

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

OXFORD NANOPORE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Petitioners

v.

PACIFIC BIOSCIENCES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

Patent Owner

Case No. Unassigned

Patent 9,738,929

DECLARATION OF DR. PATRICK HRDLICKA IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,738,929

Declaration of Dr. Patrick Hrdlicka in Support of
Petition for *IPR* of U.S. Patent No. 9,738,929

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	1
II. LEGAL UNDERSTANDING.....	3
A. Anticipation.....	4
B. Obviousness.....	4
C. Claim Construction	7
III. THE PRIOR ART.....	10
A. Prior Art Considered	10
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
V. BACKGROUND OF SEQUENCING NUCLEIC ACIDS USING NANOPORES AND MOLECULAR MOTORS	12
A. Nanopore Sequencing Using Enzyme Chaperones	12
B. Sequencing of Complementary Strands to Improve Accuracy ...	15
VI. OVERVIEW OF THE '929 PATENT	16
A. Overview of the Subject Matter of the '929 Patent.....	16
B. Overview of the Prosecution History.....	19
VII. SUMMARY OF PRIOR ART	23
A. Nanopore Sequencing using Enzyme Chaperones was Known in the Art Prior to the Earliest Priority Date Claimed by the '929 Patent.....	23
1. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0063171 (“Akeson”)	23
2. U.S. Patent No. 6,936,433 (“Akeson ’433”).....	26

Declaration of Dr. Patrick Hrdlicka in Support of
Petition for *IPR* of U.S. Patent No. 9,738,929

B.	Sequencing of Both Strands of a Polynucleotide was Known in the Art Prior to the Earliest Priority Date Claimed by the '929 Patent	27
1.	Sanger	27
2.	U.S. Patent No. 6,087,099 (“Gupte”)	28
3.	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0142559 (“Makrigiorgos”)	31
C.	Various Linkers for Connecting Complementary Strands of DNA were Known in the Art Prior to the Earliest Priority Date Claimed by the '929 Patent	34
1.	Miner	34
2.	O’Dea	35
VIII.	SUMMARY OF COMBINATIONS	36
IX.	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	37
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 16 are obvious over Akeson and Gupte	37
1.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Akeson and Gupte	37
2.	Claim 1	38
3.	Claim 2	50
4.	Claim 3	50
5.	Claim 4	51
6.	Claim 5	51
7.	Claim 6	52
8.	Claim 7	55

Declaration of Dr. Patrick Hrdlicka in Support of
Petition for *IPR* of U.S. Patent No. 9,738,929

9.	Claim 8	57
10.	Claim 10	59
11.	Claim 11	60
12.	Claim 16	62
B.	Ground 2: Claim 12 is obvious over Akeson, Gupte and Miner ..	64
1.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Akeson, Gupte and Miner.....	64
2.	Claim 12	65
C.	Ground 3: Claim 17 is obvious over Akeson, Gupte and Akeson '433.....	67
1.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Akeson, Gupte and Akeson '433.....	67
2.	Claim 17	68
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 13 are obvious over Akeson, Sanger and Makrigiorgos	69
1.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Akeson, Sanger and Makrigiorgos ..	69
2.	Claim 1	70
3.	Claim 2	81
4.	Claim 3	82
5.	Claim 4	82
6.	Claim 5	83
7.	Claim 6	83
8.	Claim 7	86
9.	Claim 8	88

Declaration of Dr. Patrick Hrdlicka in Support of
Petition for *IPR* of U.S. Patent No. 9,738,929

10.	Claim 10	89
11.	Claim 11	90
12.	Claim 13	90
E.	Ground 5: Claim 9 is obvious over Akeson, Gupte and Makrigiorgos.....	91
1.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Akeson, Gupte and Makrigiorgos. ..	91
2.	Claim 9	93
F.	Ground 6: Claim 12 is obvious over Akeson, Sanger, Makrigiorgos and Miner	96
1.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Akeson, Sanger, Makrigiorgos and Miner.	96
2.	Claim 12	96
G.	Ground 7: Claims 14 and 15 are obvious over Akeson, Sanger, Makrigiorgos and O’Dea.....	98
1.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Akeson, Sanger, Makrigiorgos and O’Dea.....	98
2.	Claim 14	99
3.	Claim 15	100
X.	CONCLUSION	101

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.