

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA)
UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF)
NEW YORK and QIAGEN)
SCIENCES, LLC,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

ILLUMINA, INC.,)

Defendant.)

Civil Action No. 19-1681-CFC

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

Columbia Ex. 2036
Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees
of Columbia University
in the City of New York
IPR2020-01177

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....9

 A. Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....9

 1. Introduction.....9

 2. Technical Background13

 a. DNA and Nucleotides.....13

 b. Patents-in-Suit.....15

 B. Defendant’s Answering Position.....17

 1. Introduction.....17

 C. Plaintiffs’ Reply19

II. AGREED-UPON CONSTRUCTIONS.....20

III. DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS.....22

 A. “Y”.....22

 1. Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....22

 a. The Intrinsic Evidence Supports Plaintiffs’ Construction
 23

 b. Illumina Admits that Y May Be Constructed Using More
 Than a Single Linker25

 2. Defendant’s Answering Position26

 a. The Claim Language Confirms Illumina’s Construction
 27

 b. The Specification Confirms Illumina’s Construction30

 c. The Prosecution History Requires Illumina’s
 Construction.....31

 d. Plaintiffs’ Construction Is Unsupported.....37

3.	Plaintiffs’ Reply Position.....	41
a.	Illumina Mischaracterizes Plaintiffs’ Position	41
b.	The Claims and Specification Support Plaintiffs’ Construction.....	43
c.	The Prosecution History Favors Plaintiffs’ Construction	47
d.	Illumina and Others Teach That a “Linker” Can Be Made of More than One Linker	50
4.	Defendant’s Sur-Reply Position	53
B.	“Small”	58
1.	Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....	58
a.	The Intrinsic Evidence Supports Plaintiffs’ Construction	59
b.	Defendant’s Construction Would Exclude Chemical Groups Designated as Small in the Specification and Prosecution History	61
2.	Defendant’s Answering Position	65
a.	Columbia’s Definition Of “Small” During Prosecution And IPR	65
b.	“Small” Should Be Defined With Respect To Rat Polymerase.....	70
c.	“Small” Should Be Defined In Terms Of “Diameter” ...	72
d.	The Court Should Not Construe The Claims In Terms Of A “Width”	74
3.	Plaintiffs’ Reply Position.....	77
a.	The Prosecution History Is Clear that Diameter Refers to Width, Not Longest Dimension.....	78

b.	Illumina’s Limitation Regarding Having to Fit Within the Rat DNA Polymerase Is Unnecessary and Unhelpful....	83
4.	Defendant’s Sur-Reply Position	85
a.	Columbia’s Representations Regarding “Small” During Prosecution And IPR Should Govern.....	85
b.	Dr. Kuriyan’s “Consistency” With The Ju Declaration Is Entitled To No Weight.....	88
C.	“R . . . is stable during a DNA polymerase reaction”	97
1.	Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....	97
2.	Defendant’s Answering Position	99
3.	Plaintiffs’ Reply	101
4.	Defendant’s Sur-Reply Position	104
D.	“A method for sequencing a nucleic acid”	105
1.	Plaintiffs’ Opening Position.....	105
2.	Defendant’s Answering Position	107
3.	Plaintiffs’ Reply Position.....	110
4.	Defendant’s Sur-Reply Position	112

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>01 Communique Lab., Inc. v. LogMeIn, Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23, 25, 43
<i>3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Tredegar Corp.</i> , 725 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	48
<i>American Piledriving Equip, Inc. v. Geoquip, Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	49, 55, 56
<i>Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Semiconductor Materials Am., Inc.</i> 98 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	105
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	107
<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	32
<i>Baldwin Graphic Sys., Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.</i> , 512 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	23, 38
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	99, 100, 102
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	105, 106, 110, 111
<i>Broadridge Fin. Sols., Inc. v. Inveshare, Inc.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51246 (D. Del. April 11, 2012)	82
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int'l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	108, 109, 111
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 658 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	35, 37

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.