

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GENEOSCOPY, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

EXACT SCIENCES CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case No: IPR2024-00459
U.S. Patent 11,634,781

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE COLOGUARD TEST AND '781 PATENT	2
A. CRC Screening Techniques Prior to the Cologuard Test.....	2
B. The Invention of the '781 Patent.....	4
III. GENEOSCOPY'S PRIOR (AND FAILED) ATTEMPT TO INVALIDATE THE '781 PATENT	5
IV. PROSECUTION HISTORY	8
A. The '607 Parent Application Issued Over Substantially Similar Rejections as the Petition Art and Arguments	8
B. Similar Claims in the '945 Application Were Recently Allowed Over all References Cited in the Petition.....	10
C. The Petition References are the Same as, or Substantially Overlap with, References Considered During Examination of the '335 Application that Resulted in the '781 Patent	11
V. OVERVIEW OF REFERENCES CITED IN GROUNDS	12
1. Lenhard (Ex. 1004) – Describes Laboratory Collection and Comparison of gFOBT with a Specific Methylation Marker Tested from Frozen Samples.....	12
2. Vilkin (Ex. 1005) – Limited to a Specific iFOBT Device Compared to gFOBT.....	14
3. Itzkowitz (Ex. 1006) – Limited to Specific DNA-Based Testing.....	15
4. Shuber (Ex. 1009) – Limited to Nucleic-Acid Based Testing.....	17
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE DISCRETION AND DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 325(d).....	18
A. Ground 1 – Lenhard in view of Itzkowitz and Vilkin is the same as, or cumulative of, previously cited art and arguments.....	21

1.	<i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (a) and (b) - Lenhard in view of Itzkowitz and Vilkin is the same or substantially the same as previously presented art	22
2.	<i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (d) - the Petitioner’s arguments substantially overlap the previous reexamination arguments and the Examiner’s arguments	32
B.	Ground IV – Shuber in combination with Vilkin is the same as, or cumulative of, previously cited art and arguments – <i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (a), (b), and (d)	34
C.	All Grounds - <i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (c), (e), and (f) – Petitioner’s failure to allege “material error” weighs heavily in favor of denial	36
VII.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE DISCRETION AND DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 314(a).....	38
A.	Factor 1: “whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent.”	41
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.”	41
C.	Factor 3: “whether at the time of filing of the second petition 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.”	42
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.”	44
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.”	44
F.	Factor 6: the finite resources of the Board.	44
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.	45
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION IS NOT NECESSARY TO DENY INSTITUTION	46

IX.	THE PETITIONER’S GROUNDS INDEPENDENTLY FAIL ON THE MERITS	46
A.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	46
B.	The Lenhard, Vilkin, and Itzkowitz Combination Does Not Teach or Suggest the Claimed Invention	48
C.	The Shuber and Vilkin Combination Does Not Teach or Suggest the Claimed Invention	55
D.	Petitioner’s Second, Third, Fifth, and Sixth Grounds Also Fail	60
X.	CONCLUSION.....	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , 2020 WL 740292 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) (precedential, designated March 24, 2020).....	19, 36
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017).....	20
<i>Biocon Pharma Ltd. v. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.</i> , 2021 WL 608300 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2021)	19, 29
<i>Ecofasten Solar, LLC v. Unirac, Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 443369 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 8, 2022)	20, 38
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Kaisha</i> , 2017 WL 3917706 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017)	40, 42, 43, 44
<i>Google LLC v. Valtrus Innovations</i> , IPR2022-01197, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. June 13, 2023).....	28, 37, 38
<i>Illumina Inc. v. Ravgen, Inc.</i> , IPR2021-01271, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 26, 2022).....	39
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Elec. Co.</i> , IPR2016-00134 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2016).....	40
<i>Realtime Data, LLC v. Iancu</i> , 912 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	46
<i>Samsung Elec. Co. Ltd. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , IPR2015-00114, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 28, 2015).....	40, 45
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Netlist, Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 22412095 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 19, 2022).....	39
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Cellport Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01423, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 28, 2015)	45
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	46
<i>In re Vivint</i> 14 F.4th 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	39

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.