

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APOTEX INC., APOTEX CORP., APOTEX PHARMACEUTICALS  
HOLDINGS INC., AND APOTEX HOLDINGS, INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

OSI PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01284  
U.S. Patent No. 6,900,221

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	6
A. State of the Art .....	6
B. Clinical Development and Approval of Tarceva® .....	7
C. The '221 Patent .....	9
D. District Court Litigation .....	10
E. Alleged Prior Art Relied on by Petitioner.....	11
III. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	17
IV. Claim Construction.....	17
V. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any of Claims 44-46 or 53 Is Obvious Over Schnur in View of Gibbs or the OSI 10-K (Ground I) .....	18
A. The Petition Fails to Identify a Motivation to Combine Schnur with Gibbs or the OSI 10-K .....	18
B. The Petition Fails to Establish that a POSA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation of Success By Combining Schnur with the OSI 10-K or Gibbs .....	23
C. Ground I Includes Redundant Alternative Combinations and Should be Limited to a Single Combination.....	32
VI. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 47 Is Obvious Over Schnur Combined with Gibbs or Wakeling, in View of Moscatello (Ground II).....	33
A. The Petition Fails to Identify a Motivation to Combine the References .....	34
B. The Petition Fails to Establish that a POSA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation of Success by Combining the References Relied on in Ground II.....	39
C. Ground II Includes Redundant Alternative Combinations and Should be Limited to a Single Combination.....	41

VII. Objective Indicia Support the Non-Obviousness of the Challenged Claims .....42

VIII. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That All Challenged Claims are Anticipated by Schnur (Ground III).....45

    A. Ground III Should be Denied Because the Petition Does Not Apply the Correct Legal Standard.....45

    B. Ground III Should Be Denied Because It Presents the Same Prior Art and Argument That Previously Was Considered and Rejected by the Patent Office.....47

    C. Ground III Should Be Denied Because The Petition Concedes There is Not a Reasonable Likelihood That Petitioner Would Prevail.....50

IX. Conclusion .....51

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	31
<i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , No. 2015-1871, (Fed. Cir. Aug. 16, 2016) .....	38
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	46
<i>Boston Sci. Corp. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson</i> , 647 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	37
<i>Butamax Adv. Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (Oct. 14, 2014).....	21, 49
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014).....	21
<i>Denso Corp. v. Netlatch, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00473, Paper 9 (July 15, 2015).....	18
<i>Funai Elec. Co. v. Gold Charm Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-01491, Paper 15 (Dec. 28, 2015).....	48
<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00383, Paper 16 (June 23, 2016) .....	24
<i>Geo. M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Machine Sys. Int’l</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	31
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l</i> , No. 2015-1300, 2016 WL 3974202 (Fed. Cir. July 25, 2016) .....	21, 38

<i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01027, Paper 16 (Dec. 22, 2014) .....	49
<i>InTouch Techs. v. VGO Commc 'ns</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	18, 23, 31
<i>Kinetic Tech., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00429, Paper 8 (Sept. 23, 2014) .....	6
<i>Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00243, 2014 WL 2810484 (June 18, 2014) .....	46
<i>Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , Case No. 08-cv-5103-SRC, 2011 WL 254313 (D.N.J. Jan. 25, 2011) .....	46
<i>OSI Pharms., Inc. v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , Case No. 09-cv-00185-SLR, Dkt. No. 239 (D. Del. May 1, 2012) .....	3, 10, 11, 31, 47
<i>Otsuka Pharm. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	37
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Teva Pharm. U.S.A.</i> , 882 F. Supp. 2d 643 (D. Del. 2012) .....	36
<i>Ranbaxy Inc. v. Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00024, Paper 10 (Apr. 12, 2016) .....	25
<i>S.S. Steiner, Inc. v. John I. Haas, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01491, Paper 7 (Mar. 16, 2015) .....	22
<i>Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	46
<i>Schrader-Bridgeport Int'l v. Continental Automotive Sys. US, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00014, Paper 12 (Mar. 13, 2013) .....	33, 41
<i>Tessera, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 646 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	45

# Explore Litigation Insights

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

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



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

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

## Advanced Docket Research



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

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

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



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

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

## API

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

## LAW FIRMS

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

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

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.