

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

OXFORD NANOPORE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PACIFIC BIOSCIENCES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR No. IPR2018-01792
U.S. Patent No. 9,738,929

**PATENT OWNER PACIFIC BIOSCIENCES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

***Mail Stop* “PATENT BOARD”**
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION PURSUANT TO §§ 314(A) AND 324(A).....	5
A. Strategic Delay in Filing the Petition	6
B. Status of District Court Litigation.....	7
C. The Board Has Broad Discretion to Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 324(a)	8
D. The <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Also Weigh Against Institution	10
III. BACKGROUND	13
A. Overview Of Sequencing Technology And The State Of The Art	13
1. Prior Art Ensemble Sequencing Techniques	13
2. Single-Molecule Sequencing	16
B. Overview Of The '929 Patent	21
C. Overview Of The Cited Prior Art.....	23
1. U.S. Patent 6,087,099 (“Gupte”)	23
2. U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0142559 (“Makrigiorgos”).....	25
3. Determination Of Nucleotide Sequences In DNA (“Sanger”)	28
4. U.S. Patent Publication 2006/0063171 (“Akeson”)	29
IV. REASONS WHY THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED	32
A. GROUNDS 1-3: The Combination Of Akeson With Gupte	32

1.	Gupte Does Not Teach Determining A Single-Molecule Consensus Sequence	32
2.	A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Be Motivated To Combine Akeson with Gupte.....	37
3.	A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In The Combination.....	44
B.	FOUNDATIONS 4-7: The Combination Of Akeson, Sanger, And Makrigiorgos	46
1.	Neither Sanger Nor Makrigiorgos Teach Determining A Single-Molecule Consensus Sequence	46
2.	A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Be Motivated To Combine Akeson with Sanger and Makrigiorgos.....	49
3.	A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success In The Combination.....	53
V.	CONCLUSION	54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Alphonso, Inc. v. Free Stream Media, Corp.</i> , IPR2017-01731, 2018 WL 566832 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 25, 2018)	40
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	45, 54
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	37
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 at 16-17 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....	passim
<i>Honeywell Int'l Inc. v. Mexichem Amanco Holding S.A. De C.V.</i> , 865 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	45, 54
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	41, 50
<i>Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-MAK), Inc. v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC</i> , Case IPR2018-00211, Paper 7 (PTAB June 20, 2018).....	44, 54
<i>Institut Pasteur v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	45
<i>InTouch Technologies, Inc. v. VGO Comms.</i> , 751 F. 3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	47
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	38, 50
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	37
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 Fed. Appx. 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	40

<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Koninkijke Philips N.V.</i> , Case IPR2018-00277, Paper 10 (June 8, 2018)	5
<i>NetApp, Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , Case IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 12, 2017)	11, 12, 13
<i>NHK Spring Co. Ltd. v. Intri-plex Techs., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)	6, 8, 9, 10
<i>NPF Ltd. v. Smart Parts, Inc.</i> , 187 Fed. Appx. 973 (Fed. Cir. June 27, 2006)	44
<i>Outdry Techs. Corp. v. Geox S.p.A.</i> , 859 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	41
<i>Princeton Biochemicals, Inc. v. Beckman Coulter, Inc.</i> , 411 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	53
<i>Trustees of Columbia Univ. in City of New York v. Illumina, Inc.</i> , 620 F. App'x 916 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	44
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. American Science & Engineering</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	9
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	5, 6, 8
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11)	11
35 U.S.C. § 324(a)	5, 6, 8
35 U.S.C. § 326(b)	8
35 U.S.C. §§ 316(b)	8

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.