

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

ANCESTRY.COM DNA, LLC  
Petitioner

v.

DNA GENOTEK, INC.  
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,221,381 B2

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2016-01152

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Claim construction.....	6
III. The Board should exercise its discretion under Section 325(d) to deny the Second Petition .....	6
A. Ground 1 presents prior art presented in the First Petition .....	8
B. Ground 1 presents substantially the same argument presented in the First Petition .....	9
C. Petitioner’s serial petition strategy is unjustified.....	14
1. Petitioner cannot, and does not attempt to, explain its failure to present the O’Donovan/Birnboim combination in the First Petition.....	15
2. Instituting a second <i>inter partes</i> review would not “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding” .....	21
3. Chelles and Clarkson are substantially the same as prior art presented in the First Petition and Petitioner provides no explanation as to why Chelles and Clarkson were not presented in the First Petition .....	25
IV. The Board should deny the Second Petition because Petitioner fails to establish a reasonable likelihood of invalidating any challenged claim as obvious .....	27
A. Petitioner impermissibly relies on the ’381 Patent’s inventors’ insights.....	29
B. Petitioner misunderstands or mischaracterizes Birnboim.....	32

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
C. Petitioner fails to provide an articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness .....	35
1. Petitioner does not explain why one of skill in the art would have considered it obvious to combine or modify elements of Birnboim with elements of O’Donovan, or obvious to modify the teachings of Birnboim in view of the teachings of O’Donovan, to arrive at the claimed invention.....	36
2. Petitioner concedes that one of skill in the art would recognize that O’Donovan’s piercing members are inappropriate for threaded engagements, like Birnboim’s engagements.....	40
3. Chelles and Clarkson do not remedy the deficiencies of Petitioner’s analysis of Birnboim and O’Donovan.....	42
V. Conclusion.....	43

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Case name,</i>	
<i>KSR, Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	5, 35, 36, 38, 39
<i>Unilever, Inc. v. The Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (Informative) .....	7-9, 16, 17, 20, 25-26
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Complement Soft LLC</i> , IPR2013-00581, Paper 15 (Informative) .....	17, 20- 22
<i>Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2014- 01080, Paper 17 .....	17-20, 22, 23
<i>Jaiwei Tech, Ltd. v. Richmond</i> , IPR2015-00580, Paper 22 .....	19, 20, 23
<i>Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil</i> , 774 F.2d 1132, 1138, 227 U.S.P.Q. 543, 547 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	30
<i>In re Shuman</i> , 361 F.2d 1008, 1012 (C.C.P.A. 1966) .....	30
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Corp.</i> , 840 F.2d 902, 907 .....	30
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States</i> , 702 F.2d 1005, 1012, 217 U.S.P.Q. 193, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	30
<i>Sensonics, Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp.</i> , 81 F.3d 1566, 1570, 38 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1551, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	30-31
<i>In re L.R. Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	36
<i>Askeladden LLC v. Sean I. McGhie and Brian K. Buchheit</i> , IPR2015- 00137, Paper 31 .....	38

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C.

§ 102..... 1

§ 103..... 1

§ 325(d).....*passim*

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R.

§ 42.23..... 1

§ 42.1(b)..... 14, 15, 21-25

# 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.