	Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 F	Filed 07/31/17 Page 1 of 38
1 2 3 4 5	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIV David Bilsker (Bar No. 152383) davidbilsker@quinnemanuel.com 50 California Street, 22 <sup>nd</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4788 Telephone: (415) 875-6600 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700 Kevin Johnson (Bar No. 177129)	AN, LLP
6 7 8	kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Dr., 5th Floor Redwood Shores, California 94065 Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100	
9 10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs BIO-RAD LABORATORIES, INC. AND LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL SECURITY, LLC	
11	UNITED STATE:	S DISTRICT COURT
12	NORTHERN DISTR	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
13	3 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
14	BIO-RAD LABORATORIES, INC. AND	CASE NO. <u>3:17-cv-4339</u>
15	SECURITY, LLC,	COMPLAINT
16	Plaintiffs,	PATENT INFRINGEMENT
17	VS.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
18	10X GENOMICS, Inc.	
19	Defendants	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		Case No. 3:17-cv-4339
		COMPLAINT

1	Plaintiffs Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc., ("Bio-Rad"), and Lawrence Livermore National
2	Security, LLC ("LLNS") (collectively "Plaintiffs") by and through their attorneys, and for their
3	Complaint against 10X Genomics, Inc. ("10X" or "Defendant"), hereby alleges as follows:
4	PARTIES
5	1. Bio-Rad is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Hercules,
6	California.
7	2. LLNS is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Livermore,
8	California.
9	3. On information and belief, 10X Genomics is a Delaware corporation with a
10	principal place of business at 7068 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 401 Pleasanton, California 94566.
11	JURISDICTION AND VENUE
12	4. Plaintiffs bring this action seeking damages arising out of the infringement by
13	Defendant of U.S. Patent No. 9,089,844 ("the '844 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 9,126,160 ("the '160
14	patent"), U.S. Patent No. 9,216,392 ("the '392 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 9,347,059 ("the '059
15	patent"), U.S. Patent No. 9,500,664 ("the '664 patent"), U.S. Patent No. 9,636,682 ("the '682
16	patent"), and U.S. Patent No. 9,649,635 ("the '635 patent") (collectively, the "Asserted Patents")
17	arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.
18	Accordingly, this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28
19	U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
20	5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant has
21	committed acts of infringement within this District. Moreover, Defendant has substantial contacts
22	with the forum as a consequence of conducting business in California and having a principal place
23	of business in Pleasanton, California. Upon information and belief, Defendant manufactures, uses,
24	sells, and/or offers to sell in, and/or imports into, the United States, droplet based emulsion
25	system, including the Chromium <sup>™</sup> and GemCode products.
26	6. As set forth above, Defendant has committed acts of infringement and has a regular
27	and established place of business in this judicial district. Venue therefore lies in the United States
28	District Court for the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (2).

	Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 3 of 38
1	INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT
2	7. This is an Intellectual Property Action to be assigned on a district-wide basis
3	pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(c).
4	FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS
5	The Asserted Patents
6	8. On July 28, 2015, the '844 patent, titled "System For Forming Emulsions," was
7	duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"). Bio-Rad
8	is the owner of the '844 patent. A copy of the '844 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
9	9. On September 8, 2015, the '160 patent, titled "System For Forming An Array Of
10	Emulsions," was duly and lawfully issued by the USPTO. Bio-Rad and LLNS are co-owners of
11	the '160 patent and Bio-Rad is an exclusive licensee of LLNS's interest in the '160 patent. A copy
12	of the '160 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
13	10. On December 22, 2015, the '392 patent, titled "System For Forming An Array Of
14	Emulsions," was duly and lawfully issued by the USPTO. Bio-Rad and LLNS are co-owners of
15	the '392 patent and Bio-Rad is an exclusive licensee of LLNS's interest in the '392 patent. A copy
16	of the '392 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C.
17	11. On May 24, 2016, the '059 patent, titled "Methods And Compositions For Nucleic
18	Acid Analysis," was duly and lawfully issued by the USPTO. Bio-Rad is the owner of the '059
19	patent. A copy of the '059 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit D.
20	12. On November 22, 2016, the '664 patent, titled "Droplet Generation For Droplet-
21	Based Assays," was duly and lawfully issued by the USPTO. Bio-Rad is the owner of the '664
22	patent. A copy of the '664 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit E.
23	13. On May 2, 2017, the '682 patent, titled "System For Generating Droplets –
24	Instruments and Cassette," was duly and lawfully issued by the USPTO. Bio-Rad is the owner of
25	the '682 patent. A copy of the '682 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit F.
26	14. On May 16, 2017, the '635 patent, titled "System For Generating Droplets With
27	Push-Back To Remove Oil," was duly and lawfully issued by the USPTO. Bio-Rad is the owner
28	of the '635 patent. A copy of the '635 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit G.
I	

1

#### Background

15. David and Alice Schwartz started Bio-Rad in 1952 in a 1,600 square foot Quonset
hut in Berkeley, California as a research-focused company to deliver life science products and
services to identify, separate, purify, and analyze chemical and biological materials. The company
went public in 1966 and expanded into the clinical diagnostics market soon thereafter. Bio-Rad
quickly established itself as a leader in the field of life science research and clinical diagnostics,
and today may of Bio-Rad's diagnostics products and tools used in the biotechnology industry are
recognized as the gold standard.

9 16. One diagnostic tool that is heavily used by those working in biotechnology is
10 Polymerase Chain Reaction ("PCR"). PCR is a method of amplifying genetic material such as
11 DNA to produce multiple copies of the starting DNA so that a sufficient amount of material will
12 exist for analysis. The inventor of PCR, Kary Mullis, won the Noble Prize in Chemistry for his
13 discovery of PCR.

14 17. While a powerful tool, traditional PCR suffered from a number of analytical
15 limitations. These limitations included the need for large sample sizes and obtaining only a single
16 measurement from the sample that would indicate whether a target was present or not.
17 Additionally, traditional forms of PCR were only semi-quantitative and required additional
18 samples ("standards") to be analyzed each time a set of PCR reactions were performed in order to
19 quantify the starting amount of the target molecule.

Subsequently, new approaches to PCR were developed including "digital PCR." 20 18. 21 Digital PCR is a technique that allows absolute quantification of the target sequences present in 22 the original sample. Early forms of digital PCR required the user to separate the starting sample 23 into multiple wells through a series of serial dilutions performed by repeatedly pipetting the 24 sample to achieve very dilute samples that contained either a single molecule or no molecule. 25 When this level of dilution was achieved, PCR was performed on the diluted samples. The resulting amplification products and "empty" wells are then evaluated using statistics to quantify 26 27 the nucleic acid concentrations of the target. Because digital PCR is an absolute measurement, no 28 standards are needed to quantify starting amounts.

## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 5 of 38

19. While an advancement over prior PCR methods, first generation digital PCR still
 suffered from a number of disadvantages. Performing serial dilutions is very laborious and raises
 the possibility of errors because of the need for multiple rounds of pipetting that are necessary to
 carry out the serial dilutions. Additionally, the sensitivity of the method was limited by the
 number of wells practically available – *i.e.* the number of wells available on a tray. Consequently,
 a better method was needed in the industry to perform digital PCR.

20. Recognizing the need and the limitations with PCR as it existed, Bio-Rad embarked
on a program to improve traditional digital PCR. The centerpiece of the solution and advancement
of digital PCR was partitioning the samples by placing them in individual microdroplets that were
formed based on emulsion chemistry. The microfluidic process of forming these droplets took the
place of the prior serial dilutions. One was now able to create a large numbers of partitions, each
one for carrying out a reaction, with a minimum amount of sample handling.

- 13 21. Bio-Rad began offering its Droplet Digital<sup>TM</sup> PCR (ddPCR<sup>TM</sup>) Systems brands in
  14 2011 following it's acquisition of QuantaLife, Inc. ("QuantaLife") and its digital droplet PCR
  15 technology ("ddPCR<sup>TM</sup>"). The work at QuantaLife and subsequently at Bio-Rad led to a large
  16 number of patents being granted throughout the world concerning droplet based emulsion systems
  17 and methods, including the Asserted Patents.
- Bio-Rad's ddPCR<sup>™</sup> Systems enable precise, highly sensitive quantification of
  nucleic acids. In essence, the technology and many of the patents are directed to the critical steps

of forming the droplets, which are a result of advances in both
microfluidics and surfactant chemistry. As shown in the image
here, in the patented technology, the sample is partitioned into
miniaturized droplets that are formed as water-in-oil emulsions
(*e.g.*, microdroplets of water surrounded by oil) by passing
samples and oil through micro-channels in a micro-fluidic chip
and collecting the droplets in a collection well.



27 23. Bio-Rad's ddPCR<sup>TM</sup> System is capable of partitioning a single sample into
 28 approximately 20,000 microdroplets. The ddPCR<sup>TM</sup> System and inventions solved scalability and

## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 6 of 38

precision issues with existing digital PCR methods that relied on test tubes or wells to hold the
samples. Moreover, the ddPCR<sup>™</sup> System allows for absolute quantification of DNA and RNA
molecules without the use of a standard curve. It is capable of detecting very low concentrations
of mutations relative to the background of wild-type DNA in a given sample. For example, BioRad's QX200 System, which operates pursuant to the claims of the asserted patents, currently can
scale to quantify target concentrations of a mutation in as low as one out of 1,000,000 (0.0001%)
total copies in a given sample.

8 24. Another important feature of Bio-Rad's ddPCR system is that it allows for
9 improved workflow and allows PCR reactions to be carried out with standard equipment such as
10 existing thermal cyclers.

25. Bio-Rad recognized that its method for forming multiple partitions of a sample, *e.g.* 11 12 generating droplets by using a microfluidic chip and particular surfactant chemistry, would not be 13 limited to performing droplet digital PCR but could also be applied to other applications. Such 14 applications include Next Generation Sequencing ("NGS") and single cell analysis. These applications, as envisioned in at least one of Bio-Rad's patents, starts with the patented preparatory 15 16 steps of creating a first set of partitions containing adaptors that are uniquely barcoded and a 17 second set of partitions comprising the sample to be studied. The barcoded adaptor partitions are 18 then merged with the sample partitions eventually resulting in the barcoded adaptors being 19 attached to the sample partitions. With these preparatory steps performed one can then use other 20 reagents and tools to perform sequencing, determine copy number or perform other modes of 21 analysis. This patented preparatory method allows more individual cells to be analyzed in a 22 highly scalable fashion than was previously possible.

23 26. After Bio-Rad spent years and hundreds of millions of dollars researching and
24 developing its droplet partitioning technology that is the foundation for ddPCR<sup>TM</sup> and has played a
25 crucial role in expanding the use and accessibility of Next Generation Sequencing and Single Cell
26 Analysis, several of its employees left to found 10X Technologies, Inc., which later became
27 Defendant 10X Genomics. This company, like QuantaLife and Bio-Rad, focused on developing
28 systems and methods for generating droplet based emulsions.

1	27. In 2015, 10X launched a droplet based emulsion system called GemCode that used	
2	the claimed microchips and chemistry for forming droplets that can be used in among other things,	
3	Next Generation Sequencing and Single Cell Analysis.	
4	28. Approximately one year later, 10X launched an updated version of its droplet based	
5	emulsion system called Chromium <sup>™</sup> .	
6	29. On information and belief, the GemCode and Chromium <sup>™</sup> products both utilized	
7	the same scientific principles to create emulsions in a microfluidics chip, and use the same type of	
8	microfluidic chips, both of which infringe the claims of the asserted patents.	
9	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION	
10	Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,089,844	
11	30. Plaintiffs incorporate all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.	
12	31. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or through the	
13	doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '844 patent, including but not limited to claim	
14	15, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing	
15	within the United States, without authority, certain emulsions formation products, including	
16	without limitation, the Chromium <sup>™</sup> and GemCode products ("Accused Emulsion Products") <sup>1</sup> .	
17	32. For example, the Accused Emulsion Products contain each element of and infringe	
18	claim 15, which states:	
19	<b>Claim 15.</b> A method of emulsion formation performed with the system of claim	
20	1, the method comprising.	
21		
22	<sup>1</sup> The evidence provided herein is preliminary and based on Plaintiffs' pre-suit investigation.	
23	As of the filing of this complaint, Defendant is making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing within the United States at least four types of Chromium <sup>TM</sup> products including the	
24	Single Cell 3' Solution, Single Cell V(D)J Solution, Genome Solution, Exome Solution, and a <i>De</i>	
25	<u>/products/</u> (last accessed July 31, 2017). These reagent products are used in conjunction with the	
26	samples and create droplets. The Chromium product line is a continuation of the prior GemCode	
27	product line, which also infringes for the same reasons identified for the Chromium. Plaintiffs have cited publically available documents that are representative of the features available on each	
28	version of the Accused Emulsion Products.	

-6-

	Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 8 of 38
1	
1 2	drive droplet formation at the channel intersections and collection of emulsions of the droplets in the droplet wells;
3	monitoring the pressure with the pressure sensor; and
4	stopping application of the pressure when the change in pressure is detected.
5	Claim 1. A system for emulsion formation, comprising:
6 7	a microfluidic device having a plurality of emulsion formation units each including a sample well, a droplet well, a sample inlet channel extending from the sample well to a channel intersection, and a droplet outlet channel extending from the channel intersection to the droplet well; and
8 9	an instrument that operatively receives the microfluidic device and including a fluidics assembly having a pressure sensor, the instrument being configured (a) to
10	apply pressure to the emulsion formation units in parallel with the fluidics assembly to drive parallel generation of droplets at the channel intersections of the
11	emulsion formation units and parallel collection of emulsions of the droplets in the droplet wells of the emulsion formation units, (b) to monitor the pressure with
12 13	the pressure sensor, and (c) to stop application of the pressure to all of the emulsion formation units when the pressure sensor detects a change in pressure indicative of air entering any one of the sample inlet channels from a corresponding sample well.
14	Defendant infringes each element of claim 15 of the '844 patent for the following reasons:
15	33. The Accused Emulsion Products are droplet based emulsion systems that use a
16	method of forming thousands of emulsions in parallel. On information and belief, these emulsions
17	are formed by combining a sample and reagents with a gel bead, encapsulating them in a water-in-
18	oil emulsion, and collecting those emulsions in outlet wells.
19	34. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products use a method that
20	include a microfluidics chip containing a plurality of emulsion formation units wherein each unit
21	has a set of inlet wells that are configured to hold either the oil phase ( <i>i.e.</i> continuous phase), the
22	sample ( <i>i.e.</i> dispersed phase) or reagents ( <i>e.g.</i> gel beads), and an outlet well to collect the
23	emulsions.
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	-7- Case No. 3:17-cv-4339 COMPLAINT



## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 10 of 38

if it senses a change indicative of air entering the sample channels. *See* Exhibit I, Chromium User
 Guide (Single Cell 3') at p. 56 (stating that one of the errors encountered that will stop the machine
 is when the fluids are loaded incorrectly is "Pressure not at Setpoint"). Without fluid in the sample
 well, air will enter the corresponding channel.

5 38. On information and belief, Defendant began selling the Chromium<sup>™</sup> Product in the
6 United States since at least February 2016 and the GemCode Product since at least February 2015.

7 39. On information and belief, Defendant commercially manufactures, uses, offers for
8 sale, or sells within the United States, or imports into the United States the Chromium<sup>™</sup> and
9 GemCode Products. Defendant's making, using, selling, and offering for sale of the Chromium<sup>™</sup>
10 and GemCode Products infringes Claim 15 of the '844 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

40. On information and belief Defendant has been aware of the existence of the '844
patent since at least July 2015 as numerous founders of its company participated in the filing of
the patent application leading to the '844 patent at least while they were employees at Bio-Rad.
As described below, Defendant has been aware that its actions in testing and developing products
and supplying products to others infringes the claims of the '844 patent.

41. On information and belief, Defendant is aware that the Accused Emulsion
Products, in their normal mode of operation for generating droplet based emulsions in a
microfluidic chip, practices the method claimed in at least Claim 15 of the '844 patent. By
providing end users with the Accused Emulsion Products and instructions to use the products in an
intended manner, which Defendant knows infringes the method claimed in at least Claim 15 of the
'844 patent, Defendant has induced infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

42. On information and belief, Defendant has supplied the Accused Emulsion Products
to end users to generate droplet based emulsions using a microfluidics chip, knowing that such
products are specifically adapted to practice the methods of the invention, are not a staple article
of commerce and knowing that when used in their intended manner do not have substantial uses,
which do not practice the method claimed in claim 15 of the '844 Patent. As set forth in the
paragraphs above, the Accused Emulsion Products supplied by Defendant are specifically
designed to be used to generate droplet based emulsions. Defendant's act of supplying a material

## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 11 of 38

and substantial component of claim 15 of the '844 Patent, which is not a staple and for which there
 are not substantial non-infringing uses, constitutes contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. §
 271(c).

43. Defendant's infringement of the '844 patent has been willful and deliberate because 4 5 Defendant's knew or should have known about the '844 patent and their infringement of that patent 6 but acted despite an objectively high likelihood that such acts would infringe the patent. On 7 information and belief, at least three of the individuals who developed the Accused Emulsion 8 Products are named inventors of the '844 patent who - while Bio-Rad employees, and on behalf of 9 Bio-Rad, which owns the '844 patent – were involved in the conception and/or reduction to 10 practice of the '844 patent and have had knowledge of the patent since it issued in July 2015. 11 44. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and, if Defendant's conduct is not stopped, will continue to suffer, severe competitive harm, 12 13 irreparable injury, and significant damages, in an amount to be proven at trial. Because Plaintiffs' 14 remedy at law is inadequate, Plaintiffs seek, in addition to damages, temporary, preliminary, and 15 permanent injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' business operates in a competitive market and will continue

- 16 suffering irreparable harm absent injunctive relief.
- 17
- 18

#### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### Infringement of Patent No. 9,126,160

45. Plaintiffs incorporate all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
46. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or through the
doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '160 patent, including but not limited to claim 1,
pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing within
the United States, without authority, certain emulsions formation products, including without
limitation, the Accused Emulsion Products.

47. For example, the Accused Emulsion Products contain each element of and infringe
at least claim 1, which states:

**Claim 1.** A system for forming an array of emulsions in parallel, comprising:

28

	Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 12 of 38
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>a plate providing an array of emulsion production units each configured to produce a separate emulsion and each including a set of wells interconnected by a set of channels forming a channel junction, each channel being bounded circumferentially, each set of wells including at least one first input well to receive a continuous phase, a second input well to receive a dispersed phase, and an output well;</li> <li>wherein the set of channels includes at least two input channels extending separately from the input wells to the channel junction, at which droplets of the dispersed phase are generated in the continuous phase, and an output channel extending from the channel junction to the output well, in which an emulsion is collected.</li> <li>Defendant infringes each element of claim 1 of the '160 patent for the following reasons:</li> <li>48. The Accused Emulsion Products are droplet based emulsion systems that form thousands of emulsions in parallel. On information and belief, these emulsions are formed by combining a sample and reagents with a gel bead, encapsulating them in a water-in-oil emulsion, and collecting those emulsions in outlet wells.</li> <li>49. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products include a microfluidics chip (<i>i.e.</i> plate) containing a plurality of emulsion formation units each configured to produce a separate emulsion.</li> <li>50. On information and belief, each emulsion formation unit in the Accused Emulsion</li> </ul>
17	well for the sample ( <i>i.e.</i> dispersed phase), an inlet well for reagents ( <i>e.g.</i> gel beads), and an outlet
18	well to collect the emulsions.
19	Single-use microfluidics chip
<ul> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ul>	Outlet well Bead well Sample well Oil well
25 26 27 28	<ul> <li>Exhibit H, Black Sales Presentation, p. 32.</li> <li>51. On information and belief, the set of wells in each emulsion formation unit is interconnected by channels to form a channel junction. As shown below, the sample inlet channel</li> </ul>
	-11- Case No. 3:17-cv-4339
	COMPLAINT

## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 13 of 38

extends from the sample well to a channel junction (red square below), and a droplet outlet
 channel extends from the channel junction to an outlet well for collecting the emulsions.



## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 14 of 38

Solution of the patent application leading to the '160 patent at least while they were employees at
 QuantaLife or Bio-Rad. As described below, Defendant has been aware that its actions in testing
 and developing products and supplying products to others infringes the claims of the '160 patent.

57. On information and belief, Defendant is aware that the Accused Emulsion
Products, in their normal mode of operation for generating droplet based emulsions in a
microfluidic chip, practice each of the elements of Claim 1 of the '160 patent. By providing end
users with the Accused Emulsion Products and instructions to use the products in an intended
manner, which Defendant knows infringes at least Claim 1 of the '160 patent, Defendant has
induced infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

On information and belief, Defendant has supplied the Accused Emulsion Products 12 58. 13 to end users to generate droplet based emulsions, knowing that such products are not a staple 14 article of commerce and knowing that when used in their intended manner do not have substantial 15 uses which do not practice claim 1 of the '160 Patent. As set forth in the paragraphs above, the 16 Accused Emulsion Products supplied by Defendant are specifically designed to generate droplet based emulsions. Defendant's act of supplying a material and substantial component of claim 1 of 17 18 the '160 Patent, which is not a staple and for which there are not substantial non-infringing uses, 19 constitutes contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

59. Defendant's infringement of the '160 patent has been willful and deliberate because
Defendant's knew or should have known about the '160 patent and their infringement of that patent
but acted despite an objectively high likelihood that such acts would infringe the patent. On
information and belief, at least three of the individuals who developed the Accused Emulsion
Products are the named inventors of the '160 patent who – while Bio-Rad employees, and on
behalf of Bio-Rad, which owns the '160 patent – were involved in the conception and/or reduction
to practice of the '160 patent and had knowledge of the patent since it issued in September 2015.

- 27
- 28

	Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 15 of 38
1	60. The marking requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287 have been satisfied through,
2	including but not limited to, Defendant's actual knowledge of the '160 patent and its infringement
3	thereof.
4	61. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
5	and, if Defendant's conduct is not stopped, will continue to suffer, severe competitive harm,
6	irreparable injury, and significant damages, in an amount to be proven at trial. Because Plaintiffs'
7	remedy at law is inadequate, Plaintiffs seek, in addition to damages, temporary, preliminary, and
8	permanent injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' business operates in a competitive market and will continue
9	suffering irreparable harm absent injunctive relief.
10	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
11	Infringement of Patent No. 9,216,392
12	62. Plaintiffs incorporate all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
13	63. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or through the
14	doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '392 patent, including but not limited to claim 1,
15	pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing within
16	the United States, without authority, certain emulsions formation products, including without
17	limitation, the Accused Emulsion Products.
18	64. For example, the Accused Emulsion Products contain each element of and infringe
19	at least claim 1, which states:
20	Claim 1. A system for forming an array of emulsions, comprising:
21	a plate including an array of emulsion production units, each unit including
22	at least one first input well to hold a continuous phase for an emulsion,
23	a second input well to hold a dispersed phase for an emulsion, and
24	an output well connected to the first and second input wells by a set of channels that form a channel junction, the set of channels including at least two input
25 26	channels extending separately from the input wells to the channel junction and an output channel extending from the channel junction to the output well, each channel of the set of channels being circumferentially bounded; and
27 28	a vacuum or pressure source configured to be connected operatively to wells of the plate to form a pressure drop between the input wells and the output well of each unit to drive the continuous phase and the dispersed phase from the first and
	-14- Case No. 3:17-cv-4339

# Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 16 of 38

second input wells of the unit to the channel junction, at which droplets of the dispersed phase are generated, and through the output channel for collection in the output well of the unit.

- 3 Defendant infringes each element of claim 1 of the '392 patent for the following reasons:
  - 65. The Accused Emulsion Products are droplet based emulsion systems that form
- 5 thousands of emulsions in parallel. On information and belief, these emulsions are formed by

6 combining a sample and reagents with a gel bead, encapsulating them in a water-in-oil emulsion,

7 and collecting those emulsions in outlet wells.

8 66. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products include a microfluidics
9 chip containing a plurality of emulsion formation units wherein each unit has a set of inlet wells
10 that are configured to hold either the oil phase (*i.e.* continuous phase), the sample, (*i.e.* dispersed
11 phase) or reagents (*e.g.* gel beads), and an outlet well to collect the emulsions.



18 Exhibit H, Black Sales Presentation, p. 32.

19 67. On information and belief, the microfluidics chip contains eight emulsion production units wherein each unit has separate channels extending from the oil well and sample 20 21 well (*i.e.* input wells) to a channel junction. On information and belief, the droplets containing the 22 sample in the oil phase (*i.e.* water-in-oil emulsion or dispersed phase in the continuous phase) are 23 generated at the channel junction and proceed from the channel junction down an outlet channel to 24 an outlet well where the emulsions are collected. As shown below, the sample inlet channel 25 extends from the sample well to a channel junction (red square below), and a droplet outlet channel extends from the channel junction to an outlet well for collecting the emulsions. 26

27

1

2

4



### Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 18 of 38

72. On information and belief Defendant has been aware of the existence of the '392
 patent since at least December 2015 as numerous founders of its company participated in the filing
 of the patent application leading to the '392 patent at least while they were employees at QuantLife
 or Bio-Rad. As described below, Defendant has been aware that its actions in testing and
 developing products and supplying products to others infringes the claims of the '392 patent.

6 73. On information and belief, Defendant is aware that the Accused Emulsion
7 Products, in their normal mode of operation for generating droplet based emulsions in a
8 microfluidic chip, practices each of the elements of Claim 1 of the '392 patent. By providing end
9 users with the Accused Emulsion Products and instructions to use the products in an intended
10 manner, which Defendant knows infringes at least Claim 1 of the '392 patent, Defendant has
11 induced infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

On information and belief, Defendant has supplied the Accused Emulsion Products 12 74. 13 to end users to generate droplet based emulsions, knowing that such products are not a staple 14 article of commerce and knowing that when used in their intended manner do not have substantial 15 uses which do not practice claim 1 of the '392 Patent. As set forth in the paragraphs above, the 16 Accused Emulsion Products supplied by Defendant are specifically designed to generate droplet 17 based emulsions. Defendant's act of supplying a material and substantial component of claim 1 of 18 the '392 Patent, which is not a staple and for which there are not substantial non-infringing uses, 19 constitutes contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

75. Defendant's infringement of the '392 patent has been willful and deliberate because
Defendant's knew or should have known about the '392 patent and their infringement of that patent
but acted despite an objectively high likelihood that such acts would infringe the patent. On
information and belief, at least three of the individuals who developed the Accused Emulsion
Products is the named inventor of the '392 patent who – while Bio-Rad employees, and on behalf
of Bio-Rad, which owns the '392 patent – were involved in the conception and/or reduction to
practice of the '392 patent and had knowledge of the patent since it issued in December 2015.

- 27
- 28

	Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 19 of 38
1	76. The marking requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287 have been satisfied through,
2	including but not limited to, Defendant's actual knowledge of the '392 patent and infringement
3	thereof.
4	77. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
5	and, if Defendant's conduct is not stopped, will continue to suffer, severe competitive harm,
6	irreparable injury, and significant damages, in an amount to be proven at trial. Because Plaintiffs'
7	remedy at law is inadequate, Plaintiffs seek, in addition to damages, temporary, preliminary, and
8	permanent injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' business operates in a competitive market and will continue
9	suffering irreparable harm absent injunctive relief.
10	FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
11	Infringement of Patent No. 9,347,059
12	78. Plaintiffs incorporate all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
13	79. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or through the
14	doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '059 patent, including but not limited to claim 1,
15	pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing within
16	the United States, without authority, certain emulsions formation products, including without
17	limitation, the Accused Emulsion Products.
18	80. For example, the Accused Emulsion Products contain each element of and infringe
19	at least claim 1, which states:
20	Claim 1. A method comprising:
21	a. generating a plurality of first partitions comprising adaptors, wherein each of the first partitions has on average a first volume and wherein the adaptors
22	comprise unique barcodes, wherein the first partitions are first droplets in a fluid that is immiscible to the first droplets:
23	b generating a plurality of second partitions comprising sample polynucleotides
24	wherein each of the second partitions has on average a second volume, wherein the second volume is greater than the first volume, wherein the second partitions
25	are second droplets in a immiscible fluid that is immiscible to the second droplets;
26	c. applying a treatment to fuse the at least one second partition with at least one first droplet to form a fused partition; and
27	
28	

# Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 20 of 38

1

2

24

25

26

27

28

d. tagging one of the sample polynucleotides, or fragment thereof, with at least one of the adaptors in the fused partition to form tagged polynucleotides or fragments thereof.

- 3 Defendant infringes each element of claim 1 of the '059 patent for the following reasons: The Accused Emulsion Products when tested and when used by customers are 4 81. 5 droplet based emulsion systems that use a method of forming thousands of emulsions in parallel. 6 On information and belief, in normal operation, these emulsions are formed by combining a 7 sample and reagents with a gel bead, encapsulating them in an oil emersion, and collecting those 8 emulsions in outlet wells.
- 9 82. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products, in normal operation, 10 such as when they are tested, use a method that has a first set of partitions containing gel beads 11 with unique adaptors and bar codes that are first droplets in a background fluid that does not mix 12 with the gel beads.



20 Exhibit J, Chromium Genome Reagents Kits User Guide at p. 2.

21 83. On information and belief, the "gel beads" used in the method contain numerous 22 copies of single oligo sequences extending from the surface with a "P5 adapter" and "10x barcode." 23

10x R1 P5 Barcode N-mer Case No. 3:17-cv-4339 -19-

## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 21 of 38



84. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products use a method that
generates a second set of partitions comprising the sample polypeptides encapsulated in an oil
phase (*i.e.* emulsions), and each of these emulsions are in an immiscible background fluid.



- 26
- 27
- 28



ect

5

6 Exhibit H, Black Sales Presentation, p. 31; *see also* Exhibit I, Chromium User Guide (Single Cell
7 3') p 2. ("Upon dissolution of the Single Cell 3' Gel Bead in a GEM, primers containing (i) an
8 Illumina R1 sequence (read 1 sequencing primer), (ii) a 16 bp 10x Barcode, (iii) a 10 bp Unique
9 Molecular Identifier (UMI) and (iv) a poly-dT primer sequence are released and mixed with cell
10 lysate and Master Mix. *Incubation of the GEMs then produces barcoded, full-length cDNA*11 *from poly-adenylated mRNA*.") (emphasis added).

and Recover

12 86. On information and belief, Defendant began selling the Chromium<sup>TM</sup> Product in the 13 United States since at least February 2016 and the GemCode Product since at least February 2015. 14 87. On information and belief, Defendant commercially manufactures, uses, offers for 15 sale, or sells within the United States, or imports into the United States the Chromium<sup>TM</sup> and 16 GemCode Products. Defendant's making, using, selling, and offering for sale of the Chromium<sup>™</sup> 17 and GemCode Products practices the methods identified above and infringes at least Claim 1 of 18 the '059 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

19 88. On information and belief Defendant has been aware of the existence of the '059
20 patent since at least May 2016 as numerous founders of its company participated in the filing of
21 the patent application leading to the '059 patent at least while they were employees at Bio-Rad.
22 As described below, Defendant has been aware that its actions in testing and developing products
23 and supplying products to others infringes the claims of the '059 patent

89. On information and belief, Defendant is aware that the Accused Emulsion
Products, in their normal mode of operation for generating droplet based emulsions in a
microfluidic chip, practices the method claimed in at least Claim 1 of the '059 patent. By
providing end users with the Accused Emulsion Products such as gel beads with bar codes,
microfluidic chips for forming partitions such as droplets, a droplet generator for creating droplets

### Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 23 of 38

in conjunction with the microfluidic chip and instructions to operate the product in an intended
 manner, which Defendant knows infringes the method claimed in at least Claim 1 of the '059
 patent, Defendant has induced infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

90. 4 On information and belief, Defendant has supplied the Accused Emulsion Products 5 to end users to generate droplet based emulsions using a microfluidics chip, knowing that such 6 products are specifically adapted to practice the methods of the invention, are not a staple article 7 of commerce and knowing that when used in their intended manner do not have substantial uses 8 which do not practice the method claimed in claim 1 of the '059 Patent. As set forth in the 9 paragraphs above, the Accused Emulsion Products supplied by Defendant are specifically 10 designed to be used to generate droplet based emulsions. Defendant's act of supplying a material 11 and substantial component of claim 1 of the '059 Patent, which is not a staple and for which there 12 are not substantial non-infringing uses, constitutes contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 13 271(c).

14 91. To the extent Defendant argues that it performs the step of generating a plurality of 15 first partitions by creating gel beads with adaptors and barcodes while its customers perform the 16 remaining steps of claim 1, Defendant is still liable for infringement under a joint infringement 17 theory. Defendant provides all the necessary components to its customers to perform the steps of 18 the claimed method. It provides directions to use those components in a way that when so used 19 practices the steps of the method other than what Defendant may claim to have practiced. The 20 guidance in using the materials Defendant provides its customers evidences sufficient direction 21 over its customers use of its products to constitute joint infringement.

92. Defendant's infringement of the '059 patent has been willful and deliberate because
Defendant's knew or should have known about the '059 patent and their infringement of that patent
but acted despite an objectively high likelihood that such acts would infringe the patent. On
information and belief, at least one of the individuals who developed the Accused Emulsion
Products is the named inventor of the '059 patent who – while a Bio-Rad employee, and on behalf
of Bio-Rad, which owns the '059 patent – was involved in the conception and/or reduction to
practice of the '059 patent and had knowledge of the patent since it issued in May 2016.

1	93. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
2	and, if Defendant's conduct is not stopped, will continue to suffer, severe competitive harm,
3	irreparable injury, and significant damages, in an amount to be proven at trial. Because Plaintiffs'
4	remedy at law is inadequate, Plaintiffs seek, in addition to damages, temporary, preliminary, and
5	permanent injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' business operates in a competitive market and will continue
6	suffering irreparable harm absent injunctive relief.
7	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
8	Infringement of Patent No. 9,500,664
9	94. Plaintiffs incorporate all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
10	95. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or through the
11	doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '664 patent, including but not limited to claim 8,
12	pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing within
13	the United States, without authority, certain emulsions formation products, including without
14	limitation, the Accused Emulsion Products.
15	96. For example, the Accused Emulsion Products contain each element of and infringe
16	at least claim 8, which states:
17	<b>Claim 8.</b> A method of generating sample-containing droplets suspended in a background fluid, comprising:
18	transporting sample-containing fluid into a sample well;
19	transporting background fluid into a background fluid well;
20	transporting sample-containing fluid through a first channel, from the sample well
21	to a dropiet generation region;
22	fluid well to the droplet generation region;
23 24	generating sample-containing droplets suspended in the background fluid at the droplet generation region; and
25	transporting the sample-containing droplets through a third channel, from the
26	droplet generation region to a droplet well;
27	wherein an upper region of each of the sample well, the background fluid well, and the droplet well protrudes from the top surface;
28	

# Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 25 of 38

wherein the first channel, the second channel, the third channel, and the droplet 1 generation region are formed in a bottom surface of the substrate; and 2 wherein the substrate and the upper region of each well are injection molded as a 3 single piece. 4 Defendant infringes each element of claim 8 of the '664 patent for the following reasons: 5 97. The Accused Emulsion Products are droplet based emulsion systems that use a method of forming thousands of emulsions in parallel. On information and belief, these emulsions 6 7 are formed by combining a sample and reagents with a gel bead, encapsulating them in a water-in-8 oil emulsion, and collecting those emulsions in outlet wells. 9 98. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products use a method that uses 10 a microfluidics chip having a bottom surface and a top surface, and each of the wells in the 11 microfluidics chip has an upper region that protrudes through the top surface of the chip. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Exhibit I, Chromium User Guide (Single Cell 3') at p. 55. 19 99. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products use a method having a set of wells containing either the sample, oil, or other reagents (*e.g.* gel beads), which are 20 21 fluidically interconnected by channels in the bottom surface of the chip to form a channel junction 22 (red square) wherein the oil phase encompasses the sample and gel bead to generate emulsions. 23 On information and belief, the channel junction or "droplet generation region" is the intersection 24 of the oil phase (background fluid) channel, sample containing fluid channel, and outlet channel 25 with the sample-containing emulsions (droplets). 26 27 28

-24-



## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 27 of 38

filing of the patent application leading to the '664 patent at least while they were employees at
 Bio-Rad. As described below, Defendant has been aware that its actions in testing and developing
 products and supplying products to others infringes the claims of the '664 patent.

4 104. On information and belief, Defendant is aware that the Accused Emulsion
5 Products, in their normal mode of operation for generating droplet based emulsions in a
6 microfluidic chip, practices the method claimed in at least Claim 8 of the '664 patent. By
7 providing end users with the Accused Emulsion Products and instructions to use the products in an
8 intended manner, which Defendant knows infringes at least Claim 8 of the '664 patent, Defendant
9 has induced infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

10 105. On information and belief, Defendant has supplied the Accused Emulsion Products to end users to generate droplet based emulsions using a microfluidics chip, knowing that such 11 12 products are specifically adapted to practice the methods of the invention, are not a staple article 13 of commerce and knowing that when used in their intended manner do not have substantial uses 14 which do not practice the method claimed in claim 8 of the '664 Patent. As set forth in the 15 paragraphs above, the Accused Emulsion Products supplied by Defendant are specifically 16 designed to generate droplet based emulsions. Defendant's act of supplying a material and 17 substantial component of claim 8 of the '664 Patent, which is not a staple and for which there are 18 not substantial non-infringing uses, constitutes contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 19 271(c).

106. Defendant's infringement of the '664 patent has been willful and deliberate because
Defendant's knew or should have known about the '664 patent and their infringement of that patent
but acted despite an objectively high likelihood that such acts would infringe the patent. On
information and belief, at least two of the individuals who developed the Accused Emulsion
Products are named inventors of the '664 patent who – while Bio-Rad employees, and on behalf of
Bio-Rad, which owns the '664 patent – were involved in the conception and/or reduction to
practice of the '664 patent and had knowledge of the patent since it issued in November 2016.

27 107. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
28 and, if Defendant's conduct is not stopped, will continue to suffer, severe competitive harm,

1	irreparable injury, and significant damages, in an amount to be proven at trial. Because Plaintiffs'
2	remedy at law is inadequate, Plaintiffs seek, in addition to damages, temporary, preliminary, and
3	permanent injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' business operates in a competitive market and will continue
4	suffering irreparable harm absent injunctive relief.
5	SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
6	Infringement of Patent No. 9,636,682

108. Plaintiffs incorporate all of t	he above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
--------------------------------------	---

109. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or through the

9 doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '682 patent, including but not limited to claim 1,

10 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing within

11 the United States, without authority, certain emulsions formation products, including without

12 || limitation, the Accused Emulsion Products.

110. For example, the Accused Emulsion Products infringe each element of claim 1,

14 which states:

7

8

13

19

20

21

22

23

- 15 Claim 1. A system for generating droplets, comprising:
- a device including a sample well configured to receive sample-containing fluid, a continuous-phase well configured to receive continuous-phase fluid, and a droplet well, the device also including a channel network having a first channel, a second channel, and a third channel that meet one another in a droplet-generation region;
- a holder for the device;

and an instrument configured to operatively receive an assembly including the device and the holder and to drive sample-containing fluid from the sample well to the dropletgeneration region via the first channel, continuous-phase fluid from the continuous-phase well to the droplet-generation region via the second channel, and sample-containing droplets from the droplet-generation region to the droplet well via the third channel.

Defendant infringes each element of claim 1 of the '682 patent for the following reasons:

- 111. The Accused Emulsion Products are droplet based emulsion systems that form
- 24 thousands of emulsions (*i.e.* droplets) in parallel. On information and belief, these emulsions are

25 formed by combining a sample and reagents with a gel bead, encapsulating them in a water-in-oil

26 emulsion, and collecting those emulsions in outlet wells in a microfluidic chip.

27

## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 29 of 38

1 112. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products include a microfluidics
 2 chip containing a plurality of emulsion formation units wherein each unit has a set of inlet wells
 3 that are configured to hold either the oil phase (*i.e.* continuous phase), the sample, (*i.e.* dispersed
 4 phase) or reagents (*e.g.* gel beads), and an outlet well to collect the emulsions.



12 113. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products have a set of wells
13 containing either the sample, oil, or other reagents (gel beads), which are fluidically
14 interconnected by channels in the bottom surface of the chip to form a channel junction (red
15 square) wherein the oil phase encompasses the sample and gel bead to generate emulsions. On
16 information and belief, the channel junction or "droplet generation region" is the intersection of
17 the oil phase channel, sample containing fluid channel, and outlet channel with the sample18 containing emulsions.







## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 32 of 38

1 121. On information and belief, Defendant has supplied the Accused Emulsion Products 2 to end users to generate droplet based emulsions, knowing that such products are not a staple 3 article of commerce and knowing that when used in their intended manner do not have substantial 4 uses which do not practice claim 1 of the '682 Patent. As set forth in the paragraphs above, the 5 Accused Emulsion Products supplied by Defendant are specifically designed to generate droplet based emulsions. Defendant's act of supplying a material and substantial component of claim 1 of 6 7 the '682 Patent, which is not a staple and for which there are not substantial non-infringing uses, 8 constitutes contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

9 122. Defendant's infringement of the '682 patent has been willful and deliberate because
10 Defendant's knew or should have known about the '682 patent and their infringement of that patent
11 but acted despite an objectively high likelihood that such acts would infringe the patent. On
12 information and belief, at least three of the individuals who developed the Accused Emulsion
13 Products are named inventors of the '682 patent who – while Bio-Rad employees, and on behalf of
14 Bio-Rad, which owns the '682 patent – were involved in the conception and/or reduction to
15 practice of the '682 patent and had knowledge of the patent since it issued in May 2017.

16 123. The marking requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287 have been satisfied through,
17 including but not limited to, Defendant's actual knowledge of the '682 patent and infringement
18 thereof.

19 124. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
20 and, if Defendant's conduct is not stopped, will continue to suffer, severe competitive harm,
21 irreparable injury, and significant damages, in an amount to be proven at trial. Because Plaintiffs'
22 remedy at law is inadequate, Plaintiffs seek, in addition to damages, temporary, preliminary, and
23 permanent injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' business operates in a competitive market and will continue
24 suffering irreparable harm absent injunctive relief.

- 25
- 26

27

125.

Plaintiffs incorporate all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION** 

Infringement of Patent No. 9,649,635

I	
1	126. Defendant has infringed, and continues to infringe, literally and/or through the
2	doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '635 patent, including but not limited to claim 1,
3	pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing within
4	the United States, without authority, certain emulsions formation products, including without
5	limitation, the Accused Emulsion Products.
6	127. For example, the Accused Emulsion Products infringe each element of claim 1,
7	which states:
8	Claim 1. A system to form and concentrate an emulsion, comprising:
9 10	a device including a sample well configured to receive sample-containing fluid, a continuous-phase well configured to receive continuous-phase fluid, and a droplet well, the device also including a channel network having a first channel, a second
11	channel, and third channel that meet one another in a droplet-generation region; and
12	an instrument configured to operatively receive the device and to create
13	(a) a first pressure differential to drive sample-containing fluid from the sample well to the droplet-generation region via the first channel, continuous-phase fluid
14 15	from the continuous-phase well to the droplet-generation region via the second channel, and sample-containing droplets from the droplet-generation region to the droplet well via the third channel, such that the droplet well collects an emulsion including sample-containing droplets disposed in continuous-phase fluid, and
16 17 18	(b) a second pressure differential to decrease a volume fraction of continuous- phase fluid in the emulsion, after the emulsion has been collected in the droplet well, by selectively driving continuous-phase fluid, relative to sample-containing droplets, from the droplet well via the third channel.
19	Defendant infringes each element of claim 1 of the '635 patent for the following reasons:
20	128. The Accused Emulsion Products are droplet based emulsion systems that form
21	thousands of emulsions ( <i>i.e.</i> droplets) in parallel. On information and belief, these emulsions are
22	formed by combining a sample and reagents with a gel bead, encapsulating them in a water-in-oil
23	emulsion, and collecting those emulsions in outlet wells in a microfluidic chip.
24	129. On information and belief, after collecting the emulsion in the outlet well, the
25	Chromium <sup>™</sup> product incorporates a second pressure differential to decrease a volume fraction of
26	continuous-phase fluid in the emulsions collected in the outlet wells by using a "pushback" step of
27	pushing the oil from the outlet well back into the outlet channel towards the inlet wells to remove
28	excess oil from under the droplets $-i.e.$ concentrating the emulsions as claimed in step b above.
	-32- Case No. 3:17-cv-4339

## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 34 of 38

1 130. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products include a microfluidics
 2 chip containing a plurality of emulsion formation units wherein each unit has a set of inlet wells
 3 that are configured to hold either the oil phase (*i.e.* continuous phase), the sample, (*i.e.* dispersed
 4 phase) or reagents (*e.g.* gel beads), and an outlet well to collect the emulsions.

Single-use microfluidics chip Outlet well Bead well Sample well Oil well

11 Exhibit H, Black Sales Presentation, p. 32.

5

6

7

8

9

10

12 131. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products have a set of wells
13 containing either the sample, oil, or other reagents (gel beads), which are fluidically
14 interconnected by channels in the bottom surface of the chip to form a channel junction (red
15 square) wherein the oil phase encompasses the sample and gel bead to generate emulsions. On
16 information and belief, the channel junction or "droplet generation region" is the intersection of
17 the oil phase channel, sample containing fluid channel, and outlet channel with the sample18 containing emulsions.



## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 35 of 38

1 132. On information and belief, the Accused Emulsion Products use an instrument, such
 2 as the Chromium<sup>™</sup> Controller, to receive the microfluidic chip and chip holder.



## Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 36 of 38

incorporates a "pushback" step of pushing the oil from the outlet well back into the outlet channel
 towards the inlet wells to remove excess oil from under the droplets – *i.e.* concentrating the
 droplets.

Intersection 135. On information and belief, Defendant began selling the Chromium<sup>TM</sup> Product in the
United States since at least February 2016 and the GemCode Product since at least February 2015.
Intersection 136. On information and belief, Defendant commercially manufactures, uses, offers for
sale, or sells within the United States, or imports into the United States the Chromium<sup>TM</sup> and
GemCode Products. Defendant's making, using, selling, and offering for sale of the Chromium<sup>TM</sup>

and GemCode Products infringes at least Claim 1 of the '635 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

10 137. On information and belief Defendant has been aware of the existence of the '635
11 patent since at least May 2017, as numerous founders of its company participated in the filing of
12 related patent applications leading to the '635 application while they were employees at Bio-Rad.
13 As described below, Defendant has been aware that its actions in testing and developing products
14 and supplying products to others infringes the claims of the '635 patent.

- 15 138. On information and belief, Defendant is aware that the Accused Emulsion
  Products, in their normal mode of operation for generating droplet based emulsions in a
  microfluidic chip, practices each of the elements of Claim 1 of the '635 patent. By providing end
  users with the Accused Emulsion Products and instructions to use the products in an intended
  manner, which Defendant knows infringes at least Claim 1 of the '635 patent, Defendant has
  induced infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).
- 21 139. On information and belief, Defendant has supplied the Accused Emulsion Products 22 to end users to generate droplet based emulsions, knowing that such products are not a staple 23 article of commerce and knowing that when used in their intended manner do not have substantial 24 uses which do not practice claim 1 of the '635 Patent. As set forth in the paragraphs above, the 25 Accused Emulsion Products supplied by Defendant are specifically designed to generate droplet 26 based emulsions. Defendant's act of supplying a material and substantial component of claim 1 of 27 the '635 Patent, which is not a staple and for which there are not substantial non-infringing uses, 28 constitutes contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

# Case 3:17-cv-04339 Document 1 Filed 07/31/17 Page 37 of 38

1	140.	Defendant's infringement of the '635 patent has been willful and	deliberate because	
2	Defendant's kn	Defendant's knew or should have known about the '635 patent and their infringement of that patent		
3	but acted despite an objectively high likelihood that such acts would infringe the patent. On			
4	information and belief, at least three of the individuals who developed the Accused Emulsion			
5	Products are named inventors of the '635 patent who – while Bio-Rad employees, and on behalf of			
6	Bio-Rad, which owns the '635 patent – were involved in the conception and/or reduction to			
7	practice of the '635 patent and had knowledge of the patent since it issued in May 2017.			
8	141. '	The marking requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287 have been satisfied	d through,	
9	including but not limited to, Defendant's actual knowledge of the existence of the '635 patent and			
10	its infringement thereof.			
11	142.	As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaint	iffs have suffered	
12	and, if Defendant's conduct is not stopped, will continue to suffer, severe competitive harm,			
13	irreparable injury, and significant damages, in an amount to be proven at trial. Because Plaintiffs'			
14	remedy at law is inadequate, Plaintiffs seek, in addition to damages, temporary, preliminary, and			
15	permanent injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' business operates in a competitive market and will continue			
16	suffering irreparable harm absent injunctive relief.			
17	PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
18	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request the following relief:			
19	<b>A</b> . 3	Enter judgement in favor of Plaintiffs on each of their claims;		
20	<b>B</b> . 1	Enter judgement against Defendant adjudging the Asserted Pater	nts to be valid,	
21	enforceable, and infringed;			
22	C	Award Plaintiffs injunctive relief;		
23	D	Award Plaintiffs an amount adequate to compensate for Defenda	nt's infringement	
24	of the Asserted Patents, including lost profits and/or a reasonable royalty under 35 U.S.C. § 284;			
25	E. (	Grant Plaintiffs' pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the	damages caused to	
26	it by reason of Defendant's infringement of the Asserted Patents;			
27	<b>F.</b>	Find that infringement has been willful and enhance damages acc	cordingly;	
28				
		-36-	Case No. 3:17-cv-4339	
			COMPLAINT	

1	G. Declare that this is an "exceptional case" under 35 U.S.C. § 285, and award			
2	Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses that it incur prosecuting their claims; and			
3	H. That Plaintiffs be awarded such other and further relief as this court deems just and			
4	proper.			
5	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL			
6	Plaintiffs hereby demand trial by jury for all causes of action, claims, or issues in this			
7	action that are triable as a matter of right to a jury.			
8				
9	DATED: July 31, 2017 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,			
10				
11	David Wile			
12	By David Bilsker			
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs BIO-RAD LABORATORIES, INC. AND			
14	LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL SECURITY, LLC			
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
$\frac{21}{22}$				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	27 Case No. 3.17-01-4330			
	-57- COMDI AINT			
	COMPLAINT			