffy for organizing access to the Jacob Burns Law Library, to Chris Holman, associate professor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law, for creating his most useful IP and biotech listserv for academics “IpBiotechProfs” and his invitation to join it, and to Josh Sarnoff, Assistant Director of the Glushko-Samuelson Intellectual Property Law Clinic in Washington DC, for reading the U.S. Patent Law chapter and sending me several pages with comments.

While working on the thesis, I benefited a lot from conversations with my colleagues at the Max-Planck-Institute for Intellectual Property, Competition and Tax Law in Munich, in particular Marc-Oliver Mackenrodt, Peter Ganea and Wolrad Prinz zu Waldeck und Pyrmont. Furthermore, Clara Sattler provided most valuable comments on the scientific background chapter.

Many thanks also to Christian Kummer SJ, professor of natural philosophy at the Munich School of Philosophy for letting me participate in his bioethical colloquium.

Many thanks also to my family and friends: my parents for their never ending support and patience; Tim and Niels Schuster, as well as Dorothee Gottwald for their huge efforts with reading corrections in exemplary ways; Marianne Menth for her substantive scientific direction.

Never enough thanks to my husband Uli for his encouragement, academic spirit and just being. He always got my back through thick and thin.

I dedicate this thesis to my son Samuel, the bringer of joy and light. May he always think of proteins as the central building blocks for all life on earth.

November 2009

*Martina Schuster*



# Contents

|                                                                                |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| List of Abbrehensions                                                          | 13 |
| Chapter 1: Introduction                                                        | 19 |
| Chapter 2: Scientific background                                               | 23 |
| A. Definition of the Term                                                      | 23 |
| B. Proteins and the biological organism                                        | 25 |
| I. Amino acid sequences                                                        | 25 |
| 1. Primary structure                                                           | 26 |
| 2. Secondary structure                                                         | 27 |
| 3. Tertiary structure                                                          | 28 |
| II. Protein folding                                                            | 30 |
| 1. Folding funnel theory of protein folding                                    | 30 |
| 2. Protein misfolding and diseases arising from ‘folding’ defects              | 33 |
| III. Structurally similar, sequence dissimilar proteins                        | 34 |
| IV. Posttranslational modifications (PTM)                                      | 34 |
| V. Role of Enzymes and their chemical activity                                 | 35 |
| C. Genetic coding of proteins                                                  | 40 |
| D. Recombinant Protein Synthesis                                               | 41 |
| E. Proteomic research                                                          | 42 |
| I. Proteome initiatives                                                        | 43 |
| II. Proteomics Technologies                                                    | 45 |
| 1. Protein expression, purification and characterization                       | 45 |
| a) Gel electrophoresis                                                         | 45 |
| b) Mass spectrometry                                                           | 46 |
| 2. Physical methods of determining the three-dimensional structure of proteins | 47 |
| a) Protein Crystallization                                                     | 47 |
| b) X-ray crystallography                                                       | 49 |
| c) NMR structure determination                                                 | 50 |
| d) Protein modeling (homologous-comparison)                                    | 51 |
| III. Data and Bioinformatics for proteomics                                    | 52 |
| 1. Databases                                                                   | 52 |
| 2. Cross-linking of database information                                       | 54 |
| 3. Database screening and drug design                                          | 55 |
| 4. In-silico screening of binding pockets                                      | 56 |

|                                                                         |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Chapter 3: Patentability Requirements                                   | 59  |
| A. Statutory Background and Fundamental Case Law in Europe and the U.S. | 59  |
| I. Introduction                                                         | 59  |
| II. Applicable law in the U.S. and Europe                               | 59  |
| 1. Patentable Subject Matter                                            | 60  |
| a) U.S.                                                                 | 60  |
| b) Europe                                                               | 62  |
| aa) Patentability of biological material                                | 62  |
| bb) Exclusions from patentability                                       | 64  |
| 2. Utility and Industrial Applicability                                 | 67  |
| a) U.S. (Utility)                                                       | 67  |
| b) Europe (Industrial Applicability)                                    | 71  |
| 3. Novelty                                                              | 73  |
| a) U.S.                                                                 | 73  |
| b) Europe                                                               | 77  |
| aa) The principle of unambiguous parameters                             | 79  |
| bb) The principles of second and further medical indications            | 83  |
| 4. Nonobviousness and Inventive Step                                    | 86  |
| a) U.S. (Nonobviousness)                                                | 86  |
| b) Europe (Inventive Step)                                              | 93  |
| 5. Written description/patent description and sufficient disclosure     | 96  |
| a) U.S.                                                                 | 96  |
| aa) Basic statutory background                                          | 96  |
| bb) Deposit requirements                                                | 99  |
| cc) The debate on a separate written description requirement            | 100 |
| i. Background to the debate                                             | 100 |
| ii. Development of a ‘separate written description’ doctrine            | 102 |
| iii. The ‘dissenting line’                                              | 104 |
| b) Europe (Sufficient disclosure)                                       | 110 |
| III. Conclusion                                                         | 114 |
| B. Case study related to protein 3-D-structure related inventions       | 116 |
| I. Introductory Remarks                                                 | 116 |
| 1. Aim of the study                                                     | 116 |
| 2. Major fields of 3-D protein structure inventions                     | 117 |
| II. Proteomics and protein structural properties <i>per se</i>          | 117 |
| 1. Structure defined by structural coordinates and protein crystals     | 117 |
| a) Claims                                                               | 117 |
| b) Background                                                           | 118 |
| c) Solutions proposed by the EPO and the USPTO                          | 118 |
| d) Discussion                                                           | 121 |

|                                                                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 2. Protein Domains                                                                  | 126 |
| a) Claims                                                                           | 127 |
| b) Background                                                                       | 128 |
| c) Solutions proposed by the EPO and the USPTO                                      | 128 |
| d) Discussion                                                                       | 130 |
| III. Proteomics and Bioinformatics                                                  | 138 |
| 1. <i>In-silico</i> screening methods                                               | 139 |
| a) Claim 1                                                                          | 140 |
| aa) Background                                                                      | 140 |
| bb) Patent Offices Analysis                                                         | 141 |
| cc) Discussion                                                                      | 143 |
| i. The discussion on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions in Europe | 143 |
| ii. Classification of <i>In-Silico</i> Screening Methods in Europe                  | 147 |
| iii. Classification of <i>In-Silico</i> Screening Methods in the U.S.               | 149 |
| b) Claim 2                                                                          | 153 |
| aa) Background                                                                      | 154 |
| bb) Patent Offices' Analysis                                                        | 154 |
| cc) Discussion                                                                      | 156 |
| 2. Structural Data of proteins per se                                               | 157 |
| a) Claims and Claim Background                                                      | 157 |
| b) Patent Offices' Analysis                                                         | 158 |
| c) Discussion                                                                       | 160 |
| 3. Compounds identified by <i>in-silico</i> screening methods                       | 161 |
| a) Claims                                                                           | 162 |
| b) Patent Offices' Analysis                                                         | 162 |
| c) Discussion                                                                       | 164 |
| aa) Reach-through-Claims                                                            | 164 |
| bb) Reach-through licensing                                                         | 166 |
| i. Statutory background in Germany                                                  | 166 |
| ii. Legal situation under U.S. law                                                  | 167 |
| IV. Conclusion                                                                      | 169 |

## Chapter 4: Scope of Protection 173

|                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| A. Introductory Remarks                                       | 173 |
| B. Claim construction in the U.S. and in Europe               | 174 |
| I. Claim construction and doctrine of equivalents in the U.S. | 174 |
| 1. Claim Construction                                         | 174 |
| 2. Doctrine of equivalents                                    | 177 |

|      |                                                                                                                |     |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| II.  | Claim construction and Doctrine of equivalents under German law                                                | 181 |
| 1.   | Claim Construction                                                                                             | 181 |
| 2.   | Doctrine of equivalents                                                                                        | 183 |
| a)   | Moulded Curbstone                                                                                              | 184 |
| b)   | Further Decisions                                                                                              | 185 |
| III. | Research/Experimental Use Exemption                                                                            | 186 |
| 1.   | Germany                                                                                                        | 186 |
| 2.   | U.S.                                                                                                           | 190 |
| C.   | Use of 3-D protein structure (concrete claim analysis)                                                         | 194 |
| I.   | Use of 3-D structure from naturally obtained proteins                                                          | 196 |
| II.  | Use of 3-D structure from recombinant proteins                                                                 | 198 |
| III. | Use of 3-D structure from crystallized proteins                                                                | 200 |
| IV.  | Use of new proteomics technologies: An example using sequence-dissimilar proteins sharing common 3-D fold      | 203 |
| 1.   | Protein engineering and legal standards for the use of protein variants                                        | 205 |
| 2.   | Literal infringement                                                                                           | 207 |
| a)   | Treatment of protein variants in the U.S.                                                                      | 207 |
| aa)  | Claims defining proteins in terms of function                                                                  | 208 |
| bb)  | The USPTO Guidelines for Examination of the ‘Written Description Requirement’                                  | 210 |
| b)   | Treatment of protein variants in Germany                                                                       | 213 |
| c)   | Application of the principles reliable for protein variants on the use of sequence-dissimilar proteins         | 215 |
| d)   | Analysis of the approach to define a protein by folding type and function                                      | 216 |
| 3.   | Infringement under the doctrine of equivalents                                                                 | 218 |
| a)   | U.S.                                                                                                           | 218 |
| aa)  | Methods for determining equivalents                                                                            | 218 |
| i.   | The “Hypothetical Claim” Analysis                                                                              | 219 |
| ii.  | The interchangeability test                                                                                    | 220 |
| iii. | The ‘function-way–result’ test                                                                                 | 221 |
| bb)  | The ruling of <i>Genentech v. Wellcome</i> and the doctrine of equivalents                                     | 222 |
| cc)  | Application of the ‘function-way-result’ test to the issue of sequence-dissimilar proteins                     | 224 |
| dd)  | Expansion of the patent coverage to as yet unidentified species                                                | 225 |
| b)   | Germany                                                                                                        | 228 |
| aa)  | Infringement under the doctrine of equivalents                                                                 | 228 |
| bb)  | Transfer of the case law related to figures and measurements to the field of 3-D protein structures inventions | 231 |

|                                                                                                             |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| c) Conclusions                                                                                              | 235     |
| V. U.S. Patent No. 5,835,382 “Small Molecule Mimetics of Erythropoietin”: A characteristic proteomic patent | 237     |
| VI. Use of selective 3-D protein structure parts (Selection inventions)                                     | 240     |
| 1. Relationship to patents covering the entire protein                                                      | 240     |
| 2. The Amgen case                                                                                           | 242     |
| 3. Applicable law                                                                                           | 242     |
| VII. Use of compounds identified through 3-D protein structure screening methods                            | 246     |
| 1. Protection as product of patentable process                                                              | 246     |
| 2. The Bayer v. Housey Case                                                                                 | 247     |
| VIII. Concluding Remarks                                                                                    | 249     |
| <br>Chapter 5: Summary and Findings                                                                         | <br>253 |
| A. Patentability of Proteomic Patent Claims                                                                 | 253     |
| B. Scope of Protection                                                                                      | 256     |
| C. General Findings                                                                                         | 259     |
| <br>Bibliography                                                                                            | <br>263 |

