

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APOTEX INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PFIZER INC.,
Patent Owner.

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2021-01132

U.S. Patent No. 6,890,927 to Bogle *et al.*
Issued: May 10, 2005

Title: TARTRATE SALTS OF 5,8, 14-TRIAZATERACYCLO[10.3.1.02,11
04.9]-HEXADECA-2(11),3,5,7,9-PENTAENE AND
PHARMACEUTICAL COMPOSITIONS THEREOF

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,890,927
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1–.80, 21.100–.123**

Mail Stop “PATENT BOARD”

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
LIST OF EXHIBITS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW	1
III. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8).....	3
A. REAL PARTIES-IN-INTEREST (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(B)(1)).....	4
B. RELATED MATTERS (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(B)(2)).....	4
C. LEAD AND BACK-UP COUNSEL AND SERVICE INFORMATION (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(B)(3), (4)).....	4
IV. FEE PAYMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a) AND § 42.103	5
V. STANDING GROUNDS (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....	6
VI. THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	6
VII. CHALLENGE OVERVIEW AND PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	6
A. CLAIMS FOR WHICH REVIEW IS REQUESTED	6
B. STATUTORY GROUNDS OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)).....	7
VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘927 PATENT, PROSECUTION HISTORY	8
A. THE ‘927 PATENT	8
B. PROSECUTION HISTORY.....	9
IX. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	13
A. 5,8,14-TRIAZATETRACYCLO[10.3.1.0 ^{2,11} .0 ^{4,9}]-HEXADECA- 2(11),3,5,7,9-PENTAENE.....	14
B. “THE TARTRATE SALT OF” VARENICLINE	14
1. Tartrate Salt—Generally	14

2.	Tartrate salt—the Intrinsic Record.....	15
X.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	18
XI.	THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	18
A.	PETITIONER’S PRIOR ART TO VARENICLINE: US ‘550 (EX1006) AND COE (EX1005).....	19
B.	SALT SELECTION AS PART OF PHARMACEUTICAL DEVELOPMENT WAS WELL KNOWN	24
1.	Berge (EX1009)	25
2.	Gould (EX1010).....	26
C.	FURTHER TARTRATE SALT EXPECTATIONS	28
XII.	GROUND FOR UNPATENTABILITY—DETAILED ANALYSIS	31
A.	LEGAL STANDARDS	31
B.	ANTICIPATION	33
1.	Ground 1: US ‘550 Alone Invalidates the Challenged Claims for Anticipation.....	37
2.	Ground 2: Coe Alone Invalidates the Challenged Claims for Anticipation	39
C.	OBVIOUSNESS.....	41
1.	Ground 3: The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Over Coe in View of Berge	41
2.	Ground 4: The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Over Coe in View of Gould	51
3.	Ground 5: The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Over Coe in View of Gould or Berge in Further View of Tartrate Salt Disclosures (Exemplified by Nyqvist).....	56
4.	There Is a Clear Motivation to Combine Coe With Berge and/or Gould and Further With the Tartrate Salt	

Disclosures as in Nyqvist.....	64
5. There Was a Reasonable Expectation of Success Combining a Known Compound with a Common Salt.....	67
6. Lack of Secondary Considerations	68
XIII. THE BOARD SHOULD INSTITUTE TRIAL BASED ON APOTEX’S PETITION (35 U.S.C. § 325(D)).....	69
XIV. CONCLUSION.....	71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>10X Genomics, Inc. v. Bio-Rad Lab 'ys., Inc.</i> , IPR2021-00133, Paper 11 at 15 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2021).....	70
<i>Abbott Lab 'ys. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	13, 16
<i>Amneal Pharm., LLC v. Supernus Pharm., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00368, Paper 8 at 12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 17, 2013).....	69
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 at 17 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017).....	69
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Lab 'ys, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	32
<i>Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus., Inc.</i> , 807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	18
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Trs. of the Univ. of Pa.</i> , IPR2016-00458, Paper 7 at 21 (P.T.A.B. July 14, 2016).....	49
<i>Fantasia Trading LLC v. CogniPower, LLC</i> , IPR2021-00067, Paper 21 at 38 (P.T.A.B. May 12, 2021).....	71
<i>Galderma Lab 'ys, L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	47
<i>Hamilton Techs. LLC v. Fleur Tehrani</i> , IPR2020-01199, Paper 6 at 21 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 6, 2021).....	71
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	68
<i>In re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.</i> , 301 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	31

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.