Case IPR2016-00820 U.S. Patent No. 7,064,197

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HOLOGIC, INC., Petitioner

v.

ENZO LIFE SCIENCES, INC., Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00820

U.S. Patent No. 7,064,197
TITLE: SYSTEM, ARRAY AND NON-POROUS SOLID SUPPORT COMPRISING FIXED OR IMMOBILIZED NUCLEIC ACIDS
Issue Date: June 20, 2006

ENZO'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Mail Stop Patent Board Patent Trial and Appeal Board U.S. Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

				<del>-</del>	<u>Page</u>	
I.	INTF	TRODUCTION				
II.	OVE	ERVIEW OF THE '197 PATENT1				
III.	FISH DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY CLAIMS IN GROUND 12					
	A.	Indep	Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, And 27			
		1.		Does Not Disclose Nucleic Acid Strands Fixed Or obilized To A Non-Porous Solid Support.	3	
		2.		Does Not Expressly Or Inherently Disclose Nucleic Strands In Hybridizable Form.	9	
			a.	Petitioner's Reliance on Diehl Does Not Establish That Fish Inherently Discloses ssDNA In Hybridizable Form.	14	
			b.	The '197 Patent Prosecution History Does Not Support Petitioner's Inherency Theory.	20	
	B.	-		Claims 16, 32-34, 41, 61-63, 69, 70, 72-74, 79, 100, 94, 212, 213, 219, 222, 225- 227, 230, 233, And 236	22	
IV.	FISH, STANDING ALONE, DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY CLAIM IN GROUND 2					
	A.	Clain	ns 31,	68, And 192	23	
	B.	Clain	ns 64,	101, And 195	26	
V.				OF GILHAM DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS S 38, 78, OR 218	28	
	A.			Oid Not Establish That Fish In View Of Gilham Of The Limitations Of Claims 38, 78, Or 218	28	
	B.	Com	bined ?	Did Not Establish That A POSITA Would Have Fish And Gilham Or That A POSITA Would Have sonable Expectation Of Success	28	



Case	IPR2016-00820
U.S.	Patent No. 7,064,197
VI.	VPK IS NOT PRIO

VI.	VPK IS NOT PRIOR ART TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM32						
	A.	The Challenged Claims Are Entitled To The Filing Date Of The 1983 Application					
		1.	The 1983 Application's Examples Of Non-Porous Solid Supports Provide Sufficient Written Description For The Genus Of "Non-Porous Solid Supports."				
		2.	Petitioner's Arguments Rely On Factually Distinguishable Cases, Incorrect Statements Of Law, Or Both. 37				
	В.		Invention of the Challenged Claims Was Conceived and ced to Practice Before VPK's Effective Date Of October 39				
		1.	Legal Standards For Antedating An Alleged 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) Reference In An <i>Inter Partes</i> Review39				
		2.	Enzo's Inventors Conceived And Reduced to Practice The Challenged Claims' Subject Matter Before October 1982				
VII.	27, 32	DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY OF CLAIMS 1, 6, 8, 9, 12-15, 1, 32, 34, 61-63, 68-70, 72, 74, 79, 100, 191-194, 213, 219, 226, OR 236					
	A.	Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12-15, And 275					
	В.	Claims 31, 32, 34, 61, 62, 63, 68-70, 72, 74, 79, 100, 191-194, 213, 219, 226, 227, And 236					
VIII.	III. VPK IN VIEW OF NOYES AND RAMACHANDRAN DOES N RENDER OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 16, 38, 64, 78, 101, 1 218, 222, OR 230						
	A.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That Noyes, VPK, And Ramachandran Meet All Of The Limitations Of Any Challenged Claim.					
	B.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That A POSITA Would Combine VPK, Noves, And Ramachandran					



Case	IPR2016-00820	
U.S.	Patent No. 7,064,197	
IX.	VPK IN VIEW OF METZGAR DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 33, 41, 73, 212, 225, OR 233	65
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	67
XI.	CONCLUSION	68



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Cases	Page(s)
ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc., 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	29, 64
Agilent Techs., Inc. v. Affymetrix, Inc., 567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10
Bilstad v. Wakalopulos, 386 F.3d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	34, 37, 38
Borror v. Herz, 666 F.2d 569 (CCPA 1981)	40
CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l. Corp., 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	22, 28, 65
Corning, Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V., Case IPR2013-00053, Paper 66 (PTAB May 1, 2014)	40
Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	33, 40
Haemonetics Corp. v. Baxter Healthcare Corp., 607 F.3d 776 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	13, 58
Hartness Int'l Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng'g Co., 819 F. 2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	22, 57
Holmwood v. Sugavanam, 948 F.2d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	40
Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	39
In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	65
In re Gordon, 733 F 2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	27 30 62



# DOCKET

# 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.

