

Filed October 25, 2018

On behalf of:

Patent Owner The Regents of the University of California

By: Kerry S. Taylor

Ryan E. Melnick

Maria V. Stout

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Tel.: (949) 760-0404 Fax: (949) 760-9502

Email: BoxUC@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**THERMO FISHER SCIENTIFIC, INC.**

Petitioner

v.

**THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Patent Owner

---

**IPR2018-01347**

U.S. Patent 9,085,799

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL .....	4
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	4
A. “greater than 4 fold increase in fluorescence emission” .....	5
B. “in the absence of the polymer” .....	6
C. “multichromophore system” .....	7
D. “sample” .....	8
E. “water soluble conjugated polymer” and “polymer” .....	9
IV. CLAIMS 1, 3, 4, 6, AND 7 ARE ENTITLED TO A PRIORITY DATE OF AT LEAST AUGUST 26, 2003 .....	9
A. The Legal Standard for Written Description.....	10
B. Claim 1 of the ‘799 Patent Is Entitled to a Priority Date of at Least August 26, 2003.....	12
C. The First Application Discloses a Representative Number of Species Falling Within Claim 1 .....	13
1. First Working Example: Example 3 in the First Application.....	14
2. Second Working Example: Example 5 in the First Application.....	14
3. Third Working Example: Incorporated by Reference from Provisional Example 2 .....	18
4. Fourth Working Example: Incorporated by Reference from Provisional Example 3 .....	19

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
*(Cont'd)*

	<b>Page No.</b>
5. The Four Working Examples Disclosed in the First Application Provide a Sufficient Representative Number of Species to Meet Written Description .....	25
D. Two Working Examples Were Also Known to Those of Skill in the Art as of August 20, 2002 .....	26
E. The General Teachings in the First Application Further Support That the First Application Contains Adequate Written Description of the Claims of the '799 Patent.....	29
F. The '799 Patent Discloses Adequate Structure-Function Correlation.....	35
G. Thermo Argued Extensively That Structure-Function Correlation and Numerous Representative Structures Within the Claimed Genera Were Known as of August 26, 2002 .....	38
1. Thermo Contradicts Its Own Lack of Written Description Argument by Asserting That Structures of the Claimed Components Were Known .....	39
2. In a Prior Proceeding, Thermo Argued That Achieving a Greater Than 4 Fold Increase in Fluorescence Was Routine .....	40
3. Thermo Contradicted Its Present Assertions Regarding Structure-Function Correlation .....	42
H. Extensive Case Law with Highly Similar Facts Supports That the Claims Satisfy the Written Description Requirement.....	43
1. <i>Ariad</i> Is Readily Distinguishable from the Present Facts .....	44
2. The First Application Discloses More Than Cases Finding Adequate Written Description.....	46

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
*(Cont'd)*

	<b>Page No.</b>
3. Presence of an Unbounded Numerical Range Is Not Dispositive for Written Description.....	52
I. Thermo Makes No Argument Regarding Priority for the Additional Limitations in Dependent Claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 .....	54
V. BECAUSE THE CLAIMS ARE ENTITLED TO A PRIORITY DATE OF AT LEAST AUGUST 26, 2003, THERMO'S SOLE GROUND IN ITS PETITION FAILS.....	54
VI. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION IS NOT A PROPER GROUND FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	55
VII. CONCLUSION .....	58

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	50, 51, 52
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoeschst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	25
<i>Anderson Corp. v. Fiber Composites, LLC</i> 474 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	52, 53
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Capon v. Eshhar</i> , 418 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Falko-Gunter Falkner v. Inglis</i> , 448 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	25, 51, 52
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs., Inc.</i> , 429 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	25, 49, 50
<i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982) .....	24
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Scruggs</i> , 459 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	11
<i>Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co, Inc.</i> 772 F.2d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	53
<i>SAP America, Inc. v. Pi-Net Int'l, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00414, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 18, 2014).....	56, 57

# 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.