

MAIWALD · Eisenstraße 3 · 80335 München

Europäisches Patentamt

80298 München

Maiwald Patentanwalts- und
Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH

München
Düsseldorf

Eisenstraße 3
80335 München
T +49 89 7472660
F +49 89 776424
H www.maiwald.eu

Munich, 25 March 2021

Official Ref.: EP 15 195 765.1 / EP 3 034 627
Patentee: The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York
Opponent: ILLUMINA INC.

Our Ref.: I09472EPOP/DJB

Dr. Dirk Bühler
Partner
buehler@maiwald.eu

Dr. Eva Dörner
Partner
doerner@maiwald.eu

This is in response to the summons to attend oral proceedings pursuant to Rule 115(1) EPC.

Geschäftsführer
(Board of Directors)

Dr. Regina Neufeind, LL.M.
Lutz Kietzmann, LL.M.
Dr. Norbert Hansen
Dr. Martin Huenges, LL.M.
Dr. Holger Glas, LL.M.
Dr. Dirk Bühler
Dr. Christian Schäfflein
Dr. Alexander Schmitz
Angela Zumstein
Dr. Derk Vos
Dr. Berthold Lux
Dr. Eva Ehlich
Alexander Ortlieb
Dr. Andreas Ledl
Dr. Eva Dörner
Dr.-Ing. Sophie Ertl
Dr. Marco Stief, LL.M.
Dr. Ralf Kotitschke
Dr. Christian Pioch

HRB Nr. 111307
Amtsgericht München

Columbia Ex. 2076
Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees
of Columbia University in the
City of New York
IPR2020-00988, -01065,
-01177, -01125, -01323



- A. Requests3**
- B. Further cited documents3**
- C. General comments and outline of arguments8**
 - I. General comments8
 - II. Outline of arguments9
- D. Conceptual disclosure of SBS versus putting SBS into practice13**
 - I. The concept of SBS was known at the effective date of the opposed patent and plausibly established.....13
 - II. The applicable case law18
- E. Insufficiency of disclosure20**
 - I. General comments20
 - II. Difficulties in putting the invention into practice with allyl and MOM as 3'-OH protective groups22
 - 1. Allyl as 3'-OH protective group.....24
 - 1.1 Finding a suitable DNA polymerase was not routine24
 - 1.2 Finding suitable cleavage conditions for allyl was not routine30
 - 1.2.1 The cleavage conditions set forth in the patent for allyl are not suitable for SBS30
 - 1.2.2 SBS-compatible cleavage conditions for allyl were not part of the common general knowledge32
 - 1.3 Summary.....35
 - 2. MOM as 3'-OH protective group37
 - III. Difficulties in putting the invention into practice with 3'-OH protective groups being as small as allyl and MOM39
 - 1. Requirement of fitting into the active site of a DNA polymerase40
 - 2. Requirement of cleavability with high yields under mild conditions.....49
 - 3. Requirement of having chemical (electronic) properties not to be cleaved by the nucleophilic group in the active site of a DNA polymerase .52
- F. Inventive step53**
 - I. D4 (Tsien) is the closest prior art and the problem underlying the claimed invention amount to providing an alternative SBS53
 - II. D15 (Stemple) as closest prior art59
- G. Added subject matter60**
- H. Conclusion62**

A. Requests

- ¹ We maintain the request to revoke EP 3 034 627 B1 in its entirety on the basis of Articles 100 (a), 100 (b) and 100 (c) EPC.
- ² Our request for oral proceedings is maintained as well.

B. Further cited documents

- ³ In addition to the documents on file, we herewith file the following documents in order to address the issues raised in the preliminary opinion in connection with the question of insufficiency of disclosure:

- D26:** R. E. Ireland et al., J. Org. Chem., 1986, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 635-648
- D27:** A. Kamal et al., Tetrahedron Letters, 1999, vol. 40, pp. 371-372
- D28:** H. Ruparel et al., PNAS, 2005, vol. 102, no. 17, pp. 5932-5937
- D29:** WO 2004/018497 A2
- D30:** A. F. Gardner et al., Nucleic Acids Research, 2002, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 605-613
- D31:** F. Guibé, Tetrahedron, 1998, vol. 54, pp. 2967-3042
- D32:** S. S. Flack, Tetrahedron Letters, 1995, vol. 36, no. 19, pp. 3409-3412
- D33:** J. Ju et al., PNAS, 2006, vol. 103, no. 52, pp. 19635-19640
- D34:** J. Guo et al., PNAS, 2008, vol. 105, no. 27, pp. 9145-9150
- D35:** Declaration by F. Romesberg dated July 1, 2020
- D36:** Declaration by J. Ju dated May 26, 2017
- D37:** Declaration by J. Kuriyan dated June 1, 2020
- D38:** K. Davies, The \$ 1,000 Genome”, 2010, Free Press, New York, Chapter 5
- D39:** T. W. Greene, P. G. M. Wuts, Protective Groups in Organic Synthesis, Third Edition, Chapter II, 1999, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- D40:** Declaration by S. M. Menchen dated June 1, 2020
- D41:** S. Lemaire-Audoire et al., Tetrahedron Letters, 1994, vol. 35, no. 47, pp. 8783-8786
- D42:** S. Lemaire-Audoire et al., Journal of Molecular Catalysis A: Chemical 116, 1997, pp. 247-258
- D43:** V. M. Swamy, Synlett, 1997, pp. 513-514
- D44:** C.-H. Lee et al., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 1981, vol. 78, no. 5, pp. 2838-2842
- D45:** L. Levine et al., Biochemistry, 1963, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 168-175
- D46:** E. J. Corey et al., Tetrahedron Letters, 1975, no. 38, pp. 3269-3270
- D47:** E. J. Corey et al., Tetrahedron Letters, 1975, no. 31, pp. 2643-2646
- D48:** Grant application by Dr. Romesberg and Dr. Ju issued in May 2006
- D49:** EP 1 530 578 B1
- D50:** Submission of September 23, 2016 by Patentee during prosecution
- D51:** Thesis by Q. Meng, Columbia University, 2006
- D52:** Declaration by S. Peisayovich dated 23 March 2021
- D53:** Patentee's response in IPR proceedings dated September 9, 2020
- D54:** WO 98/53300 A2
- D55:** Bentley et al., Nature, 2008, vol. 456, no. 6, pp. 53-59
- ⁴ D26 and D27 are named in paragraph [0007] of the contested patent as evidence of cleavage conditions for MOM and allyl which allegedly are compatible with SBS requirements. They are thus both known to the Patentee and relied upon by the Patentee for their sufficiency of disclosure arguments.
- ⁵ D40 is introduced as evidence that the **cleavage conditions set forth in the contested patent for allyl (i.e., D27) are not suitable** for SBS. D40

is an expert declaration that has been submitted by the Patentee in the context of IPR proceedings relating to US patent 9,868,985, claiming priority to the same patent application as the opposed patent, and is thus known to the Patentee.

- ⁶ D28 is evidence that extensive research efforts were required after the relevant date of the contested patent **to identify a polymerase**, namely a mutant 9°N polymerase, **and cleavage conditions** which would allow allyl to be used as a 3'-OH protective group for SBS. It is co-authored by Dr. Ju and is thus known to the Patentee. These research efforts were necessary because the polymerase and cleavage conditions in the contested patent were not functional.
- ⁷ D29 and D30 are introduced as evidence that the only polymerase which D28 discloses to be functional with allyl, namely a particular mutant 9°N polymerase, was **developed after** the relevant date of the contested patent. D51 and D48 is further evidence which shows that polymerases other than the 9°N polymerase which were known at relevant date of the contested patent were **not suitable for effective SBS when using allyl** as a 3'-OH protective group. D51 is a PhD thesis from the group of Dr. Ju at Columbia. D48 is a grant application by Dr. Romesberg and was supported by Dr. Ju. Further, both were previously cited in US proceedings in which Columbia is participating. These documents are thus known to the Patentee.
- ⁸ D31 and D32 are both references which D28 refers to when explaining why the **cleavage conditions** disclosed in these documents were not suitable for allyl. D41 and D42 are introduced as evidence that the cleavage conditions which were used in D28 for allyl required extensive research activities and were not part of the common general knowledge. These cleavage conditions differ from those mentioned in the patent, i.e., D27 (Kamal).
- ⁹ D33 is another post-published publication by the group of Dr. Ju and thus known to the Patentee. It is introduced as evidence that the photocleavable linker as shown in the various figures of EP'627 had to be replaced by an allyl linker in order to implement efficient SBS. D50 is a submission by the Patentee during examination of the contested patent which comments on D33.
- ¹⁰ D34 is another post-published publication by the group of Dr. Ju. It shows that, based on the findings of D28 (Ruparel) and D33 (Ju), only after switching to azidomethyl as a 3'-OH protective group SBS beyond 20 nucleotides became possible.

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.