

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. IPR2018-01795
U.S. Patent No. 9,678,056

**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. Petitioner’s 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)	7
III. BACKGROUND	10
A. Nanopore Sequencing Overview.....	10
B. Overview Of The ’056 Patent	12
C. Overview Of The Cited Prior Art.....	16
1. U.S. Patent Publication 2006/0063171 (“Akeson”)	16
2. U.S. Patent Publication 2007/0196846 (“Hanzel”)	18
3. Mechanochemistry Of T7 DNA Helicase (“Liao”).....	22
4. Mechanochemistry Of Transcription Termination Factor Rho (“Adelman”).....	24
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	26
V. REASONS WHY THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED	26
A. The Petition Is Based On Expert Testimony That Is Entitled To No Weight	27
B. Ground 1: Inherent Anticipation by Akeson.....	30

C.	Ground 2: Obviousness Based On Akeson And Hanzel.....	36
1.	The Combination Of Akeson And Hanzel Does Not Teach Selecting An Enzyme And Reaction Conditions Such That The Enzyme Exhibits Two Kinetic Steps	36
2.	Petitioner Fails To Establish A Motivation To Combine And Reasonable Expectation Of Success	41
D.	Ground 3: Obviousness Based On Akeson And Liao.....	45
1.	The Combination Of Akeson And Liao Does Not Teach Selecting An Enzyme And Reaction Conditions Such That The Enzyme Exhibits Two Kinetic Steps	45
2.	Petitioner Fails To Establish A Motivation To Combine Or Reasonable Expectation Of Success	49
E.	Ground 4: Obviousness Based On Akeson And Adelman	51
1.	The Combination Of Akeson And Adelman Does Not Teach Selecting An Enzyme And Reaction Conditions Such That The Enzyme Exhibits Two Kinetic Steps.....	51
2.	Petitioner Fails To Establish A Motivation To Combine Or Reasonable Expectation Of Success	54
VI.	CONCLUSION	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Alphonso, Inc. v. Free Stream Media, Corp.</i> , IPR2017-01731, 2018 WL 566832 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2018)	42
<i>Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp., v. Abraxis Bioscience, LLC</i> , IPR2018-00153, Paper 11 (PTAB May 8, 2018).....	32
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	41, 50, 55
<i>Avaya Inc., et al., v. Network-1 Security Solutions Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00071, Paper 103 (PTAB May 22, 2014).....	35
<i>Carlson v. Bioremedi Therapeutic Sys.</i> , 822 F.3d 194 (5th Cir. 2016).....	30
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	41
<i>Compass Bank v. Intellectual Ventures II</i> , IPR2014-00786, Paper 46 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2015).....	33, 45
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets</i> , IPR2013-00050, Paper 77 (PTAB May 1, 2014).....	33, 45
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017).....	6
<i>Helifix Ltd. v. Blok-Lok, Ltd.</i> , 208 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	29
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981)	31
<i>Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-MAK), Inc., v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC</i> , IPR2018-00211, Paper 7 (PTAB June 20, 2018).....	50

<i>Institut Pasteur v. Focarino</i> , 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	42
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	41
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	41, 43
<i>Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael</i> , 526 U.S. 137 (1999).....	30
<i>L'Oréal USA Inc. v. Liqwd, Inc.</i> , PGR2018-00023, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 10, 2018)	30
<i>MEHL/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum</i> , 192 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	31
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 Fed. Appx. 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	42
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Koninkijke Philips N.V.</i> , Case IPR2018-00277, Paper 10 (PTAB June 8, 2018).....	6
<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>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs, Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	43, 50, 55
<i>Outdry Techs. Corp. v. Geox S.p.A.</i> , 859 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	43
<i>Sciele Pharma Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.</i> , 684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	29
<i>Spansion, Inc. v. Macronix Int'l Co., Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-01118, Paper 16 (PTAB Jan. 21, 2015).....	33
<i>Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.</i> , 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	43, 50, 55

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.