

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APOTEX INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

PFIZER INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2021-01132  
Patent 6,890,927

TARTRATE SALTS OF 5,8, 14-TRIAZATERACYCLO[10.3.1.0<sup>2,11</sup> 0<sup>4,9</sup>]-  
HEXADECA-2(11),3,5,7,9-PENTAENE AND PHARMACEUTICAL  
COMPOSITIONS THEREOF

---

**PATENT OWNER PFIZER INC.'S**  
**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	4
A.	The '927 Patent .....	4
B.	References Cited in Petition.....	5
1.	PCT Publication No. WO 99/35131 (“Coe”) .....	5
2.	U.S. Patent No. 6,14,550 (“US ’550”).....	6
3.	Berge .....	7
4.	Gould.....	7
5.	Nyqvist .....	8
C.	Prosecution History of the '927 Patent .....	8
III.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under § 325(d).....	10
A.	The Office has Substantively Considered the Same Prior Art and Arguments ( <i>Advanced Bionics</i> Factor 1; <i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (a), (b), and (d)) .....	11
1.	<i>Becton, Dickson</i> Factor (a): “whether the same or substantially the same art previously was presented to the Office or whether the same or substantially the same arguments previously were presented to the Office”.....	12
2.	<i>Becton, Dickson</i> Factor (b): “the cumulative nature of the asserted art and the prior art evaluated during examination” .....	14
3.	<i>Becton, Dickson</i> Factor (d): “the extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which petitioner relies on the prior art” .....	22
B.	The Petitioner Cannot Demonstrate that the Office Erred in a Manner Material to the Patentability of the Challenged Claims ( <i>Advanced Bionics</i> Factor 2; <i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors (c), (e), and (f)).....	26
1.	<i>Becton, Dickson</i> Factor (c): “the extent to which the asserted art was evaluated during examination, including whether the prior art was the basis for rejection” .....	26

..

2. *Becton, Dickson* Factors (e) and (f): “whether petitioner has pointed out sufficiently how the examiner erred in its evaluation of the asserted prior art” and “the extent to which additional evidence and facts presented in the petition warrant reconsideration of the prior art or arguments.” .....27

IV. Conclusion .....32

...

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Gerate GmbH</i> IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (Feb. 13, 2020).....	11, 13, 26, 27
<i>Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC v. Merck Patentgesellschaft</i> IPR2018-00423, Paper 7 (July 23, 2018) .....	18
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (Dec. 15, 2017) .....	passim
<i>Canon Inc. v. Papst Licensing GMBH &amp; Co. KG</i> IPR2016-01202, Paper 15 (Dec. 15, 2016) .....	18, 27
<i>CSL Behring GMBH v. Shire Viropharma Inc.</i> IPR2019-00459, Paper 8 (July 2, 2019) .....	29
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> IPR2018-00277, Paper 11 (June 8, 2018).....	18
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (Sept. 12, 2018).....	14
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	30, 31
<i>Puma N.A., Inc. v. Nike Inc.</i> IPR2019-01042, Paper 10 (Oct. 31, 2019) .....	12, 26
<i>R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.</i> IPR2017-01642, Paper 10 (Jan. 16, 2018).....	16
<i>Regeneron Pharm., Inc. v. Merus N.V.</i> 864 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	14
<i>Roku Inc. v. Universal Elecs., Inc.</i> IPR2019-01619, Paper 11 (Apr. 2, 2020).....	14
<i>Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.</i> 550 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	31

*Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.*  
492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....31

*Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman*  
IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (Dec. 14, 2016) .....22

*Valeant Int'l (Barbados) SRL v. Watson Pharms., Inc.*  
No. 10-20526-CIV, 2011 WL 6792653 (S.D. Fla. Nov. 8, 2011), *aff'd sub*  
*nom. Valeant Int'l Bermuda v. Actavis, Inc.*, 534 F. App'x 999 (Fed. Cir.  
2013) .....31

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....passim

# 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.