

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

FOUNDATION MEDICINE, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

GUARDANT HEALTH, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2019-00636

Case No. IPR2019-00637

U.S. Patent No. 9,902,992

---

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. LEGAL STANDARD ..... 2

III. BASIS FOR REQUESTED RELIEF ..... 3

    A. The Board misapprehended Petitioner’s obviousness argument and improperly required Petitioner to meet an inherency standard to establish the obviousness of tagging “at least 20%” of cfDNA molecules ..... 3

    B. The Board overlooked Petitioner’s express identification of motivation to improve ligation efficiency ..... 10

IV. CONCLUSION ..... 12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>In re Napier</i> , 55 F.3d 610 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	3
<i>In re Spormann</i> , 363 F.2d 444 (CCPA 1966).....	4
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	6
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	4
<i>Southwire Co. v. Cerro Wire LLC</i> , 870 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	4
<i>Star Fruits S.N.C. v. United States</i> , 393 F.3d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	2
<i>W.L. Gore &amp; Assoc. v. Garlock Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	4
<b>Patent Trial and Appeal Board Cases</b>	
<i>Alarm.com Inc. v. Vivint, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00173, Paper 14 (PTAB May 10, 2016) .....	8, 9
<i>Bungie, Inc. v. Worlds Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01319, Paper 14, (PTAB Dec. 7, 2015) ....	5, 8
<i>Cepheid v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00881, Paper 9 (PTAB Sep. 17, 2015) .....	6, 9
<i>Telesign Corp. v. Twilio Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01976, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 9, 2018) .....	6, 9
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. Velos Media, LLC</i> , IPR2019-00194, Paper 8 (PTAB May 16, 2019).....	7, 9
<b>Regulations</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.71 .....	2, 12

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner respectfully requests rehearing of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's ("the Board") decision denying institution of trial on *inter partes* review petitions IPR2019-00636, challenging claims 1-11, 13, and 15-26 of U.S. Patent No. 9,902,992 ("the '992 patent"), and IPR2019-00637, challenging claims 11, 12, 14, and 27-33 of the '992 patent. *See* Paper 10 ("Decision").<sup>1</sup> The Board's decision was premised on the conclusion that Petitioner did not sufficiently demonstrate that the prior art "inherently" taught the claim limitation of tagging "at least 20% of the cfDNA molecules by ligation." Decision at 15. But Petitioner never made an inherency argument. Instead, the Board was led to error by Patent Owner's mischaracterization of Petitioner's obviousness argument. This error prevented the Board from applying the correct legal standard and fairly considering the argument and evidence actually provided by Petitioner.

As a result, the Board committed several errors in the Decision. First, the Board acted contrary to multiple Board decisions declining to apply an inherency standard where a Patent Owner mischaracterizes an obviousness argument as relying on an inherency theory. Here, the Board misapprehended Petitioner's obviousness argument and improperly required Petitioner to demonstrate that Schmitt inherently

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless stated otherwise, paper and exhibit numbers refer to those filed in IPR2019-00636.

disclosed tagging “at least 20%” of cfDNA molecules by ligation. Second, the Board erred by overlooking Petitioner’s express arguments regarding motivation to improve ligation efficiency. Petitioner’s explanation, ignored by the Preliminary Response and the Decision, provides the requisite motivation to modify the method of Schmitt to improve ligation efficiency.

Petitioner respectfully requests rehearing and institution of each ground in its petitions. Additionally, Petitioner is filing a request for a Precedential Opinion Panel (POP) along with this Request for Rehearing.

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

A party requesting rehearing must show that a decision should be modified by identifying “all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The Board reviews requests for rehearing under an abuse of discretion standard. *Id.* at § 42.71(c). “An abuse of discretion occurs where the decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of the law, on factual findings that are not supported by substantial evidence, or represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors.” *Star Fruits S.N.C. v. United States*, 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

# 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.