

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TWINSTRAND BIOSCIENCES, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

GUARDANT HEALTH, INC.  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2022-01116  
U.S. Patent No. 10,889,858

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,889,858**

***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 next-generation sequencing 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 commercially available kits. .... 6

    C. The prior art taught that Duplex Sequencing could dramatically lower the error rate of NGS.....7

    D. The prior art taught applying Duplex Sequencing to cfDNA. ....13

IV. The '858 patent and its prosecution history ..... 15

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. *Fintiv* does not support discretionary denial. ....25

IX. Ground 1: claims 1-7 and 10-27 would have been obvious over Narayan, Schmitt, and Meyer..... 26

    A. Claim 1 .....26

        1. “A method for analyzing sequencing reads of double-stranded cell-free deoxyribonucleic acid (cfDNA) molecules from a sample of a subject...” ..... 26

        2. “(a) tagging a plurality of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from a population of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from the sample with a set of library adaptors comprising a plurality of molecular barcodes to generate tagged parent polynucleotides, wherein the

	tagging comprises ligating a plurality of library adaptors from the set of library adaptors to the plurality of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from the population using more than a 10× molar excess of library adaptors as compared to the double-stranded cfDNA molecules of the population...” .....	27
3.	“wherein the tagging produces at least 20% of the double-stranded cfDNA molecules of the populations having library adaptors ligated to both ends of a molecule of the double-stranded cfDNA molecules...” .....	29
4.	“(b) amplifying a plurality of the tagged parent polynucleotides to produce progeny polynucleotides...” .....	30
5.	“(c) sequencing a plurality of the progeny polynucleotides to produce a set of sequencing reads...” .....	30
6.	“and (d) determining, based at least on sequence information from the molecular barcodes, individual double-stranded cfDNA molecules from among the tagged parent polynucleotides for which either (1) both a Watson strand and a Crick strand of the individual double-stranded cfDNA molecule are detected or (2) only one of a Watson strand or a Crick strand of the individual double-stranded cfDNA molecule is detected from a plurality of sequencing reads from the set of sequencing reads.” .....	30
7.	A POSA would have had a reason to combine Narayan, Schmitt, and Meyer.....	32
8.	A POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success.....	36
B.	Claim 16 .....	39
1.	“A method for analyzing double-stranded cell-free deoxyribonucleic acid (cfDNA) molecules from a sample of a subject...” .....	39
2.	“(a) tagging a plurality of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from a population of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from the sample with a set of library adaptors comprising a plurality of molecular barcodes to generate tagged parent polynucleotides, wherein the	

	tagging comprises ligating a plurality of library adaptors from the set of library adaptors to the plurality of double-stranded cfDNA molecules from the population using more than a 10× molar excess of library adaptors as compared to the double-stranded cfDNA molecules of the population...”	40
3.	“wherein the tagging produces at least 20% of the double-stranded cfDNA molecules of the population having library adaptors ligated to both ends of a molecule of the double-stranded cfDNA molecules...”	40
4.	“(b) amplifying a plurality of the tagged parent polynucleotides to produce progeny polynucleotides...”	41
5.	“(c) determining nucleotide sequences of a plurality of the progeny polynucleotides...”	41
6.	“(d) analyzing a plurality of the nucleotide sequences with a programmed computer processor the analyzing comprising mapping a plurality of the nucleotide sequences to a reference sequence to produce mapped sequences ...”	41
7.	“grouping a plurality of the mapped sequences into families based on a combination of sequence information from the molecular barcodes and start and stop positions of the mapped sequences, wherein a family of the families is representative of an individual double-stranded cfDNA molecule from among the tagged parent polynucleotides...”	42
8.	“and identifying a plurality of the families as having nucleotide sequences representing either (1) both a Watson strand and a Crick strand of an individual double-stranded cfDNA molecule from among the tagged parent polynucleotides or (2) only one of a Watson strand or a Crick strand of an individual double-stranded cfDNA molecule from among the tagged parent polynucleotides.”	44
C.	Claims 2 and 17	46
D.	Claims 3 and 18	47
E.	Claims 4 and 19	48
F.	Claims 5 and 20	49

G.	Claims 6 and 7 .....	50
H.	Claim 10 .....	51
I.	Claims 11-14 and 21 .....	52
J.	Claim 15 .....	54
K.	Claims 22 and 24.....	56
L.	Claims 23 and 25 .....	59
M.	Claim 26 .....	60
N.	Claim 27 .....	61
X.	Ground 2: claims 8-9 would have been obvious over Narayan, Schmitt, Meyer, and Craig .....	62
XI.	Ground 3: claims 28 and 29 would have been obvious over Narayan, Schmitt, Meyer, and Kivioja .....	66
XII.	Objective indicia do not support patentability.....	71
XIII.	Certification of standing and Patent IPR eligibility (37 C.F.R. §42.104(a))	71
XIV.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. §42.8(a)(1)) .....	71
XV.	Conclusion. ....	73

# 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.