Filed on behalf of Bristol-Myers Squibb Company By: David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476 (Lead Counsel) Heather M. Petruzzi, Reg. No. 71,270 (Back-up Counsel) Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20006

Tel: (202) 663-6025

Email: David.Cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS IX LLC, Petitioner,

V.

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01723

Patent No. 6,967,208

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107



Table of Contents

I.	Introduction			
II.	Background			
	A.	Thrombosis and Its Treatment Before the Present Invention	7	
	B.	Eliquis [®] Is the Result of a Decades-Long Research Effort that Changed the Paradigm for Oral Anticoagulation Therapy	8	
	C.	The '208 Patent	11	
III.	Cons	Petition's Proposed Level of Skill in the Art and Claim structions Are Not Grounded in the Specification of the Patent	14	
	A.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art		
	В.	Claim Construction		
	Б.	1. "1-(4-methoxyphenyl)-7-oxo-6-[4-(2-oxo-1-piperidinyl)phenyl]-4,5,6,7-tetrahydro-1H-pyrazolo[3,4-c]pyridine-3-carboxamide"		
		2. "Pharmaceutically Acceptable Salts"	17	
IV.	The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any Challenged Claim Is Anticipated by the Fevig References (Grounds 1 and 2)			
	A.	Legal Standard		
	В.	The Petition Does Not Attempt to Show that One of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would "at Once Envisage" Apixaban		
	C.	Even if the Petition Had Attempted a Proper Anticipation Analysis, There Is No Disclosure in the Fevig References that Would Allow One of Ordinary Skill in the Art to "at Once Envisage" Apixaban or the Claimed Lactam-Containing Compounds	27	
		1. Claim 13: There Is No Disclosure in the Fevig References that Would Lead One of Ordinary Skill in the Art to Apixaban	28	
		2. Claims 1-8: There Is No Disclosure in the Fevig References that Would Lead One of Ordinary Skill in the Art to the Lactam Genera Compounds	34	



		3. Claims 9-12, 20-27, and 34-61: The Pharmaceutical	
		Composition and Method-of-Treatment Claims	
		Depend from Claims 1-8 and 13, and Thus Are	26
		Not Anticipated for the Same Reasons	36
V.	The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any Challenged Claim Is Obvious in View of the Fevig References		
	(Grounds 3 and 4)		36
	A.	Legal Standard	37
	B.	The Petition Has Not Carried Its Burden Because It Misapplies the Law for Species-Genus Obviousness Cases	39
		•	
	C.	The Petition Improperly Dismisses Objective Considerations	44
	D.	Fevig II Is Not Available as Prior Art to Establish Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)	46
VI	Conc	lusion	47



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
CASES	
Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc., IPR2014-01126, 2015 WL 5468710 (Jan. 9, 2015)	26, 32
Apotex Inc. v. Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., IPR2015-00419, 2015 WL 4036000 (June 25, 2015)	39
Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp., 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	4, 19, 20, 22
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., Inc., 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	4, 22
Daiichi Sankyo Co. v. Matrix Labs, Ltd., 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	39
Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Calif. Edison Co., 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	46
Eisai Co. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd., 533 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	5, 24
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Wash., 334 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	4
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc., 619 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	37
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc., 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc., No. 99-cv-00038, 2001 WL 1397304 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 29, 2001)	5, 25
Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	37, 40
Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc., IPR2012-00027, 2013 WL 5947697 (June 11, 2013)	18



Impax Labs., Inc. v. Aventis Pharm. Inc., 468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	30, 31
<i>In re Baird</i> , 16 F.3d 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	5, 38, 41, 42, 43
In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	15
In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig., 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	
<i>In re Gleave</i> , 560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	21
<i>In re Jones</i> , 958 F.2d 347 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	5, 41, 43
In re Petering, 301 F.2d 676 (C.C.P.A. 1962)	4, 31
In re Schaumann, 572 F.2d 312 (C.C.P.A. 1978)	31
In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442 (C.C.P.A. 1971)	25, 42
Ineos USA LLC v. Berry Plastics Corp., 783 F.3d 865 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	31
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	37
Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea, 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	45
Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Labs., Inc., 874 F.2d 804 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	.25, 36, 40, 41, 42
Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc., IPR2014-00243, 2014 WL 2810484 (June 18, 2014)	20, 37



DOCKET

Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

