

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Ambry Genetics Corporation,  
Petitioner

v.

The Johns Hopkins University,  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2017-02093

Patent No. 7,824,889

---

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. INTRODUCTION .....1**
- II. OVERVIEW .....2**
  - A. The Petition .....2
  - B. Level of Skill in the Art.....2
  - C. The Inventors Improved Upon Existing Mutation Detection Methods and Limiting Dilution PCR .....3
- III. PETITIONER’S CONSTRUCTION OF VARIOUS PHRASES AND TERMS IS UNREASONABLY BROAD AND NOT SUPPORTED BY THE RECORD .....8**
  - A. Petitioner Ignores the Context of the Claim in Construing the Term “Plurality” in the Phrase “to Form a Set Comprising a Plurality of Assay Samples” .....10
  - B. Petitioner’s Proposed Construction of “Assay Samples of the Set” Is Also Unreasonably Broad.....11
- IV. PETITIONER’S EXPERT DECLARATION IS MERELY ATTORNEY ARGUMENT IN THE GUISE OF EXPERT TESTIMONY .....12**
- V. SYKES WAS ALREADY CONSIDERED BY THE PATENT OFFICE.....15**
- VI. GROUNDS 1 AND 2 ARE REDUNDANT .....17**
- VII. CLAIM 1 IS NOVEL OVER CHIANG.....18**
  - A. Chiang Fails to Disclose the “Analyzing” Step .....18
  - B. Chiang Fails to Disclose the “Comparing” Step .....22
- VIII. CLAIMS 1 AND 8 ARE NOVEL OVER SYKES .....24**
  - A. Sykes Fails to Disclose the “Analyzing” Step .....25
  - B. Sykes Fails to Disclose the “Comparing” Step .....27

**IX. CHIANG AND SYKES FAIL TO DISCLOSE FEATURES OF CLAIMS 1 AND 8, AND A PERSON OF SKILL IN THE ART WOULD NOT HAVE A REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS IN THEIR COMBINATION OR HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO COMBINE THEM .....30**

**X. CONCLUSION.....34**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Cases**

<i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-00115, Paper 94 (PTAB Apr. 20, 2015).....	31
<i>Cardiocom, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00439, Paper 26 (PTAB Jan. 16, 2014).....	13
<i>Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	19
<i>Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC</i> , IPR2017-00777 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2017) .....	7, 15
<i>Cuozzo Speed Tech., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	8
<i>Dayco Prods., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.</i> , 258 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	10
<i>Google, Inc. v. EveryMD.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (PTAB May 22, 2014).....	31
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	30
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	8
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	14
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279, 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	8
<i>In re Suitco Surface</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Circ. 2010).....	8, 9, 10
<i>In re Vaeck</i> , 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	31

*InfoBionic, Inc. v. Braemar Manufacturing, LLC*,  
IPR2015-01704, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 16, 2016).....14

*Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2014).....13

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....31

*Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*,  
827 F.2d 744 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....18

*Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.*,  
CBM2012-00003, Paper 7, 2 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) .....17

*Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.*,  
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....8, 9

*Organik Kimya AS v. Rohm & Haas Co.*,  
Nos. 2015-1983 and 2015-2001 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 11, 2017).....9

*Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*,  
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....31

*Princeton Biochemicals, Inc. v. Beckman Coulter, Inc.*,  
411 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....30

*Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.*,  
566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....31

*Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc.*,  
339 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 18, 25

*TRW Auto. US LLC v. Magna Elecs., Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00258, Paper 18 (PTAB Aug. 27, 2014).....14

*Unified Patents, Inc. v. Berman*,  
IPR2016-01571 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016)..... 7, 15

*W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*,  
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....32

# 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.