

Case IPR2017-00172
U.S. Patent No. 7,064,197

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BECTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY,
Petitioner

v.

ENZO LIFE SCIENCES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00172

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. FISH DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY CLAIM IN GROUND 1.	2
A. Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, And 27.....	2
1. Fish Does Not Disclose Nucleic Acid Strands Fixed Or Immobilized To A Non-Porous Solid Support.	4
2. Fish Does Not Expressly Or Inherently Disclose Nucleic Acid Strands In Hybridizable Form.....	9
i. Petitioner's Reliance on Diehl Does Not Establish That Fish Inherently Discloses ssDNA In Hybridizable Form...	14
ii. The '197 Patent Prosecution History Does Not Support Petitioner's Inherency Theory.	20
B. Dependent Claims 16, 31-34, 41, 61-63, 68-70, 72-74, 79, 100, 191-194, 212, 213, 219, 222, 225-227, 230, 233, And 236.	22
IV. FISH, STANDING ALONE, DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY CLAIM IN GROUND 2.	23
A. Claims 31, 68, And 192.....	24
B. Claims 64, 101, And 195.....	27
V. FISH IN VIEW OF GILHAM DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY CLAIM IN GROUND 3.	29
A. Petitioner Did Not Establish That Fish In View Of Gilham Meets All Of The Limitations Of Claims 38, 78, Or 218.	29

B.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That A POSITA Would Have Had A Reason To Combine Fish And Gilham Or That A POSITA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success.	29
VI.	VPK IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.	33
A.	The Challenged Claims Are Entitled To The Filing Date Of The 1983 Application.	34
1.	The 1983 Application’s Examples of Non-Porous Solid Supports Provide Sufficient Written Description for the Genus of “Non-Porous Solid Supports.”	35
2.	Petitioner’s Arguments Rely on Factually Distinguishable Cases, Incorrect Statements of Law, Or Both.	38
B.	The Invention of the Challenged Claims Was Conceived and Reduced to Practice Before VPK’s Effective Date Of October 1982.	40
1.	Legal Standards For Antedating An Alleged 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) Reference In An <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.	40
2.	Enzo’s Inventors Conceived And Reduced to Practice The Challenged Claims’ Subject Matter Before October 1982.	41
VII.	VPK DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY CLAIM IN GROUND 4.	55
A.	Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12-15, And 27.	55
B.	Claims 31, 32, 34, 61, 62, 63, 68-70, 72, 74, 79, 100, 191-194, 213, 219, 226, 227, And 236.	58
VIII.	VPK IN VIEW OF NOYES AND RAMACHANDRAN DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY CLAIM IN GROUND 5.	61
A.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That Noyes, VPK, And Ramachandran Meet All Of The Limitations Of Any Challenged Claim.	61

Case IPR2017-00172

U.S. Patent No. 7,064,197

B.	Petitioner Did Not Establish That A POSITA Would Combine VPK, Noyes, And Ramachandran.....	63
IX.	VPK IN VIEW OF METZGAR DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS ANY CLAIM IN GROUND 6.	65
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS CONFIRM THE NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	67
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc 'ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)29

Agilent Techs., Inc. v. Affymetrix, Inc.,
567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009)10

Bilstad v. Wakalopulos,
386 F.3d 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 35, 38, 39

Borrer v. Herz,
666 F.2d 569 (CCPA 1981).....41

CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l. Corp.,
349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 23, 29, 66

Corning, Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.,
Case IPR2013-00053, Paper 66 (PTAB May 1, 2014)41

Haemonetics Corp. v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.,
607 F.3d 776 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 13, 59

Hartness Int'l Inc. v. Simplimatic Eng'g Co.,
819 F. 2d 1100 (Fed. Cir. 1987) 22, 58

Holmwood v. Sugavanam,
948 F.2d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1991)41

Hologic, Inc. v. Enzo Life Sciences, Inc., Case IPR2016-00820, Paper 8 (PTAB
Oct. 4, 2016) passim

Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.,
802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986)40

In re Fine,
837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)66

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.