

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

THORNE RESEARCH, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,  
Patent Owner.

---

**Case IPR2021-00491**

**Patent 8,197,807**

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1**

**II. BACKGROUND OF DR. BRENNER’S INVENTION ..... 3**

**III. PETITIONER HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN OF SHOWING THAT EITHER THE *CELL* ARTICLE (GROUND 1) OR THE ’337 PCT PUBLICATION (GROUND 2) IS PRIOR ART ..... 6**

A. The Asserted *Cell* Article and ’337 PCT Publication Are Not “By Another” and Thus Not Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or § 102(e)..... 7

1. To Qualify as Prior Art Under § 102(a) or § 102(e), Relied-Upon Subject Matter in the Reference Must Be Invented “By Another,” *i.e.*, by Dr. Bieganowski..... 8

2. The Invention of the ’807 Patent and Relied-Upon Subject Matter in the *Cell* Article and ’337 PCT Publication ..... 12

3. The Relied-Upon Subject Matter in the *Cell* Article and ’337 PCT Publication Was Invented Only by Dr. Brenner And Not Dr. Bieganowski..... 14

4. Patent Owner’s Evidence For the “By Another” Issue Is Corroborated and Sufficient..... 18

5. The Board’s Institution Decision ..... 23

B. The Asserted *Cell* Article Is Not Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)..... 26

1. Petitioner’s Position on Priority Is Based on an Unsupported and Inapplicable Paris Convention Argument ..... 27

2. The ’807 Patent’s Priority Claim to the ’701 Application Meets the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 120 and the *Cell* Article Is Thus Not Prior Art Under § 102(b) ..... 35

**IV. CONCLUSION ..... 38**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Actelion Pharm., Ltd. v. Matal</i> , 881 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	29
<i>In re Costello</i> , 717 F.2d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	8
<i>CSL Behring LLC v. Bioverativ Therapeutics Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01313, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2019) .....	11
<i>In re DeBaun</i> , 687 F.2d 459 (C.C.P.A. 1982) .....	19
<i>Duncan Parking Techs., Inc. v. IPS Grp., Inc.</i> , 914 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	9, 11, 13, 15
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	9
<i>EmeraChem Holdings, LLC v. Volkswagen Grp. of Am., Inc.</i> , 859 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	8, 20, 22
<i>Ethicon LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.</i> , 847 F. App’x 901 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	9, 13
<i>In re Gosteli</i> , 872 F.2d 1008 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	31
<i>In re Katz</i> , 687 F.2d 450 (C.C.P.A. 1982) .....	8, 11, 18, 19
<i>In re Mathews</i> , 408 F.2d 1393 (C.C.P.A. 1969) .....	20
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	35
<i>In re Rath</i> , 402 F.3d 1207 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	29

*Return Mail, Inc. v. U.S. Postal Serv.*,  
139 S. Ct. 1853 (2019).....31

*Sandt Tech., Ltd. v. Resco Metal & Plastics Corp.*,  
264 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....21

*Sanofi-Aventis v. Immunex*,  
IPR2017-01879, Paper 88 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 14, 2019).....18

*Scimed Life Sys. v. Medtronic Vascular, Inc.*,  
468 F. Supp. 2d 60 (D.D.C. 2006).....30

*Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.*,  
545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....32

*Thomson, S.A. v. Quixote Corp.*,  
166 F.3d 1172 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....25

*Thorne Research, Inc. v. Trustees of Dartmouth College*,  
IPR2021-00268, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. June 10, 2021) .....*passim*

*Trans Ova Genetics, LC v. XY, LLC*,  
No. IPR2018-00250, Paper 35 (P.T.A.B. June 26, 2019) .....25

*Varian Med. Sys. v. William Beaumont Hospital*,  
IPR2016-00160, Paper 82 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2017) .....9, 21

*Yasuko Kawai v. Metlestics*,  
480 F.2d 880 (C.C.P.A. 1973) .....29

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 119 .....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 120 .....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 316 .....1, 9

35 U.S.C. § 363 .....32, 37

**Other Authorities**

<https://wipolex.wipo.int/en/text/287556> .....28

<https://wipolex.wipo.int/en/text/288637> .....28

MPEP § 1893.03(c).....37

# 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.