

Filed: January 22, 2019

On behalf of **Illumina, Inc.**

By:

Kerry Taylor (Reg. No. 43,947)
Michael L. Fuller (Reg. No. 36,516)
William R. Zimmerman (pro hac vice)
Nathanael R. Luman (Reg. No. 63,160)
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON
& BEAR, LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Telephone: 949-760-0404
Facsimile: 949-760-9502
Email: BoxIllumina@knobbe.com

Derek Walter (Reg. No. 74,656)
Derek.walter@weil.com
Edward R. Reines (pro hac vice)
Edward.reines@weil.com
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
201 Redwood Shores Parkway
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: 650-802-3000
Facsimile: 650-802-3100

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.

IPR2018-00291
U.S. Patent 9,718,852

PETITIONER'S REPLY

Columbia Ex. 2014 Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York IPR2018-00291

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	3
III. GROUND 1	3
A. Tsien discloses the 3'-O-allyl capping group.....	4
B. Several researchers disclosed the 3'-O-allyl capping group, including Dr. Menchen	6
C. There was motivation to use Tsien's 3'-O-allyl.....	7
1. Overview	7
2. Metzker demonstrated that the 3'-O-allyl capping group was incorporated by polymerase, and this would have encouraged a POSA.....	9
3. A POSA would have expected efficient incorporation	16
D. A POSA would have expected efficient cleavage	18
1. Tsien's disclosure of 3'-O-allyl cleavage	19
2. Columbia relies on Kamal	19
3. The prior art discloses SBS-compatible cleavage conditions	20
E. A POSA was motivated to select small capping groups.....	22
F. Reasonable expectation of success.....	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
1. A POSA would expect thymine, cytosine, and guanine incorporation	22
2. A POSA would expect polymerase to recognize 3'-O-allyl-nucleotides	23
G. Judicial estoppel does not apply to Illumina	23
IV. GROUND 2	25
A. Ground 2 is distinct from Ground 1	25
B. Dower discloses a linker	25
V. ESTOPPEL APPLIES TO COLUMBIA	27
VI. CONCLUSION.....	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.</i> , 713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	5
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Jewel Incandescent Lamp Co.</i> , 326 U.S. 242 (1945).....	8, 20
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	14
<i>MaxLinear, Inc. v. CF Crespe LLC</i> , 880 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	28
<i>Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	2
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	24
<i>Ohio Willow Wood Co. v. Alps South, LLC</i> , 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	28
<i>PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	8

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. §42.73	28
------------------------	----

I. INTRODUCTION

The Tsien reference contains the same disclosure as Columbia’s patent—both teach efficient polymerase incorporation and efficient cleavage of 3’-O-capped nucleotides. Columbia’s declarant, Dr. Menchen, was asked to identify any disclosure in Columbia’s patent that is not also in Tsien. The only difference he identified was: “Tsien doesn’t describe allyl ethers.” Ex. 1113, 329:2-14. This supposed difference is fictitious. Tsien expressly discloses “allyl ethers” as a capping group and its advantages (Ex. 1013, 24:29-25:3), which Dr. Menchen acknowledges. Ex. 1113, 324:6-326:20.

Not only does Tsien teach allyl ethers, but it is undisputed that 3’-O-allyl capped nucleotides are efficiently incorporated by polymerases and efficiently cleaved under appropriate conditions. Columbia’s patent presumes this by claiming such nucleotides without any details explaining how to incorporate or cleave them. Yet Columbia’s Patent Owner Response (“POR”) spends pages criticizing Tsien, arguing that a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”) would not have expected 3’-O-allyl capped nucleotides to be efficiently incorporable based on the later-published Metzker reference. Dr. Menchen admitted, however, that he was motivated to include the 3’-O-allyl capping group in his own 1998 and 1999 patents precisely because of Metzker’s disclosure. Ex. 1112, 189:5-13.

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.