

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 PRELIMINARY 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

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '197 PATENT	2
III. OVERVIEW OF THE PETITION	4
IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON ALL GROUNDS BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT FISH, GILHAM, VPK, NOYES, OR RAMACHANDRAN QUALIFY AS A PRINTED PUBLICATION.	6
A. A Petitioner Must Make A Threshold Showing In The Petition That A Reference Constitutes A Prior Art Printed Publication.	6
B. Neither Attorney Argument, Nor Copyright Dates, Nor Library Stamps Can Establish A Threshold Showing Of Public Accessibility.	7
C. Petitioner Did Not Make A Threshold Showing Of Public Accessibility For Any Of Its Non-Patent References.	9
V. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 1 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT FISH ANTICIPATES ANY OF CLAIMS 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 41, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 79, 100, 191, 192, 193, 194, 212, 213, 219, 222, 225, 226, 227, 230, 233, OR 236.....	11
A. Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, And 27.....	11
1. Fish Does Not Disclose Nucleic Acid Strands Fixed Or Immobilized To A Non-Porous Solid Support.	13
2. Fish Does Not Expressly Or Inherently Disclose Nucleic Acid Strands In Hybridizable Form.....	14
i. The Hybridization Described In Diehl Is Wholly Inapplicable To Fish.	17

ii.	The '197 Patent Prosecution History Does Not Support Petitioner's Inherency Theory.	21
3.	Fish Does Not Disclose A Non-Porous Solid Support.	22
B.	Dependent Claims 16, 31, 32, 33, 34, 41, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 79, 100, 191, 192, 193, 194, 212, 213, 219, 222, 225, 226, 227, 230, 233, And 236.	24
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 2 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT FISH, STANDING ALONE, RENDERS OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 31, 64, 68, 101, 192, OR 195.	26
A.	Claims 31, 68, And 192.	27
B.	Claims 64, 101, And 195.	29
VII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 3 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT FISH IN VIEW OF GILHAM RENDERS OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 38, 78, OR 218.	31
A.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That Fish In View Of Gilham Meets All Of The Limitations Of Claims 38, 78, Or 218.	31
B.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That A POSITA Would Have Combined Fish And Gilham Or That A POSITA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success.	31
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 4 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT VPK ANTICIPATES ANY OF CLAIMS 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 27, 31, 32, 34, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 79, 100, 191, 192, 193, 194, 213, 219, 226, 227, OR 236.	36
A.	The Challenged Claims Are Entitled To The Filing Date Of The 1983 Application.	37

1.	The 1983 Application’s Examples Of Non-Porous Solid Supports Provide Sufficient Written Description For The Genus Of “Non-Porous Solid Supports.”	38
2.	Petitioner’s Arguments Rely On Factually Distinguishable Cases, Incorrect Statements Of Law, Or Both.	42
B.	VPK Does Not Anticipate Any Challenged Claim.	44
1.	Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12-15, And 27	45
2.	Claims 31, 32, 34, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 79, 100, 191, 192, 193, 194, 213, 219, 226, 227, And 236	47
IX.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 5 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT VPK IN VIEW OF NOYES AND RAMACHANDRAN RENDERS OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 16, 38, 64, 78, 101, 195, 218, 222, OR 230.	49
A.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That Noyes, VPK, And Ramachandran Meet All Of The Limitations Of Any Challenged Claim.	49
B.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That A POSITA Would Combine VPK, Noyes, And Ramachandran.	51
X.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 6 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT VPK IN VIEW OF METZGAR RENDERS OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 33, 41, 73, 212, 225, OR 233.	55
XI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON PETITIONER’S REDUNDANT CHALLENGES.	56
XII.	CONCLUSION.	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	31, 51
<i>Agilent Techs., Inc. v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	15
<i>Apple, Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgm't</i> , Case IPR2015-00369, Paper 9 (PTAB June 25, 2015)	8, 10, 36
<i>Bilstad v. Wakalopulos</i> , 386 F.3d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	38, 42
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l. Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	26, 31, 55
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Constellation Techs. LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00914, Paper 11 (PTAB Jan. 2, 2015)	6
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs IV LLC v. Pharmacyclics LLC</i> , Case IPR2015-01076, Paper 33 (PTAB Oct. 19, 2015)	7, 10
<i>Dish Network L.L.C. v. Dragon Intellectual Property, LLC</i> , Case IPR2015-00499, Paper 7 (PTAB July 17, 2015)	9
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	6
<i>Hartness Int'l Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng'g Co.</i> , 819 F. 2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	24, 46
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. U.S. Philips Corp.</i> , Case IPR2015-01505, Paper 15 (PTAB Dec. 16, 2015)	7
<i>Hilgraeve, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 271 F. Supp. 2d 964 (E.D. Mich. 2003)	8, 10

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.