16CV291137 Santa Clara – Civil

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON (S.B. #177129) kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com VICTORIA F. MAROULIS (S.B. #202603) victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com ANDREW J. BRAMHALL (S.B. #253115) andrewbramhall@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Dr., 5th Floor Redwood Shores, California 94065 Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100 Attorneys for TWIST BIOSCIENCE CORP. and EMILY LEPROUST	& ROSATI I CHARLES T tgraves@wsg One Market P San Francisco	. GRAVES (S.B. #197923)	
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CA	ALIFORNIA	
10	COUNTY OF S	SANTA CLARA	Case #16CV291137 Env #2444060	
11				
12 13	AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware Corporation, Plaintiff,	Case No. 16-cv-291137 TWIST BIOSCIENCE CORPORATION AND EMILY LEPROUST'S ANSWER		
14	v. TWIST BIOSCIENCE CORP., a Delaware	AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO AGILENT'S SECOND AMENDED		
15 16 17 18	Corporation; EMILY LEPROUST, an Individual; SIYUAN CHEN, an Individual; SOLANGE GLAIZE, an Individual; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, Defendants.	Action Filed: Judge:	Feb. 3, 2016 Hon. Brian C. Walsh	
19	TWIST BIOSCIENCE CORP and EMILY	Location:	Department 1	
20 21	LEPROUST, Cross-Complainants, v.			
22 23	AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,			
	Cross-Defendants			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1	
2	Lepro
3	Amen
4	("Agi
5	
6	
7	deny
8	damaş
9	pursu
10	throug
11	
12	
13	concu
14	By all
15	bear t
16	Witho
17	defen
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	claim
23	
24	
25	of lim
26	

27

28

Defendants and Cross-Complainants Twist Bioscience Corp. ("Twist") and Emily Leproust ("Leproust" and together with Twist, "Defendants"), hereby answer the Second Amended Complaint ("SAC") of Plaintiff and Cross-Defendant Agilent Technologies, Inc. ("Agilent" or "Plaintiff").

GENERAL DENIAL

Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30, subdivision (d), Defendants hereby deny each and every material allegation in the SAC and further deny that Agilent has been damaged in the manner alleged, in any manner, or in any amount. Defendants file this answer pursuant to Code Civ. Pro. 430.30, subdivision (c) and reserve all rights to challenge the SAC through their demurrer and motion to strike.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Defendants hereby incorporate by reference the facts alleged in Defendants' concurrently-filed Cross-Complaint in this action as support for their general denial and defenses. By alleging the affirmative defenses set forth below, Defendants do not agree or concede that they bear the burden of production or persuasion on any of these issues, whether in whole or in part. Without waiving the foregoing answer, Defendants assert the following separate affirmative defenses to the SAC:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

2. Plaintiff has failed to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

3. Plaintiff released, relinquished, waived, and/or abandoned any right to any of the claims upon which Plaintiff now seeks relief.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

4. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by any and all applicable statutes of limitations.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

5. Any alleged conduct or omission by Defendants was not the cause in fact or

Case No. 16-cv-291137

1	proximate cause of any injury alleged by Plaintiff.
2	FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
3	6. To the extent that the following are deemed affirmative defenses rather than
4	ordinary defenses, Plaintiff's purported trade secrets are not protectable or were otherwise not
5	misappropriated because they were already disclosed within the public domain, were generally
6	known, were the subject of independent development or derivation, or were readily ascertainable.
7	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
8	7. Plaintiff has failed to state facts sufficient to support an award of punitive damages.
9	SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
10	8. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of laches.
11	EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
12	9. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because by virtue of its own
13	conduct, Plaintiff is estopped from recovering from Defendants.
14	NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
15	10. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of unclean hands.
16	TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
17	11. Defendants have not committed the wrongs alleged in the Second Amended
18	Complaint. Thus, Plaintiff is barred from recovery, in whole or in part, to the extent that recovery
19	by Plaintiff would constitute unjust enrichment and a windfall to Plaintiff.
20	ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
21	12. Plaintiff is barred from recovery, in whole or part, because any actions taken by
22	Defendants, if any, with respect to Plaintiff, were based on an honest, reasonable, and good faith
23	belief in the facts as known and understood at the time.
24	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
25	13. At all relevant times, Plaintiff consented to and approved all the purported acts and
26	omissions about which Plaintiff now complains.
27	
28	

THIRTEENTH	AFFIRMATIV	VE DEFENSE
------------	-------------------	------------

14. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, to the extent the purported acts and omissions about which Plaintiff now complains are licensed or otherwise authorized by persons or entities with the right to license or authorize.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

15. Plaintiff's claims for a constructive trust are barred or otherwise unavailable, either in whole or part, under the California Uniform Trade Secrets Act and California contract law.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

16. Plaintiff's claims for a constructive trust are barred, either in whole or part, because Defendants' alleged profits, gains, increases in value, or equity interests are not the result of any conduct complained of by Plaintiff.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

17. Plaintiff's claims are barred because they seek to enforce purported contract provisions that are against public policy and are therefore void and unenforceable, including under Business and Professions Code section 16600 et seq.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

18. To the extent that the following is deemed an affirmative defense rather than an ordinary defense, Plaintiff's claims are barred because Plaintiff failed to take reasonable efforts and/or precautions to protect its purported trade secrets.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

19. Plaintiff's claim for misappropriation was brought and maintained in bad faith, as Plaintiff had no evidence of misappropriation prior to commencing this lawsuit and continues to maintain this suit even after exculpatory evidence has been made known. In addition to any contractual right to attorneys' fees, Defendants are entitled to, and will seek reasonable expenses, including attorneys' fees and costs, in defending itself in accordance with the laws of the State of California, including Code of Civil Procedure section 128.7.

1	NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	20. Plaintiff has failed to state facts sufficient to support an award of attorneys' fees
3	against Defendants.
4	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
5	21. Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief is improper because Plaintiff has not suffered
6	any irreparable injury, there is no likelihood of future injury to Plaintiff, and there exists an
7	adequate remedy at law to address the claims set forth in the Complaint.
8	TWENTY FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
9	22. Plaintiff voluntarily and with knowledge assumed the risk of all damages of which
10	Plaintiff complains.
11	TWENTY SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
12	23. Plaintiff failed to take reasonable efforts or make reasonable expenditures to
13	mitigate and/or avoid the damages of which Plaintiff complains.
14	TWENTY THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
15	24. Plaintiff's claim for breach of contract is barred, either in whole or in part, because
16	there is no enforceable contract, including because there was no mutual assent or exchange of
17	valuable consideration between the parties to the alleged contract.
18	TWENTY FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
19	25. Plaintiff is aware that the allegations in the Complaint are frivolous and that the
20	Complaint has been filed in bad faith so as to constitute a sham pleading.
21	TWENTY FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
22	26. Plaintiff failed to exercise reasonable care and diligence to avoid the risk of and/or
23	enhancement of any injuries which might be sustained by reason of the alleged acts of Defendants.
24	Therefore, any damages awarded to the Plaintiff shall be limited to recovery for injuries which
25	Plaintiff would have sustained had Plaintiff exercised reasonable care and diligence to avoid the
26	risk and/or enhancement of injury to Plaintiff.
, ,	

28

1 **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS** 2 27. Defendants reserve the right to assert additional defenses, including based on additional information learned or obtained during discovery and their own investigation. 3 4 STATEMENT OF INTENTION TO PURSUE CIVIL CODE SECTION 3426.4 REMEDY 5 28. Because Defendants believe that Plaintiff acted in bad faith within the meaning of 6 Civil Code section 3426.4, Defendants intend to seek all fees and costs permitted under that 7 statute. 8 PRAYER FOR RELIEF 9 Wherefore, Defendants and Cross-Complainants Twist and Leproust pray for judgment and relief as follows: 10 11 1. That the Second Amended Complaint be dismissed with prejudice and that Plaintiff take nothing thereby; 13 2. For Defendants' costs of suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees; 14 3. For attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Civil Code section 3426.4; and 4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. 15 16 DATED: January 29, 2019 Respectfully submitted, 17 18 19 20 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP 21 Kevin P.B. Johnson 22 Victoria F. Maroulis Andrew J. Bramhall 23 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH 24 & ROSATI PC Charles T. Graves 25 Attorneys for TWIST BIOSCIENCE CORP. 26 and EMILY LEPROUST 27 28