

1 Juanita R. Brooks, SBN 75934
 2 brooks@fr.com
 3 Craig E. Countryman, SBN 244601
 4 countryman@fr.com
 5 Michael A. Amon, SBN 226221
 6 amon@fr.com
 7 Robert M. Yeh, SBN 286018
 8 ryeh@fr.com
 9 Ryan L. Frei, SBN 310722
 10 rfrei@fr.com
 11 Fish & Richardson P.C.
 12 12390 El Camino Real
 13 San Diego, CA 92130
 14 Phone: 858-678-5070
 15 Fax: 858-678-5099

Douglas E. McCann (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 dmccann@fr.com
 Fish & Richardson P.C.
 222 Delaware Avenue
 17th Floor, P.O. Box 1114
 Wilmington, DE 19801
 Phone: 302-652-5070
 Fax: 302-652-0607

11 *Attorneys for Defendant*
 12 ILLUMINA, INC.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15

16 THE SCRIPPS RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
 17 Plaintiff,
 18 v.
 19 ILLUMINA, INC.,
 20 Defendant.
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

Case No. 16-cv-661 JLS (BGS)

**ILLUMINA'S OPENING CLAIM
 CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

Date: January 30, 2018
 Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Judge: Hon. Janis L. Sammartino
 Courtroom: 4D

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3		
4	I. INTRODUCTION	1
5	II. STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	2
6	A. The '596 Patent Claims a “Bifunctional Molecule” With a Specific Structure	
7	Depicted Using Chemical Formulas.....	2
8	B. The '596 Patent Defines Variable “a” in the Claimed Formulas $(X_n)_a$ and $(Z_n)_a$,	
9	and Illumina’s Constructions Adopt those Definitions.....	3
10	C. Scripps Narrowed Its Definition of the “Linker Molecule” Claim Limitation	
11	to Avoid Prior Art at the Patent Office.....	6
12	III. LEGAL STANDARDS	9
13	IV. ARGUMENT.....	10
14	A. The Patent Defines the Term “ $(Z_n)_a$ ” so that Parameter “a” Refers to the	
15	Number of Chemical Unit Identifiers.....	10
16	B. The Patent Defines the Term “ $(X_n)_a$ ” so that Parameter “a” Refers to the	
17	Number of Chemical Units X in the Polymer A.	13
18	C. Subscript “a” is Properly Defined in the Context of “ $(Z_n)_a$ ” and “ $(X_n)_a$.”.....	18
19	D. Scripps’s Disclaimers Limit the Term “B is a Linker Molecule Operatively	
20	Linked to A and C,” as the PTO Correctly Determined.....	19
21	E. The Preamble Term “Bifunctional Molecule” Is Not Limiting.....	22
22	F. The Court Should Reject Scripps’s Attempts to Read Limitations Into the	
23	Term “Identifier Oligonucleotide C”.....	24
24	V. CONCLUSION	25
25		
26		
27		
28		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	<i>Abbott Labs. v. Novopharm Ltd.</i> ,	
6	323 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	14
7	<i>ALA Eng'g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Int'l S/A</i> ,	
8	657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	9
9	<i>Alcon Research Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> ,	
10	687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
11	<i>Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.</i> ,	
12	299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	23
13	<i>Am. Med. Sys. v. Biolitec, Inc.</i> ,	
14	618 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	23
15	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc.</i> ,	
16	842 F.3d 1229 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	16
17	<i>Bayer CropScience AG v. Dow AgroSciences LLC</i> ,	
18	728 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	18
19	<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> ,	
20	713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	9
21	<i>ContentGuard Holdings, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> ,	
22	2015 WL 1289321 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 20, 2015)	22
23	<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chem. Co.</i> ,	
24	803 F.3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	18
25	<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> ,	
26	582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14, 15
27	<i>Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co.</i> ,	
28	192 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	9, 20
29	<i>Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Ltd. v. Resmed Corp.</i> ,	
30	2016 WL 9488705 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 22, 2016)	22

1 *Geneva Pharms., Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline, LLC,*
 349 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 17

2 *Indacon, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.,*
 3 824 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 17

4 *Irdeto Access, Inc. v. Echostar Satellite Corp.,*
 5 383 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 17

6 *Kraft Foods, Inc. v. Int’l Trading Co.,*
 7 203 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 16

8 *Phillips v. AWH Corp.,*
 9 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*)..... 9, 10, 22

10 *Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.,*
 11 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 25

12 *SkinMedica, Inc. v. Histogen Inc.,*
 2011 WL 206619 (S.D. Cal. May 24, 2011) (Sammartino, J.) 16

13 *SkinMedica, Inc. v. Histogen Inc.,*
 14 727 F. 3d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 14

15 *Southwall Techs., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.,*
 16 54 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 16

17 *Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.,*
 18 802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 24

19 *Technological Properties Ltd. LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co., Ltd.,*
 20 849 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 20

21 *Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,*
 22 789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 18

23 *In re Varma,*
 816 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 16

24 *Weiland Sliding Doors and Windows, Inc. v. Panda Windows and Doors LLC,*
 25 2011 WL 3490481 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2011)..... 23

26 *Wi-LAN USA, Inc. v. Apple Inc.,*
 27 830 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 20

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112(d) 12

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.