

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DNA GENOTEK INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPECTRUM DNA; SPECTRUM SOLUTIONS
L.L.C.; and SPECTRUM PACKAGING L.L.C.,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 15-cv-00661-SLR

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF DNA GENOTEK INC.'S OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

OF COUNSEL:
David C. Doyle
Brian M. Kramer
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive
San Diego, CA 92130
(858) 314-5415
ddoyle@mofocom
bmramer@mofocom

John W. Shaw (No. 3362)
Karen E. Keller (No. 4489)
300 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1120
SHAW KELLER LLP
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 298-0700
jshaw@shawkeller.com
kkeller@shawkeller.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: August 24, 2015

ANCESTRY EX. 1005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS.....	1
III. STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
A. DNAG is a Leading Innovator of DNA Collection Technology.....	2
B. The '381 Patent Encompasses Many Embodiments of DNAG's Sample Collection Devices.....	3
C. Spectrum's Product Infringes At Least Claim 1 of the '381 Patent.	4
IV. ARGUMENT	8
A. DNAG Will Likely Succeed on the Merits.....	8
B. DNAG Will Be Irreparably Harmed if the Court Does Not Issue a Preliminary Injunction	10
1. DNAG Will Suffer Irreparable Harm As a Result of Spectrum's Infringing Conduct.....	11
a. Spectrum's Infringing Product Will Cause DNAG to Suffer Price Erosion.....	11
b. Spectrum's Infringing Product Will Damage DNAG's Relationship with Current and Potential Customers.....	13
c. Spectrum's Infringing Product Will Harm DNAG's Ability to Do Business	15
2. Spectrum's Ability to Pay Money Damages is Uncertain	16
3. DNAG's Harm Is Directly Attributable to Spectrum's Infringement	17
4. Harm to DNAG is Already Occurring; More Harm is Imminent.....	18
C. The Balance of Hardships Weighs in Favor of Issuing an Injunction	19
D. The Public Interest Weighs in Favor of Issuing an Injunction	20
V. CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>3M Unitek Corp. v. Ormco Co.</i> , 96 F. Supp. 2d 1042 (C.D. Cal. 2000)	13
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 473 F.3d 1196 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	10
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	8
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	8
<i>Antares Pharma., Inc. v. Medac Pharma., Inc.</i> , 55 F. Supp. 3d 526 (D. Del.), <i>aff'd</i> , 771 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	8
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 695 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	11, 17
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 735 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	17
<i>Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Semiconductor Materials Am., Inc.</i> , 98 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	8
<i>Aria Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	11, 12
<i>Bio-Techn. Gen. Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 80 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	15
<i>Butamax™ Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , 868 F. Supp. 2d 359 (D. Del. 2012).....	11
<i>Canon Computer Sys., Inc. v. Nu-Kote Int’l, Inc.</i> , 134 F.3d 1085 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	9
<i>Celsis in Vitro, Inc. v. CellzDirect, Inc.</i> , 664 F.3d 922 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prods. Co.</i> , 717 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	11, 13, 14

Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc.,
405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....7

Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co.,
339 U.S. 605 (1950).....9

Opticians Assoc. of Am. v. Indep. Opticians of Am.,
920 F.2d 187 (3d Cir. 1990).....11

Pfizer, Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.,
429 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....9

Polymer Technologies, Inc. v. Bridwell,
103 F.3d 970 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....11, 12

Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.,
2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 88488 (D. Del. June 30, 2014).....14

Presidio Components, Inc. v. Am. Tech. Ceramics Corp.,
702 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....11

Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.,
659 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....16, 17, 19

Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex Inc.,
488 F. Supp. 2d 317 (S.D.N.Y. 2006),
aff’d 470 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2006)15

Sciele Pharma Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.,
684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....8

Sofamor Danek Group, Inc. v. DePuy-Motech, Inc.,
74 F.3d 1216 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....9

TechSearch, L.L.C. v. Intel Corp.,
286 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....9

TIP Sys., LLC v. Phillips & Brooks/Gladwin, Inc.,
529 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....10

Trebro Mfg. v. FireFly Equip., LLC,
748 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....10, 11

Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.,
520 U.S. 17 (1997).....9

Windsurfing Int'l, Inc. v. AMF, Inc.,
782 F.2d 995 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....19

Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.,
555 U.S. 7 (2008).....8

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 282.....8

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Manual of Patent Examination Procedure § 2111.03 (2014).....7

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.