

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
--

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

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

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 <i>from outside of</i> Tsien, whereas Illumina’s petitions rely on protecting group disclosures <i>within</i> Tsien	58
B. Polymerase incorporation distinction.....	60

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

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.