

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

NATERA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARCHERDX, INC., ARCHERDX, LLC,  
and INVITAE CORPORATION,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 20-cv-125-GBW  
(Consolidated)

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' RENEWED MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS  
A MATTER OF LAW AND ALTERNATIVE REQUEST FOR A NEW TRIAL**

Dated: December 4, 2023

Edward R. Reines (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Derek C. Walter (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Karnik F. Hajjar (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Tel: (650) 802-3000  
Fax: (650) 802-3100  
edward.reines@weil.com  
derek.walter@weil.com  
karnik.hajjar@weil.com

Elizabeth Y. Ryan (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
200 Crescent Court, Suite 300  
Dallas, TX 75201  
Tel: (214) 746-7700  
liz.ryan@weil.com

Matthew D. Sieger (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
2001 M Street, NW, Suite 600,  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: (202) 682-7000  
matthew.sieger@weil.com

Brian E. Farnan (Bar No. 4089)  
Michael J. Farnan (Bar No. 5165)  
FARNAN LLP  
919 North Market St., 12th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
Tel: (302) 777-0300  
Fax: (302) 777-0301  
bfarnan@farnanlaw.com  
mfarnan@farnanlaw.com

Aaron J. Curtis (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Kathryn Leicht (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Barry Zhang (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
Tel: (212) 310-8000  
aaron.curtis@weil.com  
kathryn.leicht@weil.com  
barry.zhang@weil.com

*Attorneys for Invitae Corp., ArcherDX, Inc.  
and ArcherDX, LLC*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARGUMENT.....	1
I. Natera Cannot Recover Royalties For Non-PCM Kits.....	1
II. Natera Cannot Recover Royalties For Foreign Kit Sales.....	3
III. The '708 Patent Is Invalid for Indefiniteness.....	5
IV. The Accused Products Do Not Infringe The '172 And '220 Patents.....	6
V. Archer's PCM Product Is Covered By The Safe Harbor.....	7
VI. The '220 And '172 Patents Do Not Have Written Description Support.....	8
VII. The '220 And '172 Patents Are Unenforceable Due To Prosecution Laches.....	9
VIII. In The Alternative, The Court Should Order A New Trial Or Remittitur Of Damages.....	10
CONCLUSION.....	10

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>ArcherDX, LLC v. Qiagen Scis., LLC</i> , 2021 WL 3857460 (D. Del. Aug. 30, 2021).....	3, 10, 12
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 35 F.4th 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2022) .....	9
<i>Dow Chemical Co. v. Nova Chemicals Corp. (Canada)</i> , 803 F3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	5
<i>Go Med. Indus. Pty., Ltd. v. Inmed Corp.</i> , 471 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	3
<i>Infernal Technology LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 4391250 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 16, 2021).....	4
<i>Momenta Pharms., Inc. v. Amphastar Pharms., Inc.</i> , 686 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	8
<i>Morrison v. Nat’l Australia Bank Ltd.</i> , 561 U.S. 247 (2010).....	4, 10
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Rsch. in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3
<i>Promega Corp. v. Life Techs. Corp.</i> , 875 F.3d 651 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	2, 3
<i>PSC Comput. Prods., Inc. v. Foxconn Int’l</i> , 355 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	7
<i>Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC</i> , 2023 WL 6542320 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2023).....	9, 10
<i>Standard Havens Prod., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc.</i> , 953 F.2d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	1
<i>TecSec, Inc. v. Adobe Inc.</i> , 978 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	1
<i>Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	5
<i>TQ Delta, LLC v. 2Wire, Inc.</i> , 486 F. Supp. 3d 803 (D. Del. 2020).....	4

*U.S. Gypsum Co. v. Schiavo Bros.*,  
668 F.2d 172 (3d Cir. 1981).....9

*Vectura Ltd. v. Glaxosmithkline LLC*,  
981 F.3d 1030 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....2

*Williamson v. Consol. Rail Corp.*,  
926 F.2d 1344 (3d Cir. 1991).....10

*Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Rsch., Inc.*,  
395 U.S. 100 (1969).....2

## ARGUMENT

### I. Natera Cannot Recover Royalties For Non-PCM Kits

The need for a JMOL grant is unusually compelling given the jury's flat rejection of Natera's indirect infringement theory, an adverse verdict Natera has not challenged.

In short, the jury improperly awarded Natera royalties on sales of non-PCM kits for customer use, even though such sales (1) legally cannot infringe a method patent directly and (2) were found not to infringe indirectly. Natera does not dispute that its liability theory at trial for kits sold for customer use was that Archer *indirectly* infringed the patents by providing customers with the kits and information about how to use them. *See, e.g.*, Trial Tr. 504:22–509:24, 1238:7–11. Natera cannot, and does not, dispute that the jury rejected that theory and found no infringement for those kit sales. Opp. 4. And Natera does not dispute that the jury included those non-infringing sales in the royalty base it used to calculate royalties. *Id.* at 4–5.

In response, Natera speculates the jury “may have” awarded a lower royalty rate than what Natera requested to account for the non-infringing customer use. Opp. 2–4. But Natera improperly conflates the *royalty rate* with the *royalty base*. The jury's 10% royalty rate was lower than Natera's proposed 19.7% rate. Opp. 3–4. But the jury then applied that royalty rate to a royalty base that erroneously included sales that did not infringe Natera's patents. Mot. 4. Such sales were not “properly included in a patent damages award” because Natera failed to prove indirect infringement with respect to them. *See Standard Havens Prod., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc.*, 953 F.2d 1360, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 1991). If the jury intended to reduce the royalties to account for non-infringing sales, the jury should have reduced the royalty base, not the royalty rate. But the jury had no way of doing so because Natera “presented no evidence of damages caused by [Archer's alleged] direct infringement, which was the only form of infringement that the jury found [Archer] to have committed.” *TecSec, Inc. v. Adobe Inc.*, 978 F.3d 1278, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2020).

# 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.