

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 IPR2017-00181

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

**SYSTEM, ARRAY AND NON-POROUS SOLID SUPPORT
COMPRISING FIXED OR IMMOBILIZED NUCLEIC ACIDS**

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Grounds for Standing	1
III. Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)	2
A. Real Party-In-Interest	2
B. Related Matters	2
C. Lead and Back-up Counsel; Postal, Hand-Delivery, and Electronic Service	3
D. Fee Payment	4
VII. Statement of Precise Relief Requested	4
A. Claims for Which Review Is Requested	4
B. Statutory Grounds of Challenge	4
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art at the Time of the Claimed Invention	8
VIII. Summary of the Prosecution History of the '197 Patent and the State of the Art	9
A. Hybridizable Nucleic Acids Bound to Solid Supports	9
B. Specification of the '197 Patent	10
C. Summary of Prosecution History	11
IX. Claim Construction	12
A. "Non-Porous Solid Support"	12
B. "Hybridizable form"	14
C. "Array"	15
X. The Challenged Claims of the '197 Patent Are Unpatentable	16
A. Ground 1: Claims 17, 19, 25, 105, 106, 114, 116, 119, 128, 129, 150, 152, 178, 180, 186, and 187 are anticipated by Fish	16
1. Independent claims 17, 19, and 25	17
2. Dependent claims 105, 106, 114, 116, 119, 128, 129, 150, 152, 178, 180, 186, and 187.....	28

B.	Ground 2: Claims 130, 131, 151, and 154 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Fish.	31
1.	Claim 131	33
2.	Claims 130 and 154	34
3.	Claim 151	35
C.	Ground 3: Claims 120 and 189 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Fish in view of Metzgar and further in view of Sato.	35
D.	Ground 4: Claims 113 and 185 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Fish in view of Gilham.	38
E.	Ground 5: Claim 17, 19, 25, 105, 106, 114, 119, 120, 128, 129, 131, 150, 151, 152, 178, 180, 186, and 189 would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on VPK in view of Metzgar.	40
1.	The Challenged Claims Are Entitled to a Priority Date No Earlier Than the Filing of the CIP Application (Appl. No. 06/732,374)	40
2.	The legal requirements for claiming priority	41
3.	The original disclosure of the 1983 application does not provide written description support for the element “non-porous solid support.”	42
4.	Claims 17, 19, 25, 105, 106, 114, 119, 120, 128, 129, 131, 150, 151, 152, 178, 180, 186, and 189 would have been obvious based on VPK in view of Metzgar.	46
F.	Ground 6: Claims 113, 116, 130, 154, 185, and 187 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Noyes in view of VPK and further in view of Metzgar and Ramachandran.	54
1.	Claims 116 and 187	57
2.	Claims 113 and 185	57
3.	Claims 130 and 154	58
XI.	Secondary Considerations, Even if Considered, Fail to overcome the Evidence of Obviousness	59
XII.	Conclusion	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	42
<i>ButamaxTM Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00539 (P.T.A.B. March 3, 2015)	41
<i>Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	17
<i>In re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.</i> , 301 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	17
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Barr Labs.</i> , 251 F.3d 955 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	17
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	31
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	60
<i>Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre et Marie Curie v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	60
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	60
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	32
<i>Leapfrog Enterprises Inc. v. Fisher-Price Inc.</i> , 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	61
<i>LizardTech v. Earth Resource Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	43

<i>Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	45
<i>Newell Cos., Inc. v. Kenney Mfg. Co.</i> , 864 F.2d 757 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	60
<i>In re O’Farrell</i> , 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	32
<i>In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation</i> , 483 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	16
<i>Purdue Pharma LP v. Faulding Inc.</i> , 230 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	44
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Rea</i> , 731 F.3d 1248 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	60
<i>Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals</i> , 339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	28
<i>Technology Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	41, 44
<i>Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	17, 28
<i>Tronzo v. Biomet</i> , 156 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	45
<i>Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar</i> , 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	42
<i>Verizon Services Corp. v. Cox Fibernet Virginia, Inc.</i> , 602 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	17
<i>In re Wesslau</i> , 353 F.2d 238 (CCPA 1965)	32
<i>Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC</i> , 683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	60

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.