

Filed on behalf of: The Board of Trustees of the  
Leland Stanford Junior University

Paper \_\_\_\_\_

By: R. Danny Huntington, Lead Counsel  
Sharon E. Crane, Ph.D., Backup Counsel  
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck, P.C.  
607 14<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC, 20005  
dhuntington@rfem.com  
scrane@rfem.com  
Main Telephone: (202) 783-6040  
Main Facsimile: (202) 783-6031

Filed: May 7, 2014

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SEQUENOM, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF  
THE LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2013-00390  
Patent 8,195,415

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE FAN '415 PATENT.....	1
III. CLAIM INTERPRETATION .....	2
A. Windows of Defined Length .....	3
1. The Fan '415 Patent Examples Use “Windows” of Equal Length .....	4
2. The Fan '415 Patent Explicitly States “Windows” Are of Equal Length.....	5
3. Predefined Subsections of a Chromosome Are of Equal Length.....	7
4. The Board’s Interpretation in the '922 Interference Is Unduly Broad.....	8
B. Sliding Window of a Predetermined Length.....	11
IV. LO II DOES NOT ANTICIPATE THE FAN '415 PATENT CLAIMS.....	13
A. Windows Are Distinct from Chromosomal Regions .....	13
1. Windows in the Fan '415 Patent Are a Tool USED TO TEST for Aneuploidy .....	14
2. Chromosomal Regions in Lo II Are BEING TESTED for Aneuploidy .....	15
3. The Board’s Decision in the '922 Interference Improperly Attributes Additional Functions to Windows of Defined Length .....	17
B. The Lo II Normalization Method Shows Windows of Defined Length Are Not Disclosed .....	18
C. Lo II Does Not Enable the Claim Term “Windows of Defined Length” .....	19
1. Lo II Does Not Contain Any Working Examples .....	20
2. Lo II Does Not Provide Any Guidance .....	20
3. Undue Experimentation Is Required to Make and Use “Windows of Defined Length” Based on the Lo II Disclosure .....	21
V. LO II IN COMBINATION WITH WANG DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 13, 16, OR 17 OBVIOUS.....	22

A. The Combination of Wang and Lo II Does Not Disclose a “Sliding Window a Predetermined Length” .....	22
B. The “Windows” Disclosed in Wang Are a Region Being Analyzed for Abnormal Distribution, and NOT a Subset of that Region.....	24
C. Wang Does Not Disclose the “Second Mean” of Claim 13, step (d).....	26
VI. LO II AND WANG IN COMBINATION WITH HILLIER AND/OR SMITH DOES NOT RENDER CLAIM 17 OBVIOUS .....	27
VII. LO I DOES NOT DISCLOSE THE CONCEPT OF “WINDOWS” .....	29
VIII. LO II IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE FAN ’415 PATENT .....	29
A. Background.....	31
B. Collaboration with Dr. Yair Blumenfeld.....	32
C. Conception.....	33
D. Reduction to practice .....	33
1. Sequencing samples from females carrying non-aneuploid fetuses confirmed the conception by Drs. Fan and Quake .....	33
2. Sequencing samples from females carrying either aneuploid or non-aneuploid fetuses was an actual reduction to practice by Drs. Fan and Quake.....	36
3. The drafts of the PNAS paper evidence the reduction to practice by Drs. Fan and Quake .....	38
4. The Draft Manuscripts Disclose “Sliding Windows” and “Windows of Defined Length .....	60
IX. CONCLUSION .....	60

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Hoescht Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	19
<i>Berges v. Gottstein</i> , 618 F.2d 771, 776 (CCPA 1980).....	31
<i>Blicharz v. Hays</i> , 496 F.2d 603 (CCPA 1974).....	30
<i>Blicharz v. Hays</i> , 496 F.2d 603, 606 (CCPA 1974).....	30
<i>Breuer v. DeMarinis</i> , 558 F.2d 22, 29 (CCPA 1977),.....	31
<i>Clearvalue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	13
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	30
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	27
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).....	22
<i>Hologic, Inc. v. SenoRx, Inc.</i> , 639 F.3d 1329, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	3
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	22
<i>In re Gurley</i> , 27 F.3d 551, 553 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	27
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	22
<i>In re Scheiber</i> , 587 F.2d 59, 61 – 62 (CCPA 1978);.....	30
<i>In re Spiller</i> , 500 F.2d 1170, 1178 (CCPA 1974).....	30
<i>In re Stemptel</i> ,	

...

241 F.2d 755, 760 (CCPA 1957).....	30
<i>In re Suitco Surface</i> ,	
603 F.3d 1255, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	2
<i>In re Wands</i> ,	
858 F.2d 731, 737 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	20
<i>InnovaPure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
381 F.3d 1111, 1119 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	3
<i>Irdeeto Access, Inc. v. Echostar Satellite Corp.</i> ,	
383 F.3d 1295, 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	3
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> ,	
550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007).....	27
<i>Mahurkar v. CR Bard, Inc.</i> ,	
79 F.3d 1572, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	30
<i>Philips v. AWH Corp.</i> ,	
415 F.3d 1303, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3
<i>Price v. Symsek</i> ,	
988 F.2d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	30
<i>Schriber-Schroth Co. v. Cleveland Trust Co.</i> ,	
311 U.S. 211, 217 (1940).....	2
<i>Wang Labs., Inc. v. Am. Online, Inc.</i> ,	
197 F.3d 1377, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	3
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. §112, ¶4.....	14
<b>Regulations</b>	
37 C.F.R. §42.100(b).....	3

# 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.