

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ILLUMINA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00385
Patent 9,725,480

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Illumina Ex. 1049 IPR Petition - USD 10,425,742

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Introduction	1
B.	The Challenged Claim Is Patentably Distinct From Claims The Board Previously Considered	4
C.	Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	8
D.	Claim Construction	9
E.	State of the Art	11
F.	Illumina’s Ground 1 Challenge For Obviousness Over Tsien In View Of Prober Is Flawed	16
1.	Illumina Has Not Established That Tsien Or Prober Disclose A “Small” Capping Group Not Containing A Ketone And Not Forming An Ester Or A Methoxy Group With The 3’-Oxygen Of The Nucleotide Analogue	19
2.	Illumina Has Not Established A Motivation To Select The Allyl Capping Group	22
a.	Tsien Does Not Provide Motivation To Select The Allyl Capping Group	23
b.	The Art Subsequent To Tsien Shows The Field Was Not Interested In The Allyl Capping Group.....	26
c.	A POSA Would Have Been Motivated To Select Only A 3’-OH Capping Group That Met Tsien’s SBS Requirements.....	30
d.	Illumina’s Contention That A Small 3’-OH Capping Group Would Have Been “Desirable” Is Unsupported.....	40
3.	Illumina Has Not Established A Reasonable Expectation of Success	43

:

4.	The Lead Compound Analysis.....	46
5.	The Board Should Also Deny Institution On Ground 1 Based On 35 U.S.C. §325(d).....	48
G.	Illumina’s Ground 2 Challenge For Obviousness Over Dower In View Of Prober And Metzker Is Flawed.....	50
1.	Missing Claim Features In Illumina’s Challenge	50
a.	Dower Does Not Disclose A Chemically Cleavable, Chemical Linker	50
b.	Since None Of Dower, Prober, Or Metzker Disclose A “Chemically Cleavable, Chemical Linker” Y, They Cannot Disclose Features (a) Or (b) Of Feature Y	52
c.	None Of Dower, Prober, Or Metzker Disclose The Functional Features Present In The Claimed Deaza-guanine Nucleotide Analogue.....	53
2.	Illumina Has Not Established A Motivation To Select The Allyl Capping Group And A Deazapurine Nucleotide.....	54
a.	Metzker 1994 Provides No Motivation To Select The Allyl Capping Group	54
b.	A POSA Reading Dower Would Have Been Motivated To Select Only A 3’-OH Capping Group That Met Three SBS Requirements	55
c.	Illumina’s Contention That A Small 3’-OH Capping Group Would Have Been “Desirable” Is Unsupported.....	57
d.	Illumina Admitted A POSA Would Not Select An Ether Capping Group.....	59

e.	Illumina Has Not Established That A POSA Would Have Been Motivated To Use Prober's Deazapurines In Dower's Methods.....	60
3.	Illumina Has Not Established A Reasonable Expectation of Success	62
H.	Patent Owner Estoppel Does Not Apply.....	63
I.	Conclusion.....	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen Ag</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Dec. 15, 2017)	49
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	19
<i>In re Etter</i> , 756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	27
<i>In re Stepan Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	23, 39
<i>Kayak Software Corp. v. Int’l Bus. Machines Corp.</i> , CBM2016-00075, Paper 16 (Dec. 15, 2016).....	49
<i>Lupin Ltd. v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01773, Paper 36 (Feb. 28, 2017).....	43
<i>Medtronic, Inc., v. Barry</i> , IPR2014-01210, Paper 10 (Feb. 10, 2015).....	19
<i>Neil Ziegman, N.P.Z., Inc. v. Stephens</i> , IPR2015-01860, Paper 13 (Sept. 6, 2017).....	49
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	29
<i>Skechers USA, Inc. v. Adidas AG</i> , IPR2017-00320, Paper 7 (May 30, 2017)	49
<i>Sprint Spectrum L.P. v. General Access Solutions, Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-01885, Paper 8 (March 9, 2018)	18
<i>Tristar Products, Inc. v. Choon’s Design, LLC</i> , IPR2015-01883, Paper 6 (March 9, 2016)	65

Other Authorities

35 U.S.C. §102(b)	42
-------------------------	----

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.