

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 | 12 |
| A. The Board previously upheld the same claims in IPR2013-00517 | 12 |
| B. The Federal Circuit affirmed the Board’s Decision from IPR2013-00517 | 14 |
| C. The Northern District of California upheld the same claims from the same patent | 14 |
| IV. BGI’S SECOND FOLLOW-ON PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A) | 15 |
| A. Factor 1: Whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent..... | 19 |
| 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..... | 21 |
| 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 | 22 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

Page No.

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 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..... | 23 |
| 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 | 24 |
| F. | Factor 6: The finite resources of the Board..... | 25 |
| 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 | 25 |
| V. | THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL | 26 |
| VI. | NEW CLAIM CONSTRUCTION IS UNNECESSARY | 27 |
| VII. | THE LAW OF NONOBVIOUSNESS | 27 |
| VIII. | THERE WAS NO MOTIVATION TO COMBINE DOWER WITH ZAVGORODNY AND CHURCH | 27 |
| A. | Introduction to Dower, Zavgorodny, and Church..... | 28 |
| B. | BGI Primary Issue 1: A POSITA would not have expected a 3'-O-azidomethyl group to be efficiently and accurately incorporated by a polymerase | 29 |
| 1. | There was no motivation to use an azidomethyl group in Dower's sequencing methods because there was no expectation of efficient and accurate polymerase incorporation | 30 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

| | Page No. |
|--|-----------------|
| 2. BGI has not shown there was a reasonable expectation of success in arriving at the claimed “incorporation”..... | 39 |
| C. BGI Primary Issue 2: A POSITA would not have expected azidomethyl removal conditions to be “mild” for Dower’s SBS method..... | 40 |
| 1. Phosphine deblocking conditions produce amines | 41 |
| 2. Pyridine was a known DNA denaturant | 44 |
| 3. Young’s cleavage conditions were not mild..... | 44 |
| D. BGI Primary Issue 3: A POSITA would not have expected azidomethyl to be cleaved with appropriate efficiency for SBS | 45 |
| E. BGI fails to address Illumina’s evidence that the electrophilic 3’-O-azidomethyl group would not be compatible with nucleophiles within the polymerase active site..... | 47 |
| IX. AZIDOMETHYL WAS NOT A SIMPLE SUBSTITUTION INTO DOWER’S SBS METHOD..... | 50 |
| X. MOTIVATION IS LACKING FROM BGI’S PETITION THAT IS PRESENT IN ILLUMINA’S PETITIONS | 52 |
| XI. THE DEPENDENT CLAIMS ARE NONOBVIOUS | 54 |
| XII. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN LIGHT OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS | 55 |
| A. BGI was aware of Illumina’s evidence of non-obviousness, but failed to address the evidence | 55 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

| | Page No. |
|--|-----------------|
| B. BGI avoids addressing Illumina’s previously-presented unexpected results by using an unsupported and incorrect legal theory | 56 |
| C. BGI avoids addressing Illumina’s previously-presented evidence of long-felt, unmet need | 57 |
| D. BGI incorrectly argues that since there is no evidence of a competing commercial product, there can be no evidence of copying | 59 |
| XIII. CONCLUSION..... | 60 |

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.