

Filed on behalf of Ionian Technologies, LLC
By: Aaron F. Barkoff, Ph.D.
Christopher P. Singer, Ph.D.
McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ENVIROLOGIX INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

IONIAN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00405
Patent 9,562,263

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
ARGUMENT	2
A. Ground 1: Ehses does not anticipate the claims.....	2
1. Ehses fails to disclose at least four claim limitations	3
a. Ehses does not disclose “obtaining from an animal, plant or food, a sample comprising a target nucleic acid”	4
b. Ehses does not disclose a method of amplification “without first subjecting the target nucleic acid to a thermal denaturation step associated with amplification of the target polynucleotide sequence”	6
c. Ehses does not disclose “combining, in a single step, the obtained sample directly with an amplification reagent mixture or diluting the obtained sample and combining, in a single step, the diluted sample with an amplification reagent mixture”	7
d. Ehses does not disclose “detecting the amplified target . . . within 10 minutes of subjecting the reaction mixture to isothermal conditions”	9
B. Ground 2: Ehses-Dissertation does not anticipate the claims.....	11
1. The petition fails to show that Ehses-Dissertation qualifies as a “printed publication”	12
2. Ehses-Dissertation fails to disclose at least three of the same claim limitations that are missing from Ehses.....	16
a. Ehses-Dissertation does not disclose “obtaining from an animal, plant or food, a sample comprising a target nucleic acid”	16
b. Ehses-Dissertation does not disclose a method of amplification “without first subjecting the target nucleic acid to a thermal denaturation step associated with amplification of the target polynucleotide sequence”	18

c.	Ehses-Dissertation does not disclose “combining, in a single step, the obtained sample directly with an amplification reagent mixture or diluting the obtained sample and combining, in a single step, the diluted sample with an amplification reagent mixture”	20
C.	Ground 3: The claims are not obvious over Ehses and Ehses-Dissertation.....	21
1.	The combination of Ehses and Ehses-Dissertation fails to disclose all of the claim limitations	21
2.	In addition, the petition fails to adequately explain a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	22
D.	Ground 4: Piepenburg does not anticipate the claims.....	24
1.	Piepenburg fails to disclose the limitations “arranged as in the claim”	24
2.	Piepenburg fails to disclose at least four claim limitations	26
a.	Piepenburg does not disclose an amplification reaction mixture comprising either the first or second oligonucleotide recited in claim limitations 1(b)(iii) and 1(b)(iv)	26
b.	Piepenburg does not disclose “detecting the amplified target polynucleotide sequence in real time”	29
c.	Piepenburg does not disclose “detecting the amplified target . . . within 10 minutes of subjecting the reaction mixture to isothermal conditions”	32
E.	Ground 5: The claims are not obvious over Piepenburg in view of Kong	34
1.	The combination of Piepenburg and Kong fails to disclose all of the claim limitations	34
2.	In addition, the petition fails to adequately explain a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	35
F.	Ground 6: The claims are not obvious over Piepenburg in view of Kato	38

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
IPR2018-00405

1.	The combination of Piepenburg and Kato fails to disclose all of the claim limitations	38
2.	In addition, the petition fails to adequately explain a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	39
G.	Ground 7: The claims are not obvious over Piepenburg in view of Ehses and Ehses-Dissertation.....	41
1.	The combination of asserted prior art fails to disclose all of the claim limitations.....	41
2.	In addition, the petition fails to adequately explain a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	42
H.	Ground 8: The claims are not obvious over Ehses and Ehses-Dissertation in view of Piepenburg.....	44
1.	The combination of asserted prior art fails to disclose all of the claim limitations.....	44
2.	In addition, the petition fails to adequately explain a motivation to combine or reasonable expectation of success.....	44
	CONCLUSION.....	46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Apple, Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369 (PTAB Aug. 12, 2015)	13
<i>Argentum Pharms., LLC v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00204 (PTAB May 23, 2016)	15
<i>Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	5
<i>Helifix v. Blok-Lok, Ltd.</i> , 208 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	3, 7
<i>Howmedica Osteonics Corp. v. Zimmer, Inc.</i> , 640 F. App'x 951 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22
<i>Impax Labs., Inc. v. Aventis Pharms. Inc.</i> , 468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	3, 7
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	12, 13
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	12
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	12
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981)	11
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	3
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	3, 5, 18
<i>In re Wyer</i> , 655 F.2d 221 (CCPA 1981)	13
<i>Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	22, 43, 45
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	12

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.