

By: Jeffrey D. Blake, Esq.
Matthew L. Fedowitz, Esq.
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
191 Peachtree Street N.E., Suite 4300
Atlanta, GA 30303
jblake@merchantgould.com
Main Telephone: (404) 954-5100
Main Facsimile: (404) 954-5099

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS II LLC
Petitioner

v.

NPS PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-00990
Patent 7,056,886

**REPLY DECLARATION OF
ANTHONY PALMIERI III, Ph.D., R.Ph.**

CFAD Exhibit 1041

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. QUALIFICATIONS	2
III. SUMMARY OF OPINION.....	3
IV. ANALYSIS OF PATENT OWNER’S OPPOSITION	6
A. The ‘886 patent does not recognize any of the “complexities” associated with peptide formulation that Dr. Carpenter discusses.....	6
B. Dr. Carpenter’s previous publications contradict his declaration and support Petitioner’s positions.....	11
C. Dr. Carpenter unnecessarily elevates the level of ordinary skill in the art	20
D. Dr. Carpenter’s Declaration contains statements unsupported by any evidence.	23
E. Dr. Carpenter improperly and unnecessarily narrows the claims to support his arguments	24
i. The claims recite a GLP-2 peptide <i>or an analog thereof</i>.....	24
ii. Dr. Carpenter improperly characterizes the claims as requiring a particular stability.....	27
F. Dr. Carpenter does not read Kornfelt as a whole and improperly concludes Kornfelt provides a teaching away.....	31
i. Dr. Carpenter ignores Kornfelt’s disclosure of histidine in combination with mannitol among preferable combinations.....	31
ii. Dr. Carpenter ignores Kornfelt’s broad pH range.....	32

G. Dr. Carpenter disregards known protocols and a finite number of options to assert that there would be no reasonable expectation of success..... 34

H. Dr. Carpenter fails to rebut the motivation to combine with a reasonable expectation of success 38

i. There was a need for stable peptide formulations 38

ii. RP-HPLC shows histidine reduces *in vitro* degradation of glucagon, and both glucagon and GLP-2 are susceptible to *in vitro* degradation by the same mechanisms..... 39

iii. Dr. Carpenter does not point to any teaching away from Petitioner’s combinations..... 41

iv. Dr. Carpenter’s statements regarding lack of importance of secondary structure are disingenuous 42

v. Dr. Carpenter’s characterization of histidine is unsupported..... 44

I. Dr. Carpenter does not demonstrate unexpected results 48

i. Legal standards regarding unexpected results 49

ii. The results in Figure 2 are not surprising and unexpected, and are not commensurate in scope with the claims..... 50

iii. The results in Figure 3 are not surprising and unexpected, and are not commensurate in scope with the claims..... 53

iv. The results in Figure 4 are not surprising and unexpected, and are not commensurate in scope with the claims..... 56

v. The results in Figures 5 and 6 are not surprising and unexpected, and are not commensurate in scope with the claims 58

J. A formulation of Gattex[®] did not address a long-felt, unresolved need 62

V. CONCLUSION 62

I, Dr. Anthony Palmieri III, hereby declare and state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I previously submitted a Declaration in IPR2015-00990 (Ex. 1001) setting forth my background and credentials. My curriculum vitae (Ex. 1002) sets forth my education and experience in further detail.

2. In forming the opinions set forth herein, I have considered the documents and exhibits referenced by Patent Owner and those referenced by Dr. Carpenter in his Declaration (Ex. 2148). I have also relied on my own experience, knowledge, and considered the documents referenced in my initial Declaration (Ex. 1001). Furthermore, I considered the documents discussed herein that are responsive to the arguments and positions taken by Dr. Carpenter.

3. I understand that the Board found that the Petitioner established that there is a reasonable likelihood that it will prevail with respect to at least one of the challenged claims in U.S. Patent No. 7,056,886 and, thus, instituted an *inter partes* review on the following grounds in IPR2015-00990:

Ground 1 - Claims 46-50, 52, and 69-75 as obvious over the combination of Drucker '379, Kornfelt, and Osterberg;

Ground 2 - Claims 61-67 as obvious over the combination of Drucker '600, Kornfelt, Osterberg, and Holthius;

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.