SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SU	PREME COU	JRT OI	THE	UNITED	STATES
				_	
AMGEN INC., ET AI	. ,)	
	Petition	ners,)	
v.) No. 2	1-757
SANOFI, ET AL.,)	
	Responde	ents.)	
				_	

Pages: 1 through 111

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: March 27, 2023

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-4888
www.hrccourtreporters.com

Τ	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	
3	AMGEN INC., ET AL.,
4	Petitioners,)
5	v.) No. 21-757
6	SANOFI, ET AL.,
7	Respondents.)
8	
9	
10	Washington, D.C.
11	Monday, March 27, 2023
12	
13	The above-entitled matter came on for
14	oral argument before the Supreme Court of the
15	United States at 10:05 a.m.
16	
17	APPEARANCES:
18	JEFFREY A. LAMKEN, ESQUIRE, Washington, D.C.; on
19	behalf of the Petitioners.
20	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQUIRE, Alexandria, Virginia; on
21	behalf of the Respondents.
22	COLLEEN R. SINZDAK, Assistant to the Solicitor
23	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.;
24	for the United States, as amicus curiae,
25	supporting the Respondents.

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	JEFFREY A. LAMKEN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents	56
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
9	COLLEEN R. SINZDAK, ESQ.	
10	For the United States, as amicus	
11	curiae, supporting the Respondents	86
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
13	JEFFREY A. LAMKEN, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioners	105
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:05 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear
4	argument first this morning in Case 21-757,
5	Amgen versus Sanofi.
6	Mr. Lamken.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF JEFFREY A. LAMKEN
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
9	MR. LAMKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chief
10	Justice, and may it please the Court:
11	Amgen invented a new class of
12	antibodies that lower cholesterol that bind to a
13	small spot on PCSK9, the sweet spot, and thereby
14	block that protein from binding to and
15	destroying LDL receptors that remove
16	cholesterol. Amgen had in hand 384 examples
17	before the Texas article Sanofi cites as
18	hypothesizing such antibodies, before Sanofi
19	began researching PCSK9.
20	This case concerns the reason the
21	requirement that patents enable skilled artisans
22	to make and use the invention. The roadmap in
23	Amgen's patents allows skilled artisans to
24	easily make those antibodies every time using
25	two new anchor antibodies that cover the entire

- 1 sweet spot so skilled artisans can be certain to
- 2 make all the claims' antibodies, including
- 3 defendants' examples.
- 4 The Federal Circuit here never
- 5 identified a single actual antibody that's in
- 6 the claims that can't be made or requires undue
- 7 experimentation. Instead, it invoked something
- 8 that no one will defend is even relevant here:
- 9 the cumulative effort to make all or some large
- 10 group of an invention's potentially myriad
- 11 variations.
- This Court's cases, however, reflect
- the Act's pragmatic boots-on-the-ground focus on
- enabling skilled artisans who want to practice
- 15 the invention on a concrete action, making and
- 16 using the invention. Patents thus satisfy the
- 17 law when sufficiently definite to guide
- 18 artisans' successful application of the
- invention wherein there's some practical way of
- 20 putting them into operation, requiring
- 21 reasonableness with due regard to the patent's
- 22 subject matter.
- In concrete terms, that means that
- 24 those who are seeking to overto the P --
- 25 overturn the PTO's issuance of the patents and