UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HOLOGIC, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

ENZO LIFE SCIENCES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00822

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

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, SATO, 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 17, 19, 25, 105, 106, 114, 116, 119, 128, 129, 150, 152, 178, 180, 186, OR 187. 11

A. Independent Claims 17, 19, And 25 11

1. Fish Does Not Disclose Nucleic Acid Strands Fixed Or Immobilized To A Non-Porous Solid Support. 12

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. 16

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

ii. The '197 Patent Prosecution History Does Not Support Petitioner's Inherency Theory. 20

3. Fish Does Not Disclose An "Array." 22

4. Fish Does Not Disclose "A Non-Porous Solid Support." 22

B. Dependent Claims 105, 106, 114, 116, 119, 128, 129, 150, 152, 178, 180, 186, And 187 23

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 130, 131, 151, OR 154. 26

VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 3 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT FISH IN VIEW OF METZGAR AND SATO RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIM 120 OR CLAIM 189. 30

A. Petitioner Did Not Establish That Fish In View Of Metzgar And Sato Meets All Of The Limitations Of Claims 120 Or 189. 30

B. Petitioner Did Not Establish That A POSITA Would Have Combined Fish, Metzgar, And Sato 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 A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT FISH IN VIEW OF GILHAM RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIM 113 OR CLAIM 185. 35

A. Petitioner Did Not Establish That Fish In View Of Gilham Meets All Of The Limitations Of Claims 113 Or 185. 35

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. 36

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

IX. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 5 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT VPK IN VIEW OF METZGAR RENDERS OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 17, 19, 25, 105, 106, 114, 119, 120, 128, 129, 131, 150, 151, 152, 178, 180, 186, OR 189. 40

A. The Challenged Claims Are Entitled To The Filing Date Of The 1983 Application. 41

1. The 1983 Application's Examples Of Non-Porous Solid Supports Provide Sufficient Written Description For The Genus Of "Non-Porous Solid Supports." 42

2. Petitioner's Arguments Rely On Factually Distinguishable Cases, Incorrect Statements Of Law, Or Both. 46

B. VPK In View Of Metzgar Does Not Render Obvious Any Challenged Claim. 49

1. VPK In View Of Metzgar Does Not Teach, Suggest, Or Disclose Every Limitation Of Any Challenged Claim. 49

i. Independent Claims 17, 19, And 25 49

ii. Dependent Claims 105, 106, 114, 119, 120, 128, 129, 131, 150, 151, 152, 178, 180, 186, And 189 50

2. Petitioner Did Not Establish A Reason To Combine VPK And Metzgar. 52

X. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON GROUND 6 BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH THAT VPK IN VIEW OF NOYES, METZGAR, AND RAMACHANDRAN RENDERS OBVIOUS ANY OF CLAIMS 113, 116, 130, 154, 185, OR 187. 53

A. Petitioner Did Not Establish That The Combination Of Noyes, VPK, Metzgar, And Ramachandran Meets All Limitations Of The Challenged Claims. 53

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Petitioner Did Not Establish A Reason To Combine VPK, Metzgar, Noyes, And Ramachandran. 55

XI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON PETITIONER'S REDUNDANT CHALLENGES. 58

XII. CONCLUSION.....61

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.