

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AGILA SPECIALTIES INC. AND  
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,  
Petitioner,  
v.

CUBIST PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

U.S. Patent No. 8,129,342

---

Case IPR2015: Unassigned

---

**EXPERT DECLARATION OF CATHERINE MULLIGAN, PH.D**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Qualifications and Background .....	1
A.	Education and Experience; Prior Testimony.....	1
B.	Bases for Opinions and Materials Considered .....	4
C.	Scope of Work .....	5
II.	Summary of Opinions.....	5
III.	Legal Standards .....	8
IV.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	10
V.	The ‘342 Patent.....	11
VI.	Background.....	16
A.	Use of Surfactants and Biosurfactants .....	16
B.	Biosurfactant Purification and State of the Art in 2000.....	20
VII.	Scope and Content of the Prior Art References.....	29
A.	U.S. Patent No. 4,874,843 (‘843 Patent) [Ex. 1007].....	29
B.	U.S. Patent No. 4,331,594 (‘594 Patent) [Ex.1009].....	30
C.	U.S. Patent No. 5,912,226 (‘226 Patent) [Ex.1010].....	31
D.	Mulligan and Gibbs, “Recovery of Biosurfactants by Ultrafiltration,” Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology, 47:23-9 (1990) (Mulligan) [Ex.1013] .....	33
E.	Lin and Jiang, “Recovery and Purification of the Lipopeptide Biosurfactant Bacillus subtilis by Ultrafiltration,” Biotechnology Techniques, 11:413-6 (June 1997) (Lin I) [Ex. 1014] .....	35

F.	Lin et al., “General Approach for the Development of High-Performance Liquid Chromatography Methods for Biosurfactant Analysis and Purification,” <i>Journal of Chromatography</i> , 825:149-59 (1998) (Lin II) [Ex.1015] .....	37
G.	U.S. Patent No. 5,227,294 (‘294 Patent) [Ex. 1016].....	40
H.	Tally et al., “Daptomycin: A Novel Agent for Gram-positive Infections,” <i>Expert Opin. Invest. Drugs</i> 8:1223-38 (1999) [Ex. 1018].....	41
VIII.	INVALIDITY OF THE ‘342 PATENT .....	42
A.	The Challenged Claims of the ‘342 Patent are Anticipated and/or Obvious Over the ‘226 Patent .....	42
B.	Claims 1-4, 7-18, 21, 30-34 and 40-43 of the ‘342 Patent are Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or ‘594 Patent In View of Mulligan, Lin II and the ‘226 Patent.....	57
	(a) Claims 1-4 and 7-16 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent in View of Mulligan, Lin II and the ‘226 Patent .....	58
	(b) Claims 17-18 and 21 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent in View of Mulligan and Lin II.....	64
	(c) Claims 30-34 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent in View of Mulligan and Lin II .....	68
	(d) Claims 40-43 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent in View of Mulligan and Lin II .....	71
C.	Claims 5-6 and 50 of the ‘342 Patent are Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or the ‘594 Patent In View of Mulligan, Lin I and/or Lin II and the ‘226 Patent.....	75

(a)	Claim 50 of the ‘342 Patent is Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or the ‘594 Patent in View of Mulligan, Lin I, Lin II and the ‘226 Patent.	75
(b)	Claims 5-6 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or ‘594 Patent in View of Mulligan, Lin I, Lin II and the ‘226 Patent.....	79
D.	Claims 19-20, 25-29, 35-39 and 44-49 of the ‘342 Patent are Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or the ‘594 Patent In View of Mulligan, Lin II, the ‘226 Patent and/or Tally.....	82
(a)	Claims 19-20 and 25-29 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or ‘594 Patent in View of Mulligan, Lin II, the ‘226 Patent and Tally	82
(b)	Claims 25-29, 35-39 and 44-49 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or ‘594 Patent in View of Mulligan and Lin II.....	84
E.	Claims 22-24 and 51-54 of the ‘342 Patent are Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent or ‘594 Patent In View of Mulligan, Lin II, the ‘226 Patent.....	86
(a)	Claims 22-24 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent in View of Mulligan, Lin II and the ‘226 Patent, and Lin I, and Further in View of ‘594 Patent.....	87
(b)	Claims 51-54 of the ‘342 Patent are Invalid as Obvious Over the ‘843 Patent in View of Mulligan, Lin II and the ‘226 Patent and the ‘594 Patent	90
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	95

1. My name is Catherine N. Mulligan, Ph.D. I have been retained by counsel for Mylan Inc. (Mylan). I understand that Mylan intends to petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,129,342 (the ‘342 patent) [Ex. 1002], which is assigned to Cubist Pharmaceuticals, Inc. I also understand that Mylan intends to petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,058,238 (the ‘238 patent) [Ex. 1001], which is also assigned to Cubist Pharmaceuticals, Inc. I further understand that Mylan will request that the United States Patent and Trademark Office cancel certain claims of the ‘342 patent and the ‘238 patent as unpatentable in the *Inter Partes* Review petitions. I submit this expert declaration, which addresses and supports Mylan’s *Inter Partes* Review petition for the ‘342 patent. I have prepared and submitted a separate declaration which addresses and supports Mylan’s *Inter Partes* Review petition for the ‘238 patent.

I. **Qualifications and Background**

A. **Education and Experience; Prior Testimony**

2. I received my Bachelors of Engineering and Masters of Engineering in Chemical Engineering in 1983 and 1985, respectively, from McGill University. My Masters thesis was under the supervision of Professor David Cooper, an expert in biosurfactants. I went on to obtain my Ph.D in Geoenvironmental Engineering from McGill University in 1998 with Professor Raymond N. Yong. My thesis

# 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.