

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
Petitioner

v.

YEDA RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CO., LTD.,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,399,413

Case IPR2015-00644

**EXPERT DECLARATION OF ARI GREEN, M.D.
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S
RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Summary of Opinions.....	2
II.	Legal Standards	5
III.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	5
IV.	The Patent At Issue’s Claims are Obvious Over the Prior Art.....	6
V.	A POSA Was Motivated to Create a Less Frequent Dosing Regimen	11
A.	A POSA Recognized That Patients Preferred a Less Frequent Dosing Regimen.....	11
B.	A POSA Recognized Substantial Clinical Benefits to a Less Frequent Dosing Regimen.....	12
C.	The Prior Art Repeatedly Suggested that a POSA Further Study Less Frequent Dosing Regimens.....	14
D.	The Patent Owner’s Two Arguments that the Prior Art Taught Away From Less Frequent Dosing Regimens Are Wrong	18
1.	A POSA Would Not Credit Dr. Fox’s Histamine Theory	18
2.	Dr. Ziemssen’s Mechanism of Action Theory Does Not Teach Away from Less Frequent Administration	24
E.	Dr. Ziemssen’s and Dr. Fox’s Criticisms of Pinchasi and Flechter 2002A Do Not Refute Motivation to Pursue a Less Frequent Dosing Regimen.....	48
VI.	All of the Patent At Issue’s Dependent Claims Are Obvious	56
VII.	The Patent At Issue Satisfied No Long-Felt But Unmet Need	56

VIII. The Patent At Issue Provided No Unexpected Benefits.....	57
--	----

1. I am the same Ari Green, M.D. who previously submitted a declaration in this proceeding dated February 5, 2015. I submit this expert declaration on behalf of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. and Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC to respond to certain opinions expressed in the expert declarations submitted with Patent Owner's Response to the Petition (Ex. 2129, 2134, 2135).

2. My *curriculum vitae* submitted with my original declaration is current. See Ex. 1004 at Ex. A.

3. In addition to the materials identified in my earlier declaration (Ex. 1004), and in addition to my experience, education, and training, I have also considered the materials cited herein and the materials identified in Exhibit A, in providing the opinions contained herein.

4. I reaffirm that my scope of work and compensation has not changed since I submitted my initial declaration in this proceeding. I have been retained by Mylan as a technical expert in this matter to provide various opinions regarding the patent at issue. I receive \$1000 per hour for my services. No part of my compensation is dependent upon my opinions given or the outcome of this case. I do not have any current or past affiliation with Yeda Research & Development Co., Ltd., or the named inventor on the patent at issue.

I. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS

5. In my opinion, all claims of the patent at issue are obvious over Pinchasi in view of Flechter 2002A or the SBOA. Pinchasi discloses administration of 40 mg of glatiramer acetate (“GA”) every other day. The claimed regimen is identical to Pinchasi, save for having one less dose every two weeks. This difference is minimal, and is well within GA’s forgiving range. Flechter 2002A and the SBOA provide the POSA additional motivation and a reasonable expectation of success to develop a lower frequency dosing regimen. Flechter 2002A includes clinical data demonstrating that every other day administration of GA may be safe, effective, and well-tolerated. Flechter 2002A also suggests that a total weekly dose of only 70 mg may be efficacious. The SBOA includes a suggestion from an FDA reviewer as early as 1996 advocating for less frequent dosing. Especially in light of other background art—which provided additional clinical data supporting less frequent administration of GA, as well as a potentially therapeutically effective range of total weekly doses between 70 mg and 280 mg—a 40 mg three-times-weekly dosing regimen (total weekly dose of 120 mg) was obvious.

6. Further background knowledge and common sense of a POSA provided additional motivation to develop a less frequently administered dosing regimen. For example, both patients and doctors recognized that an effective GA

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.