

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA**

NATERA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEOGENOMICS LABORATORIES,
INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:23-cv-629-CCE-JLW

**NEOGENOMICS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR ISSUANCE OF
LETTERS OF REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND TO
EXAMINE PERSONS PURSUANT TO HAGUE EVIDENCE CONVENTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
SUMMARY OF REPLY	1
I. RULE 16'S "GOOD CAUSE" STANDARD DOES NOT APPLY BECAUSE NEOGENOMICS HAS NOT REQUESTED TO EXTEND THE FACT DISCOVERY DEADLINE	3
II. NEOGENOMICS' REQUESTS ARE PROPER UNDER THE LAW OF INVENTORSHIP	6
III. NEOGENOMICS' REQUESTS ARE SPECIFICALLY DIRECTED TO DRS	7
IV. NEOGENOMICS' REQUESTS ARE NOT INCONSISTENT WITH ITS EARLIER POSITIONS	10
V. CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR DR. SWANTON	11
CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Banner Pharmacaps, Inc. v. Perrigo Co.</i> , No. 1:04-CV-00492, 2005 WL8165011 (M.D.N.C. July 6, 2005).....	1
<i>Blue Gentian, LLC v. Tristar Prods., Inc.</i> , 70 F.4th 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2023)	6, 9
<i>Compagnie des Grands Hotels d’Afrique S.A. v. Starman Hotel Holdings LLC</i> , No. 18-00654 RGA, 2019 WL3391971 (D. Del. Jul. 26, 2019).....	12
<i>In re Customs & Tax Admin. Of the Kingdom of Den. (SKAT) Tax Refund Litig.</i> , No. 18-MD-2865 (LAK), 2024 WL 3184978 (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 26, 2024)	3, 4
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. United States Surgical Corp.</i> , 135 F.3d 1456 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	6, 7
<i>In re Horstemeyer</i> , 557 B.R. 427 (Bankr. D.S.C. 2016)	5
<i>IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 18-452-WCB, 2021 WL 11960830 (D. Del. Oct. 15, 2021).....	4
<i>Magnetar Techs. Corp. v. Six Flags Theme Parks Inc.</i> , 599 Fed. App’x 960 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	6
<i>McAirlaids, Inc. v. Kimberly-Clark Corp. et al.</i> , No. 7:13-CV-193, Dkt. 346 (W.D. Va. Jan. 16, 2015)	5
<i>McGill v. Armstrong</i> , No. C:84-CV-1118-S, 1986 WL 2428 (M.D.N.C. Feb. 4, 1986)	5
<i>Mr. Dee’s Inc. v. Inmar, Inc.</i> , No. 1:19-CV-141, 2022 WL 825995 (M.D.N.C. Mar. 18, 2022).....	5
<i>Plastipak Packaging, Inc. v. Premium Waters, Inc.</i> , 55 F.4th 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	1, 6
<i>Stewart v. Peffer</i> , No. 92-1806, 1993 WL 21981 (4th Cir. Feb. 3, 1993) (per curiam)	2, 5
<i>Trovan, Ltd. v. Sokymat SA, Irori</i> , 299 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	7, 11

Other Authorities

FRCP Rule 16 1, 3

SUMMARY OF REPLY

Natera's opposition confirms that it is desperate to avoid the requested discovery into Dr. Swanton's and Dr. Jamal-Hanjani's collaboration with Natera on the inventions claimed in the asserted patents, as well as a fulsome presentation of NeoGenomics' improper inventorship defense to the Court and jury. Most glaringly, Natera relies on incorrect case law to assert that the requested discovery is irrelevant because Natera is no longer asserting the implicated claims. But improper inventorship as to a single claim renders the entire patent invalid, regardless of whether the claim is asserted. *Plastipak Packaging, Inc. v. Premium Waters, Inc.*, 55 F.4th 1332, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2022) ("While inventorship is evaluated on a claim-by-claim basis, the failure to join an inventor of any claim invalidates the entire patent.").

Similarly, Natera relies on incorrect case law to argue that NeoGenomics has not shown good cause as required to modify the case schedule under Rule 16. Because NeoGenomics has not requested an extension of the fact discovery deadline, Rule 16's good cause standard does not apply, and instead the Court should be guided by the liberal standard courts routinely rely on in evaluating motions for letters rogatory. *See, e.g., Banner Pharmacaps, Inc. v. Perrigo Co.*, No. 1:04-CV-00492, 2005 WL8165011, at *2 (M.D.N.C. July 6, 2005) ("outside of the realm of the substance of the discovery, ***some good reason must be shown by the opposing party*** for a court to deny a motion for a Letter of Request") (emphasis added).

Unable to muster any cogent opposition to the relevance of the requested discovery

under the correct legal standards, Natera speculates about future timing and procedure, asserting that it is “likely” the discovery will necessitate modification of the scheduling order. Natera’s speculation is both premature and wrong. Discovery remains open for more than three months, and NeoGenomics expects to complete the requested depositions before fact discovery closes by prosecuting the Letters directly to the English High Court through its outside counsel’s London office. Regardless, if the process takes longer, the Court can then decide whether to allow the depositions to occur after the current discovery period. *See, e.g., Stewart v. Pepper*, No. 92-1806, 1993 WL 21981, at *3 (4th Cir. Feb. 3, 1993) (per curiam) (finding witness unavailability a reason for a *de bene esse* deposition four days before trial). Denying NeoGenomics’ motion now based on Natera’s speculation would be premature and highly prejudicial to NeoGenomics.

Finally, Natera’s opposition wrongly attempts to litigate the merits of NeoGenomics’ defense primarily based on testimony of Natera’s own witness (Dr. Zimmermann). Aside from the fact that Dr. Zimmerman’s account contradicts the considerable overlap between the asserted patents and information indisputably provided to Natera by Drs. Swanton and Jamal-Hanjani, the sworn testimony from those non-Natera witnesses will be central to the merits of NeoGenomics’ defense. If those witnesses testify under oath that they made no inventive contributions, then the debate ends, and nobody has been materially prejudiced. But if their sworn testimony supports NeoGenomics’ position, the public’s interest in not allowing Natera to monopolize cancer testing methods with invalid patents would be served. Respectfully, the Court should not block NeoGenomics’

ability to take additional discovery to serve its and the public's interests by proving that Natera's patents are invalid.

I. Rule 16's "good cause" standard does not apply because NeoGenomics has not requested to extend the fact discovery deadline.

Natera argues that "the Court should deny NeoGenomics' motion because the discovery it seeks will *likely* require extending the fact discovery deadline—*potentially* by a very significant amount," and that NeoGenomics has not shown good cause to extend the discovery deadline as required by Rule 16. *See* Dkt. 354 at 4 (emphasis added). Notwithstanding Natera's speculation, good cause is not the applicable standard because NeoGenomics is not seeking to extend the case schedule under Rule 16.

As detailed in the accompanying Declaration of Chiraag Shah (a UK attorney with experience prosecuting applications for Letters Rogatory in the UK), the requested depositions can likely be completed prior to the close of discovery as long as NeoGenomics' motion is granted relatively soon. Ex. 1, Shah Decl., ¶ 5. That is because rather than the typical process, which requires the UK government to prosecute the application, Mr. Shah plans to expedite the process by directly prosecuting the application to the English High Court through its London office. *Id.* In view of this evidence, the Court should not permit Natera to obstruct the requested discovery based on speculation about how long the process might take.

Further, the only case Natera cites where issuance of a Letter of Request was denied due to the risk of delay is unpublished and distinguishable. *In re Customs* was a multidistrict litigation (MDL) encompassing more than one hundred actions brought by the

Customs and Tax Administration of the Kingdom of Denmark to recover funds allegedly obtained from it by fraud. *In re Customs & Tax Admin. Of the Kingdom of Den. (SKAT) Tax Refund Litig.*, No. 18-MD-2865 (LAK), 2024 WL 3184978, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 26, 2024). The defendant filed a motion for a letter of request six months before trial, years after fact discovery had closed, and after summary judgment had already been denied. *Id.* at *1, *4. The court was “particularly averse to risking delay” because the case had been pending for more than six years, and the trial was the first of several trials in the MDL, meaning delay was “likely to have knock-on effects for subsequent trials.” *Id.* at *4. The delay was further complicated because the defendant faced a pending criminal trial in Denmark, which “might affect the timing of Danish authorities’ decision” as to the letter rogatory. *Id.* Even more, the court found that the testimony sought from the foreign witness “would be of little value” and “cumulative of other evidence and witnesses available in the United States,” particularly because the parties’ joint Rule 56.1 statement at summary judgement had already set out the subject matter of the discovery sought “in considerable detail.” *Id.* at *3. None of these myriad aggravating factors are present here. Not only is this case on an expedited track, but NeoGenomics’ motion was timely filed,¹

¹ NeoGenomics filed its motion three days after the Court granted Natera’s motion to amend its complaint to add the ’596 Patent, the day before Natera even filed the amended complaint, and almost four months prior to the close of discovery. Consequently, Natera’s reliance on *IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.*, No. 18-452-WCB, 2021 WL 11960830 (D. Del. Oct. 15, 2021), is also misplaced. In that case, the movant waited until just ten days before the close of discovery to pursue a deposition pursuant to the Hague. *Id.* at *1.

fact discovery remains open, there is no parallel international action that could affect the timing of the English Court's decisions as to the letters of request, and Drs. Swanton and Jamal-Hanjani have unique, unbiased knowledge regarding inventorship of the asserted patents that cannot be obtained from other witnesses available in the United States (and certainly not from Natera's own biased witness).²

Finally, to the extent the process is delayed, and the depositions cannot be taken before the close of fact discovery, the Court has discretion to permit *de bene esse* depositions up until trial. *See, e.g., Stewart*, 1993 WL 21981, at *3; *Mr. Dee's Inc. v. Inmar, Inc.*, No. 1:19-CV-141, 2022 WL 825995, at *5 (M.D.N.C. Mar. 18, 2022) (recognizing the ability of counsel to take a trial deposition after discovery had ended); *McGill v. Armstrong*, No. C:84-CV-1118-S, 1986 WL 2428, at *3 (M.D.N.C. Feb. 4, 1986) ("The court may consider conducting the trial through a *de bene esse* deposition, be it videotaped, audiotaped, or stenographically transcribed."); *In re Horstemeyer*, 557 B.R. 427, 432 (Bankr. D.S.C. 2016) ("Despite case law authorities that there is no absolute right to take a *de bene esse* deposition after the discovery period has closed, it is within the court's discretion to allow such a deposition to occur."); *McAirlaids, Inc. v. Kimberly-Clark Corp. et al.*, No. 7:13-CV-193, Dkt. 346 (W.D. Va. Jan. 16, 2015) (granting motion

² While Natera points to an email from Dr. Jamal-Hanjani to support its position, that email actually underscores the need for the requested depositions because it demonstrates Dr. Jamal-Hanjani's uncertainty on the issue. *See* Dkt. 144-8 at 4-5 ("I can't ***easily ascertain*** if any data from my thesis or work we did with natera . . . has contributed to the patent.") (emphasis added). NeoGenomics believes that pointed deposition questions will aid the process.

to take *de bene esse* deposition two months after fact discovery closed and reserving for later decision whether to permit the witness to testify live at trial in lieu of using his deposition testimony).

NeoGenomics therefore respectfully submits that the most prudent course would be for the Court to grant the motion now, and if it turns out that the process is delayed beyond the close of discovery, decide then whether to allow the depositions prior to trial.

II. NeoGenomics' requests are proper under the law of inventorship.

Natera argues that the proposed examination topics are irrelevant and unduly burdensome because they relate only to “unasserted dependent claims.” *See* Dkt. 354, at 16. Natera’s argument is contrary to inventorship law. “[T]he failure to join an inventor of *any claim* invalidates the *entire* patent.” *Plastipak Packaging*, 55 F.4th at 1340 (emphasis added). Whether the challenged claim is asserted or unasserted, independent or dependent, does not affect inventorship so long as the alleged inventor “contributed significantly to the conception . . . or reduction to practice of *at least one claim*.” *Blue Gentian, LLC v. Tristar Prods., Inc.*, 70 F.4th 1351, 1358, 1361-62 (Fed. Cir. 2023) (emphasis added); *see also, Magnetar Techs. Corp. v. Six Flags Theme Parks Inc.*, 599 Fed. App’x 960 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (Mem.) (affirming summary judgment of invalidity of the entire patent for improper inventorship of unasserted claims); *Ethicon, Inc. v. United States Surgical Corp.*, 135 F.3d 1456, 1460 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (A claimed inventor does not need to “make a contribution to every claim of a patent. A contribution to one claim is enough.”). (Internal citations omitted).

Natera's reliance on *Trovan, Ltd. v. Sokymat SA, Irori*, 299 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002), is misplaced. The Federal Circuit in *Trovan* did not hold that improper inventorship can only apply to asserted claims. Rather, the court emphasized the need to properly construe claims during the improper inventorship analysis. *Id.* at 1302. Indeed, *Trovan* cites *Ethicon* for the proposition that “a co-inventor of at least one claim is entitled to a pro rata undivided interest in the entire patent.” 299 F.3d at 1310 (citing *Ethicon*, 135 F.3d at 1465-66). The unasserted patents are thus invalid if Drs. Swanton and Jamal-Hanjani invented any of the patents' claims.³

III. NeoGenomics' requests are specifically directed to Drs. Jamal-Hanjani's and Swanton's contributions to the alleged inventions as claimed.

NeoGenomics' request is narrowly tailored to its claim of improper inventorship in response to Natera's First Amended Complaint—that is, based on Drs. Jamal-Hanjani's and Swanton's conception of applying Natera's assay to track clonal heterogeneity by analyzing cfDNA for tumor-specific mutations, and specifically tracking the identified tumor-specific mutations in the relevant claims. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 352-10, '596 Patent at Claim 4 (“The method of claim 1, wherein the tumor-specific mutations comprise one or

³ Moreover, despite the Court's order that Natera narrow its infringement contentions (Dkt. 345), Natera claims it has an undisturbed right to amend its selection of narrowed claims. *See* Dkt. 355-6, Dec. 11, 2024 email from T. Srinivasan (“Natera reserves the right to make timely amendments to the selection of Asserted Claims to due [sic] ongoing fact discovery and claim construction.”). While NeoGenomics believes that such amendments would be improper, Natera's reservation of rights further supports granting NeoGenomics' motion.

more SNV mutations in a gene selected from the group consisting of CYFIP1, FAT1, MLLT4, RASA1, HERC4, JAK2, MSH2, MTOR, PLCG2, GABRG1, and TRIM67.”); Dkt. 001-1, Claim 7, ’454 Patent (“The method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises determining clonal heterogeneity of the tumor sample.”). Natera’s assertion that its inventors purportedly contributed the idea using of whole exome sequencing (“WES”) or whole genome sequencing (“WGS”) as the first step in its assay is thus irrelevant. *See* Dkt. 354 at 16-17. The issue of inventorship for the relevant claims is not who conceived of an assay—it is who conceived of *applying* that assay as recited in the dependent claims of the ’596 and ’454 patents.

As between Natera’s inventors and Drs. Jamal-Hanjani and Swanton, the documents produced in this case strongly suggest that Drs. Jamal-Hanjani and Swanton conceived of the claimed applications. This concept was explained in Dr. Jamal-Hanjani’s thesis, which was shared with Natera during the collaboration. For example, claims 4 and 7 of the ’596 patent are directed to methods of detecting the *exact* subclonal mutations identified by Dr. Jamal-Hanjani in the thesis. *See* Dkt. 352 at 10-11, 17.

Natera does not argue in its opposition that the named inventors conceived of the combination of using an assay to track clonal and subclonal mutations in cell-free DNA. Instead, Natera simply states that the mutations themselves were generally known.⁴ Even

⁴ The testimony from Dr. Zimmerman cited by Natera concerned only the “whole exome sequencing [] or whole genome sequencing” elements in the ’454 patent and does not address any of the specific SNVs in claims 4 and 7 of the ’596 patent. *See* Dkt. 355-1 at 87:9-12, 100:24-104:12, 105:16-109:13, 109:24-113:19. More broadly, Dr. Zimmerman’s

if true, however, such an assertion does not defeat Drs. Jamal-Hanjani's and Swanton's inventorship. As the Federal Circuit has repeatedly recognized, even where inventions are a combination of individual elements that are known in the art, the act of inventorship lies in combining those elements in a nonobvious manner. *See, e.g., Blue Gentian*, 70 F.4th at 1361-62 (“[I]t is the significance of [the joint inventor]’s overall contribution that matters for determining inventorship, not the significance of certain elements standing alone.”).

Moreover, in response to NeoGenomics’ invalidity challenge to the ’454 Patent at the preliminary injunction stage, Natera relied on Example 13 as written description support for the asserted claims. *See* Dkt. 144 at 7-8 (citing Metzker Decl., Dkt. 145 at 129-131). As explained in NeoGenomics’ opening brief, Example 13 of the ’454 patent describes work and data taken from the Jamal-Hanjani thesis. *See* Dkt. 352 at 13-17. Sworn testimony from those witnesses confirming that they directed the experiments underlying Example 13 would thus also be powerful evidence of inventorship of the claims that flow directly from Example 13.

In view of the above, NeoGenomics’ proposed topics of examination are relevant and not overbroad. *See also*, Ex. 1, Shah Decl., ¶ 7 (confirming that the proposed topics of examination will likely be accepted by the English Court). NeoGenomics further respectfully submits that if there are doubts about that issue, the United Kingdom High Court can determine whether the requested topics are proper under United Kingdom law.

testimony does not address who conceived of using Natera’s assay to track clonal and subclonal mutations in ctDNA, which is common to both patents.

See Ex. 1, Shah Decl., ¶ 8 (stating that if the English court determines that the topics are overbroad or do not comport with English law, that court may either strike or narrow them).⁵

IV. NeoGenomics' requests are not inconsistent with its earlier positions.

NeoGenomics' decision to drop its inequitable conduct counterclaim is irrelevant to NeoGenomics' improper inventorship defense. Improper inventorship invalidates a patent without regard to whether the other elements of inequitable conduct are satisfied. More importantly, as explained in its opening brief, NeoGenomics maintained its improper inventorship claim as to the '454 patent, Dkt. 352 at 4, n.1 and the application of the defense to the newly asserted '596 is even more straightforward, *see* Section III *supra*.

Natera asserts that the requested depositions would exceed the 10-deposition limit NeoGenomics' previously sought under the local rules' presumptive limits for an "exceptional" case. As an initial matter, neither the parties nor the Court has determined the number of additional depositions for the remaining fact discovery period. Regardless, NeoGenomics has not stated that it will depose all seven fact witnesses Natera recently identified (the day before it filed its response brief) in relation to the '596 patent, six of whom have already been deposed with respect to the '454 patent. In any case, issuing the

⁵ Natera's Opposition challenges the document requests included in the Letters of Request as overbroad under UK law. The key evidence NeoGenomics seeks from Drs. Jamal-Hanjani and Swanton is their testimony. Thus, to minimize the potential disputes before this Court and the UK court, NeoGenomics withdraws the document requests and submits herewith revised letters of request directed solely to testimony. Exs. 2 & 3.

letters of request for the two requested depositions would not require a departure from the presumptive limits.

That NeoGenomics previously sought a limit to the number of depositions prior to the addition of the '596 patent also does not bar the requested depositions. Contrary to Natera's assertion, the operative facts in this case have changed. Although the asserted patents share the same specification, unlike the '454 Patent, the claims of the '596 patent list the *exact same* variants used in the TRACERx study conceived of and led by Drs. Swanton and Jamal-Hanjani. *See Trovan*, 299 F.3d at 1303 (“[I]nventorship is determined on a claim-by-claim basis.”). Testimony from Drs. Swanton and Jamal-Hanjani thus now has even more relevance.

V. Confidentiality of the Letter of Request for Dr. Swanton

The Court's December 10, 2024, Text Order directed the parties to address sealing issues pertaining to confidential information contained in NeoGenomics' Letter of Request for Dr. Swanton. That letter of request references two emails produced by Natera that Natera designated as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY” under the Protective Order (NAT-NEO-00888999 and NAT-NEO-00889209). *See* Dkt. 352-2 at 15. A review of those emails shows that they are likely not confidential, but even if they are, Dr. Swanton is permitted to see them under the protective order because he received them. *See* Dkt. 47 at 14-15, ¶ 32. Regardless, to the extent those emails and the Letter of Request need to remain under seal, NeoGenomics can file them confidentially in the UK. *See* Ex. 1, Shah Decl., ¶ 9-10.

CONCLUSION

As detailed above and in NeoGenomics' opening brief, the proposed deponents have non-duplicative, material information central to NeoGenomics' improper inventorship defense. Such information exceeds the standard required by courts, which "routinely" issue letters of request where the movant makes a "reasonable showing that the evidence sought may be material or may lead to the discovery of material evidence." *Compagnie des Grands Hotels d'Afrique S.A. v. Starman Hotel Holdings LLC*, No. 18-00654 RGA, 2019 WL3391971, at *2 (D. Del. Jul. 26, 2019). To ensure that NeoGenomics can pursue its improper inventorship defense (and thus serve its and the public's legitimate interests in quashing invalid patents that cover important cancer testing methods), NeoGenomics respectfully requests the Court grant its motion and issue the Letters of Request.

This the 20th day of December, 2024

/s/ John F. Morrow, Jr.

JOHN F. MORROW, JR.

JOHN D. WOOTEN IV

WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON (US) LLP

One West Fourth Street

Winston-Salem, NC 27101

Tel: 336-721-3584

Fax: 336-733-8429

Email: John.Morrow@wbd-us.com

JD.Wooten@wbd-us.com

DARALYN J. DURIE*

MATTHEW I. KREEGER*

ANNIE A. LEE*

JACK WILLIAM HAISMAN*

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: (415) 268-7000

Fax: (415) 268-7522
DDurie@mofo.com
MKreeger@mofo.com
AnnieLee@mofo.com
JHaisman@mofo.com

CHARLES CALHOUN PROVINE*
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2100 L Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20037
Tel: (202) 887-1500
Fax: (202) 887-0763
CProvine@mofo.com

ERIC NIKOLAIDES*
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
250 West 55th St.
New York, NY 10019
Tel: (212) 336-4061
ENikolaides@mofo.com

AARON G. FOUNTAIN*
HUI ZHAO*
MORRISON & FOERSTER
300 Colorado Street, Suite 1800
Austin, TX 78701
Tel: (737) 309-0700
AFountain@mofo.com
HZhao@mofo.com

MATTHEW R. STEPHENS*
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92130
Tel: (858) 720-5100
Fax: (858) 720-5125
MStephens@mofo.com

Counsel for NeoGenomics Laboratories, Inc.
**Special Appearance under Local Civil Rule*
83.1(d)

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.3(d), I certify that this document complies with the word count limitation of Rule 7.3(d). This certificate was prepared in reliance on the word count feature of the word processing software used to prepare this document.

/s/ John F. Morrow, Jr.

John F. Morrow, Jr. (NC Bar No. 23382)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on December 20, 2024, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Issuance of Letters of Request for Production of Documents and to Examine Persons Pursuant to Hague Evidence Convention was served via electronic mail upon the following:

ANDREW R. SHORES
CARMELLE F. ALIPIO
ROBERT VAN ARNAM
WILLIAMS MULLEN
301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1700
Raleigh, NC 27601
ashores@williamsmullen.com
calipio@williamsmullen.com
rvanarnam@williamsmullen.com

KEVIN ALEXANDER SMITH
TARA SRINIVASAN
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
50 California St., 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
kevinsmith@quinnemanuel.com
tarasrinivasan@quinnemanuel.com

KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON
VICTORIA MAROULIS
ANDREW J BRAMHALL
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com
victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com
andrewbramhall@quinnemanuel.com

SANDRA HABERNY
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
sandrahaberny@quinnemanuel.com
qe-natera-
neogenomics@quinnemanuel.com

Attorneys for Natera, Inc.

/s/ John F. Morrow, Jr.

John F. Morrow, Jr.