

No. 2015-1123

IN THE
United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

ILLUMINA CAMBRIDGE LTD.,
Appellant,

v.

INTELLIGENT BIO-SYSTEMS, INC.,
Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD IN NO. IPR2013-00128

BRIEF OF PATENT OWNER-APPELLANT
ILLUMINA CAMBRIDGE LTD.

BRENTON R. BABCOCK
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON
& BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Fl.
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 760-0404

KERRY S. TAYLOR, PH.D.
NATHANAEL R. LUMAN, PH.D.
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON
& BEAR, LLP
12790 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
(858) 707-4000

March 10, 2015

WILLIAM R. ZIMMERMAN
Counsel of Record
JONATHAN E. BACHAND
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON
& BEAR, LLP
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 640-6400

Attorneys for Appellant

Columbia Ex. 2023 Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York
--

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Appellant certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

Illumina Cambridge Ltd.

2. The name of the real party in interest represented by me is:

Illumina Cambridge Ltd.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curie represented by me are:

Illumina Cambridge Ltd. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Illumina, Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in San Diego, CA.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court are:

Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP: Brenton R. Babcock, William R. Zimmerman, Jonathan E. Bachand, Kerry S. Taylor, Nathanael R. Luman, Andrew E. Morrell; Reinhart Boerner Van Dueren s.c.: James G. Morrow, James D. Borchardt.

Dated: March 10, 2015

By: /s/ William R. Zimmerman

William R. Zimmerman

Brenton R. Babcock

Jonathan E. Bachand

Kerry S. Taylor

Nathanael R. Luman

Attorneys for Patent Owner-Appellant

Illumina Cambridge Ltd.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES	viii
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT	1
I. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
III. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	2
A. Technological Background	2
1. Sequencing by synthesis	2
2. Illumina's '026 patent	10
3. The prior art	12
a. The prior art did not teach nucleotides that combine a 3'-protecting group and a disulfide linkage attaching a label to the base	12
b. The prior art recognized the importance of deblocking the 3'-protecting group in SBS	15
c. The prior art taught that disulfide linkage cleavage conditions yielded inefficient and variable results	16
B. The <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Proceedings.....	19
1. IBS's petition and the Board's institution decision	19
2. Illumina's Motion to Amend	21
3. The Board's Final Written Decision	23

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
IV. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	27
V. ARGUMENT.....	31
A. Standard Of Review	31
B. The Board Erred In Determining That Substitute Claims 9-12 Would Have Been Obvious	32
1. The Board improperly focused on the added disulfide linkage limitation rather than combination of amended claim limitations.....	33
2. The Board failed to provide a motivation for, or a reasonable expectation of success in, combining the prior art to achieve Illumina’s claimed invention.....	35
a. The uncontroverted evidence showed that SBS requires efficient removal of the 3’ protecting group.....	38
b. The Board misapprehended Illumina’s argument regarding cleavage efficiency.....	42
c. One skilled in the art would not have been motivated to use disulfide linkage cleavage conditions because they result in inefficient and variable cleavage.....	46
d. The Board’s conclusion that the disulfide linkage cleavage efficiency of the prior art could have been increased with an expectation of success was clearly erroneous.....	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
i. The Board imposed an improperly heightened standard of nonobviousness	50
ii. There is no evidence to support the Board's conclusion that a nucleotide having a disulfide linkage would provide sufficient cleavage efficiency of the 3'-protecting group	51
3. The Board did not identify any 3'-protecting group and disulfide linkage that are cleavable under identical conditions	55
4. The Board improperly discounted Illumina's evidence of unexpected results	58
a. Illumina presented testing demonstrating unexpected results using the claimed nucleotides	58
b. Illumina properly compared its claims to the closest prior art.....	61
c. Illumina demonstrated that the unexpected results are not a latent property of the disulfide linkage.....	63
5. Illumina demonstrated the patentability of the substitute claims	64
VI. CONCLUSION.....	65
ADDENDUM	

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.