Filed January 23, 2018

On behalf of **Illumina Cambridge Ltd.**
By: Kerry S. Taylor
Michael L. Fuller
Nathanael R. Luman
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel.: 858-707-4000
Email: BoxIllumina2@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COMPLETE GENOMICS, INC.

Petitioner

v.

ILLUMINA CAMBRIDGE LTD.

Patent Owner

IPR2017-02172
Patent 7,566,537

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER ILLUMINA CAMBRIDGE LTD.

Columbia Ex. 2009
Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees
of Columbia University
in the City of New York

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ILLUMINA'S CLAIMED INVENTION INCLUDES A NOVEL AND NONOBVIOUS 3′-OH PROTECTING GROUP FOR DNA SEQUENCING 6

III. THE BOARD, FEDERAL CIRCUIT, AND DISTRICT COURT PREVIOUSLY UPHELD PATENTABILITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS 11

A. The Board previously upheld the same claims over the same art and arguments in IPR2013-00517 11

B. The Federal Circuit affirmed the Board's decision from IPR2013-00517 14

1. The Federal Circuit affirmed that there was no motivation 15

2. Reasonable expectation of success is measured by the claims 16

C. The Northern District of California upheld the same claims over the same art and arguments 17

IV. BGI PROVIDES NO JUSTIFICATION FOR ITS REQUEST TO RELITIGATE PATENTABILITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS 18

V. BGI'S PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A) 21

A. Factor 1: Whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent 23

B. Factor 2: Whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition or should have known of it 26

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(*cont'd*)

Page No.

C. Factor 3: Whether the petitioner already received the patent owner's preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board's decision on whether to institute review in the first petition 26

D. Factor 4: The length of time that elapsed between the time the petitioner learned of the prior art asserted in the second petition and the filing of the second petition 28

E. Factor 5: Whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time elapsed between the filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent 28

F. Factor 6: The finite resources of the Board 29

G. Factor 7: The requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) to issue a final determination not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices institution of review 30

VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) 31

VII. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL 32

VIII. NEW CLAIM CONSTRUCTION IS UNNECESSARY 32

IX. THE LAW OF NONOBVIOUSNESS 32

X. THERE WAS NO MOTIVATION TO COMBINE TSIEN WITH GREENE & WUTS OR ZAVGORODNY 33

A. Introduction to Tsien, Greene & Wuts, and Zavgorodny 33

B. Criteria 1: A POSITA would not have expected a 3'-O-azidomethyl group to be efficiently and accurately incorporated by a polymerase 36

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(*cont'd*)

Page No.

1. There was no motivation to use an azidomethyl group in Tsien's sequencing methods because there was no expectation of efficient and accurate polymerase incorporation 36

2. BGI has not shown there was a reasonable expectation of success in arriving at the claimed "incorporation" 44

C. Criteria 2(i): A POSITA would not have expected azidomethyl removal conditions to be "mild" for Tsien's DNA sequencing method 45

1. Phosphine deblocking conditions produce amines 46

2. Pyridine was a known DNA denaturant 48

3. Young's cleavage conditions were not mild 49

D. Criteria 2(ii): A POSITA would not have expected quantitative azidomethyl removal 49

E. Criteria 3: A POSITA would not have expected an azidomethyl ether to permit a polymerase to reinitiate synthesis subsequent to deblocking 52

XI. AZIDOMETHYL WAS NOT A SIMPLE SUBSTITUTION INTO TSIEN'S SBS METHOD 56

XII. MOTIVATION IS LACKING FROM BGI'S PETITION THAT IS PRESENT IN ILLUMINA'S PETITIONS 58

A. BGI relies on disclosure of a 3'-protecting group *from outside of* Tsien, whereas Illumina's petitions rely on protecting group disclosures *within* Tsien 58

B. Polymerase incorporation distinction 60

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(*cont'd*)

Page No.

C. Illumina's positions are consistent with previous Board and Federal Circuit decisions, whereas BGI's petition and Columbia's patents seek to undo those decisions 60

1. BGI's petition seeks to undo IPR2013-00517 60

2. Columbia's patents seek to undo IPR2012-00006, IPR2012-00007, and IPR2013-00011 61

XIII. THE DEPENDENT CLAIMS ARE NONOBVIOUS 62

XIV. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS 62

A. BGI failed to address Illumina's evidence of non-obviousness 62

B. BGI advances an unsupported and incorrect legal theory regarding unexpected results 63

C. BGI avoids addressing Illumina's evidence of long-felt, unmet need 64

D. BGI incorrectly argues that since there is no evidence of a competing commercial product, there can be no evidence of copying 65

XV. CONCLUSION 67

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.