

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

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

Civil Action No.
19-1681-CFC

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

ILLUMINA, INC.,)

Defendant.)

**DEFENDANT ILLUMINA, INC.'S RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

Columbia Ex. 2001
Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees
of Columbia University
in the City of New York
IDB2020-01177

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT	3
A. “Y”	3
1. The Claim Language Confirms Illumina’s Construction.....	4
2. The Specification Confirms Illumina’s Construction	7
3. The Prosecution History Requires Illumina’s Construction	8
4. Plaintiffs’ Construction Is Unsupported	14
B. “Small”	18
1. Columbia’s Definition Of “Small” During Prosecution And IPR	18
2. “Small” Should Be Defined With Respect To Rat Polymerase.....	22
3. “Small” Should Be Defined In Terms Of “Diameter”	24
5. The Court Should Not Construe The Claims In Terms Of A “Width”	27
C. “R...is stable during a DNA polymerase reaction”	30
D. “A method for sequencing a nucleic acid”	32
III. CONCLUSION.....	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	32
<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	9
<i>Baldwin Graphic Sys., Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.</i> , 512 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	14
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	31
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	35
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	33, 34
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 658 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11, 14
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Amersham PLC</i> , 439 F. Supp.2d 309 (S.D.N.Y. 2006)	6
<i>Fenner Investments, Ltd. v. Cellco Partnership</i> , 778 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	13, 17
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees Of Columbia Univ. In The City Of New York</i> , IPR2012-00007	29
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees Of Columbia Univ. In The City Of New York</i> , IPR2018-00385, Paper No. 1	17
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees Of Columbia Univ. In The City Of New York</i> , IPR2018-00385, Paper No. 13	10
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees Of Columbia Univ. In The City Of New York</i> , IPR2018-00385, Paper No. 30	8
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees Of Columbia Univ. In The City Of New York</i> , IPR2018-00385, Paper No. 48 (Feb. 5, 2019)	11, 17
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees Of Columbia Univ. In The City Of New York</i> , IPR2018-00385, Paper No. 66	11

<i>Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enterp., Inc.</i> , 302 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10
<i>Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Int'l, Inc.</i> , 778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	16
<i>Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 952 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	8
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8, 12, 13
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 734 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	12
<i>Princeton Digital Image Corp. v. Konami Digital Entm't Inc.</i> , No. 12-1461-LPS-CJB, 2017 WL 6375173 (D. Del. Dec. 13, 2017)	9
<i>Rolls-Royce, PLC v. United Techs. Corp.</i> , 603 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	16
<i>Rowe v. Dror</i> , 112 F. 3d 473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	33
<i>Sage Prods., Inc. v. Devon Indus., Inc.</i> , 126 F.3d 1420 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	6
<i>SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Adv. Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	6
<i>Symantec Corp. v. Computer Assoc. Int'l, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	33, 34
<i>Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	29
<i>TomTom, Inc. v. Adolph</i> , 790 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	33
Statutes and Regulations	
37 C.F.R. §1.132	10

Pursuant to Paragraph 16 of the Court’s Scheduling Order (D.I. 17) and the Stipulation and Order Extending Claim Construction Deadlines (D.I. 45, as ordered June 26, 2020), defendant Illumina, Inc. (“Illumina”) submit this answering brief to plaintiffs The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York (“Columbia”) and Qiagen Sciences, LLC’s (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) opening brief regarding the construction of disputed claim terms of U.S. Patent Nos. 10,407,458 (the “458 Patent”); 10,407,459 (the “459 Patent”); 10,428,380 (the “380 Patent”); 10,435,742 (the “742 Patent”); and 10,457,984 (the “984 Patent”) (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”).

I. INTRODUCTION

The instant suit is the latest of three that Plaintiffs have filed against Illumina in this district since 2012. All three of Plaintiffs’ lawsuits have involved the same family of Columbia patents, and the prior two lawsuits have followed an identical pattern. Specifically, after Plaintiffs accused Illumina of infringing, Illumina successfully invalidated Plaintiffs’ patents in *inter partes* review (“IPR”). Across the first two lawsuits, Illumina has invalidated the asserted claims in eight of Plaintiffs’ patents.¹

¹ The Federal Circuit affirmed the PTAB’s decision on appeal for the patents asserted in the first suit; the Federal Circuit appeal of the second suit is pending.

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.