

1 Derek Gilliland (admitted *pro hac*) (Texas 24007239)
2 Robert Winn Cutler (admitted *pro hac*) (Texas 24084364)
3 Christian Hurt (admitted *pro hac*) (Texas 24059987)

4 **NIX PATTERSON & ROACH**
5 1845 Woodall Rodgers Fwy., Suite 1050
6 Dallas, Texas 75201
7 Telephone: (972) 831-1188

8 and

9 Bruce J. Zabarauskas (State Bar No. 248601)
10 Bruce S. Sostek (admitted *pro hac*) (Texas 18855700)
11 Herbert Hammond (admitted *pro hac*) (Texas 08858500)
12 Vishal Patel (admitted *pro hac*) (Texas 24065885)

13 **THOMPSON & KNIGHT LLP**
14 707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 4100
15 Los Angeles, California 90017
16 Telephone: (310) 203-6900

17 and

18 1722 Routh Street, Suite 1500
19 Dallas, Texas 75201
20 Telephone: (214) 969-1700

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff
22 The Scripps Research Institute

23 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
24 **FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

25 **THE SCRIPPS RESEARCH INSTITUTE,**
26 Plaintiff,

27 v.

28 **ILLUMINA, INC.,**
Defendant.

Case No. 3:16-cv-661-JLS-BGS

SCRIPPS'S OPENING CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 1

II. THE CLAIMS AT ISSUE 2

IV. APPLICABLE LAW 3

V. ARGUMENT 4

 A. “a” 4

 B. “(X_n)_a” and “(Z_n)_a” 9

 C. “B is a linker molecule operatively linked to A and C” 10

 D. “bifunctional molecule” 14

 E. “identifier oligonucleotide C” 15

VI. CONCLUSION 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

1		
2		
3	<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i>	
4	856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	3
5	<i>Blast Motion, Inc. v. Zepp Labs, Inc.</i>	
6	2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16549 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2017).....	3
7	<i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co.</i>	
8	224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	5
9	<i>Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i>	
10	289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	14
11	<i>Chi. Bd. Options Exh., Inc. v. Int’l Sec. Exh., LLC</i>	
12	677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	5
13	<i>Depuy Orthopaedics, Inc. v. Orthopaedic Hosp.</i>	
14	2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2030 (N.D. Ind. Jan. 8, 2016).....	11
15	<i>GE Lighting Sols., LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i>	
16	750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	6
17	<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i>	
18	755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5
19	<i>Info-Hold, Inc. v. Applied Media Techs. Corp.</i>	
20	783 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3
21	<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i>	
22	415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	3
23	<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i>	
24	182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	14
25	<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.</i>	
26	711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	17
27	<i>Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Yahoo! Inc.</i>	
28	2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65813 (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2014).....	3, 11

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

Regents of the Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp.
717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 11

Rowe v. Dror
112 F.3d 473 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 14

Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.
135 S. Ct. 831 (2015)..... 3

TomTom, Inc. v. Adolph
790 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 4

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 3

Warner-Lambert Co. v. Apotex Corp.
316 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 9

I. INTRODUCTION

The Patent-in-Suit involves complicated technical subject matter—encoded combinatorial chemical libraries. Technology aside, the Court can reject Illumina’s constructions because they violate basic claim-construction principles. As the Court determined in its denial of Illumina’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 34), Illumina improperly tries to limit the “a”-related terms to an exemplary disclosure in an embodiment and does so even though the doctrine of claim differentiation and the plain claim language support a broader construction. Illumina likewise attempts to shoehorn into the “linker molecule” limitations based on a misreading of the prosecution history of other patents relating to different claim limitations—language not found in the Patent-in-Suit. Illumina also seeks to read out the word “identifier” from the term “identifier oligonucleotide C.” Federal Circuit precedent rejects those approaches to claim construction, and Scripps respectfully requests that this Court do so as well.

II. BACKGROUND

The Scripps Research Institute (“Scripps”) developed the inventions described and claimed in the Patent-in-Suit, U.S. Patent No. 6,060,596 (the “’596 Patent”). The ’596 Patent, entitled “Encoded Combinatorial Chemical Libraries,” claims priority to an application filed in March, 1992. The three inventors of the ’596 Patent each hold doctoral degrees, and one inventor is a Nobel Laureate. Because the Court is already familiar with the technology in the context of Illumina’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 34), Scripps will provide only a brief technical background here.¹

In general, the ’596 Patent relates to encoding a library of chemical polymers with genetic information to track the structure of each chemical polymer. Metzker Decl., at ¶ 39. These libraries are used in the manufacture of DNA microarrays. Each DNA substrate or bead in a microarray product contains hundreds of thousands of copies of specific DNA

¹ Scripps’s technical expert has provided in his declaration a more extensive background of DNA, biological systems, chemical synthesis, and the ’596 Patent. *See* Declaration of Dr. Michael L. Metzker at ¶¶ 22–38 (attached as Exh. 1)

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.