

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TWINSTRAND BIOSCIENCES, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

GUARDANT HEALTH, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022- 01115
U.S. Patent No. 10,801,063

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,801,063**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Statement of Precise Relief Requested and Reasons Therefor (37 C.F.R. §42.22(A))	2
III.	State of the art before December 2013	2
	A. Optimization techniques for DNA library preparation were well known.	2
	B. Cell-free DNA isolated from blood was widely used in NGS platforms.....	5
	1. The presence of cell-free tumor DNA in human blood was well known.....	5
	2. Isolating cfDNA from blood was routine with off-the-shelf kits.	6
	C. The prior art taught that Duplex Sequencing dramatically lowers NGS error rate.	7
	D. The prior art taught applying Duplex Sequencing to cfDNA.	13
IV.	The '063 patent and prosecution history	14
V.	Person of ordinary skill in art	18
VI.	Claim construction.....	18
VII.	Identification of the challenge (37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)).....	19
VIII.	The facts and law weigh against discretionary denial of institution.	21
	A. This Petition satisfies 35 U.S.C. §325(d).....	21
	B. <i>Fintiv</i> does not support discretionary denial.	24
IX.	Ground 1: claims 1-7, 9-11, 15-18, and 22-28 would have been obvious over Narayan, Schmitt, and Meyer	26
	A. Claim 1	26
	1. “A method for classifying consensus sequences generated from sequencing reads derived from double-stranded cell-free deoxyribonucleic acid (cfDNA) molecules from a sample of a human subject...”.....	26
	2. “(a) non-uniquely tagging a population of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from the sample with more than a 10x molar excess of adapters comprising	

- molecular barcodes, relative to the double-stranded cfDNA molecules in the population, to generate non-uniquely tagged parent polynucleotides...” 27
3. “wherein the double-stranded cfDNA molecules that map to a mappable base position of a reference sequence are tagged with a number of different molecular barcodes ranging from at least 2 to fewer than a number of double-stranded cfDNA molecules that map to the mappable base position...” 29
 4. “wherein at least 20% of the double-stranded cfDNA molecules are non-uniquely tagged with the adapters comprising the molecular barcodes at both ends of a molecule of the double-stranded cfDNA molecules...” 30
 5. “(b) amplifying a plurality of the non-uniquely tagged parent polynucleotides to produce progeny polynucleotides...” 31
 6. “(c) enriching a plurality of the progeny polynucleotides for target regions of interest to generate enriched progeny polynucleotides...” 31
 7. “(d) sequencing a plurality of the enriched progeny polynucleotides to produce a set of sequencing reads...” 31
 8. “(e) mapping a plurality of sequencing reads from the set of sequencing reads to the reference sequence...” 32
 9. “(f) grouping a plurality of the mapped sequencing reads into families of mapped sequencing reads based at least on (i) sequence information from the molecular barcodes and (ii) a beginning base position and an ending base position of the mapped sequencing reads...” 32
 10. “(g) generating a consensus sequence for each family from among one or more of the families to produce a set of consensus sequences...” 33
 11. “(h) classifying one or more consensus sequences from among the set of consensus sequences as (1) paired consensus sequences generated from sequencing reads representing a Watson strand and a Crick strand of a non-uniquely tagged parent polynucleotide or (2) unpaired consensus sequences

	generated from sequencing reads representing only one of either a Watson strand or a Crick strand of a non-uniquely tagged parent polynucleotide.”	34
12.	A POSA would have had a reason to combine Narayan, Schmitt, and Meyer	35
13.	A POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success.....	41
B.	Claim 15	44
1.	“A method for classifying unique sequencing reads generated from sequencing reads derived from double-stranded cell-free deoxyribonucleic acid (cfDNA) molecules from a bodily fluid sample of a human subject...”	44
2.	“(a) tagging a population of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from the bodily fluid sample with more than a 10x molar excess of adapters comprising molecular barcodes, relative to the double-stranded cfDNA molecules in the population, to generate tagged parent polynucleotides, wherein at least 20% of the cfDNA molecules are ligated with the adapters comprising the molecular barcodes at both ends of a molecule of the double-stranded cfDNA molecules...”	45
3.	“(b) amplifying a plurality of the tagged parent polynucleotides to produce progeny polynucleotides...”	45
4.	“(c) sequencing a plurality of the progeny polynucleotides to produce a set of sequencing reads...”	46
5.	“(d) mapping a plurality of sequencing reads from the set of sequencing reads to a reference sequence...”	46
6.	“(e) determining unique sequencing reads from the set of mapped sequencing reads based at least on the molecular barcode sequences, wherein a unique sequencing read from among the unique sequencing reads is representative of a tagged parent polynucleotide from among the tagged parent polynucleotides...”	46
7.	“(f) classifying one or more of the unique sequencing reads as either (1) paired sequences generated from	

	sequencing reads representing a Watson strand and a Crick strand of a tagged parent polynucleotide or (2) unpaired sequences generated from sequencing reads representing only one of either a Watson strand or a Crick strand of a tagged parent polynucleotide.”	47
C.	Claim 2	48
D.	Claim 3	49
E.	Claim 4	49
F.	Claims 5 and 24	50
G.	Claims 6 and 25	52
H.	Claims 7 and 22	53
I.	Claim 9	53
J.	Claim 10	54
K.	Claims 11 and 18	56
L.	Claim 28	58
M.	Claim 16	60
N.	Claim 17	60
O.	Claim 23	62
P.	Claim 26	62
Q.	Claim 27	63
X.	Ground 2: claim 8 would have been obvious over Narayan, Schmitt, Meyer, and Craig.....	64
XI.	Ground 3: claims 12-14 and 19-21 would have been obvious over Narayan, Schmitt, Meyer, and Kivioja.....	67
	A. Claims 12-13 and 19-20	67
	B. Claims 14 and 21	71
XII.	Objective indicia do not support patentability.....	72
XIII.	Certification of standing and Patent IPR eligibility (37 C.F.R. §42.104(a))	72
XIV.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. §42.8(a)(1))	72
XV.	Conclusion.	74

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.