

Filed: July 17, 2018

Filed on behalf of: Benson Hill Biosystems, Inc.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BENSON HILL BIOSYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

THE BROAD INSTITUTE INC.,
PRESIDENTS AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE &
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Patent Owners.

U.S. Patent No. 9,790,490

PETITION FOR POST GRANT REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART	2
III. SUMMARY OF THE '490 PATENT	5
A. The Challenged Claims	5
B. The Specification.....	6
C. The Prosecution History.....	8
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
VI. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES.....	14
A. Ground 1: Failure to Comply with the Written Description Requirement for the Recited Genus of “Cpf1 effector protein[s]”	15
1. The Specification Does Not Describe a Sufficient Number of Representative Species or Provide a Structure/Function Correlation Sufficient to Adequately Describe the Full Scope of the Subject Matter Recited in Claims 1-60	15
2. Claims 12-14 Fail to Sufficiently Narrow the Scope of the Genus.....	24
B. Ground 2: Claims 1-60 Fail to Comply with the Enablement Requirement for the Recited Genus of “Cpf1 effector protein[s]”	25
1. The Amount of Direction or Guidance Presented and The Presence or Absence of Working Examples.....	27

2.	The Predictability or Unpredictability of the Art and The Quantity of Experimentation Necessary	31
3.	Claims 12-14 Fail to Sufficiently Narrow the Scope of the Genus.....	37
4.	Conclusion that the Claimed Invention Lacks Enablement.....	39
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-60 Fail to Inform with Reasonable Certainty the Scope of “a Cpf1 effector protein”	39
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1-60 Fail to Comply with the Enablement Requirement for the Recited Genus of Systems “lack[ing] a tracr sequence”	46
E.	Ground 5: Claims 1-60 Fail to Comply with the Written Description Requirement for the Recited Genus of Systems “lack[ing] a tracr sequence”	49
F.	Ground 6: Claims 1-60 Lack Practical Utility	51
G.	Ground 7: Claims 1-60 Would Have Been Obvious Over Schunder in View of the General Knowledge in the Art and Secondary References	53
VII.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	69
VIII.	GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	69
IX.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	70
X.	CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d).....	71
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>In re '318 Patent Infringement Litigation</i> , 583 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	52
<i>AbbVie Deutschland GmbH & Co. v. Janssen Biotech, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	15, 16, 23
<i>ALZA Corp. v. Andrx Pharmaceuticals, LLC</i> , 603 F.3d 935 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	26, 48
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , 872 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	18, 37
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (<i>en banc</i>)	15, 16, 23
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co.</i> , 750 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	28
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	13
<i>Broad Inst., Inc. et al. v. Regents of the Univ. of California</i> , 2017 WL 657415 (PTAB 2017)	18, 19, 30, 33
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chems. Corp.</i> , 803 F.3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	40
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Calgene, Inc.</i> , 188 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	26
<i>Geneva Pharms., Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC</i> , 349 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	40, 51
<i>Nat'l Recovery Techs., Inc. v. Magnetic Separation Sys., Inc.</i> , 166 F.3d 1190 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	26

<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig. Instruments Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	39
<i>PAR Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. TWI Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	54, 55
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	42
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	11
<i>Plant Genetic Sys., N.V. v. DeKalb Genetics Corp.</i> , 315 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	37
<i>PPG Indus., Inc. v. Guardian Indus. Corp.</i> , 75 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	27
<i>SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	44
<i>In re Vaeck</i> , 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	28, 29
<i>In re Wands</i> , 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	27
<i>In re Wright</i> , 999 F.2d 1557 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	25, 26
<i>Wyeth & Cordis Corp. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 720 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	<i>passim</i>
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 101	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 103	15, 54, 69
35 U.S.C. § 112	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 112(b)	45

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.