

Filed on behalf of Patent Owners Bristol-Myers Squibb Company and Pfizer Inc.

By: Heather M. Petruzzi, Reg. No. 71,270 (Lead Counsel)
Timothy A. Cook, Reg. No. 74,073 (Back-up Counsel)
Amy K. Wigmore (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Kevin S. Prussia (*Pro Hac Vice*)
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 663-6028
Email: Heather.Petruzzi@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY and
PFIZER INC.,

Patent Owners.

IPR2018-00892

Patent No. 9,326,945

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	4
A. Anticoagulants and the Development of Apixaban	4
B. The '945 Patent	6
C. The Relevant Prosecution History	7
1. Rejections Over Nause and Wei.....	7
2. Interview and Response.....	9
3. Notice of Allowance.....	10
D. Asserted Prior Art	10
1. Wei (Ex. 1008)	10
2. Carreiro (Ex. 1004).....	11
3. The '208 Patent (Ex. 1007)	12
4. Rudnic (Ex. 1010)	13
5. FDA Dissolution Guidance (Ex. 1015).....	13
III. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art and Claim Construction.....	14
IV. The Board Should Deny Institution Pursuant to § 325(d)	15
A. Legal Standard	17
B. The Balance of Interests Favors Denial of Institution	18
1. The Examiner already considered and applied the same or substantially the same prior art.....	19

2.	The Petition fails to provide any reason why the Examiner was wrong	25
3.	No additional evidence in the Petition or Park Declaration warrants reconsideration.....	28
4.	Patent Owners’ interest in repose outweighs Petitioner’s competing interest.....	30
V.	The Petition Fails to Establish a Motivation to Combine the References.....	32
A.	Legal Standard	33
B.	The Petition Relies on Two Generalized Conclusory Assumptions that Are Not Supported in the Record	34
1.	The Petition assumes that low solubility equates to low bioavailability.....	34
2.	The Petition assumes that increasing the dissolution rate of a compound improves bioavailability.....	38
VI.	The Petition Fails to Establish that Carreiro, FDA Dissolution Guidance, and Rudnic are Printed Publications.....	40
A.	Rudnic	42
B.	FDA Dissolution Guidance.....	43
C.	Carreiro	44
VII.	Petitioner Fails to Name All of the Real Parties in Interest.....	45
VIII.	Conclusion.....	50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

<i>10X Genomics, Inc. v. Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00301, 2018 WL 3019915 (June 15, 2018)	38
<i>Align Technology, Inc. v. 3Shape A/S</i> , IPR2018-00198, Paper 7 (May 30, 2018).....	17, 26
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Appistry, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00480, 2015 WL 4467407 (July 13, 2015)	48
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , No. 2017-1698 (Fed. Cir. July 9, 2018).....	47
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Paper 88 (Jan. 6, 2015).....	48, 49
<i>Becton, Dickinson, and Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, 2017 WL 6405100 (Dec. 15, 2017)	17, 18
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Aurobindo Pharma USA Inc.</i> , No. 17-cv-374-LPS, D.I. 182-1 (D. Del. May 18, 2018)	15
<i>Celltrion, Inc. v. Biogen, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01614, 2018 WL 1037223 (Feb. 21, 2018).....	14, 43, 44
<i>Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC</i> , IPR2017-00777, 2017 WL 3635100 (Aug. 22, 2017).....	17, 20
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268, 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	15
<i>Dole Food Co. v. Patrickson</i> , 538 U.S. 468 (2003).....	48
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3, 41
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01876, 2017 WL 1240081 (Apr. 3, 2017).....	30

<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Joiner</i> , 522 U.S. 136 (1997).....	37, 40
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00739, 2017 WL 3209157 (July 27, 2017)	17, 30
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	33
<i>Kayak Software Corp. v. Int’l Business Machines Corp.</i> , CBM2016-00075, 2016 WL 11034653 (Dec. 15, 2016).....	22
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	41
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	33
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	41, 44
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	34
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Corel Software, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01300, 2017 WL 380951 (Jan. 4, 2017)	44, 45
<i>Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Int’l GmbH</i> , IPR2016–01563, 2017 WL 506756 (Feb. 3, 2017)	44
<i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Anacor Pharms., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01358, Paper 2 (July 6, 2018)	49
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	34
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Imperium (IP) Holdings</i> , IPR2015-01233, 2015 WL 9599164 (Dec. 1, 2015)	37, 40
<i>Samsung Electronics Co. v. Arendi S.A.R.L.</i> , IPR2014-00214, 2014 WL 2447197 (May 28, 2014)	28

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.