

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re *Inter Partes* Review of:                    )  
U.S. Patent No. 5,665,772                        )  
Issued: Sept. 9, 1997                            )  
Application No.: 08/416,673                    )  
U.S. Filing Date: April 7, 1995                )

For: **O-Alkylated Rapamycin Derivatives and Their Use, Particularly As  
Immunosuppressants**

**FILED VIA PRPS**

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM L. JORGENSEN PH.D. IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,665,772**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction And Qualifications.....	1
II. My Relevant Experience With Rapamycin And Other Immunosuppressants In The Early-1990s .....	3
III. Understanding Of The Governing Law .....	4
A. Invalidity by Obviousness.....	4
B. Materials Relied on in Forming My Opinion.....	6
IV. Overview Of The '772 Patent.....	6
A. Disclosure of the '772 Patent .....	6
V. Prosecution History .....	14
VI. Level Of Skill In The Art .....	15
VII. Claim Construction.....	17
VIII. Summary Of Opinions.....	17
IX. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF THE PRIOR ART .....	25
A. Background and State of the Prior Art.....	26
1. Rapamycin And Its Immunosuppressant Activity Were Extremely Well-Known to Those of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	26
2. Rapamycin's Poor Solubility Was Extremely Well- Known to Those of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	27
3. Routine Molecular Modifications To Improve Solubility Were Well-Known to Those of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	28
4. Those of Ordinary Skill in the Art Made Routine Modifications to Rapamycin.....	34
5. The Discovery and Disclosure of the Rapamycin/FKBP- 12 Binding Structure Taught Those of Ordinary Skill in the Art the Optimum Position and Types of Substitutions to Make to Rapamycin.....	40

Declaration of William L. Jorgensen, Ph.D., in Support of  
Par Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 5,665,772

6.	Standard Assays to Test Immunosuppressive Activities and Properties of Rapamycin Derivatives Were Well-Known to Those of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	56
B.	Prior Art Relevant to Obviousness Grounds 3 and 4 .....	57
1.	Computer Based Modeling Allowed for Rapid Screening of Possible Modifications .....	57
X.	Claims 1-3 & 8-10 Of The '772 Patent Would Have Been Obvious To A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art .....	59
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3 and 10 of the '772 Patent Would Have Been Obvious In View of Morris, Lemke, Yalkowsky, and Van Duyne and Rossmann .....	60
1.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Selected Rapamycin as a Lead Compound .....	60
2.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Modify Rapamycin to Improve Its Solubility As Taught in the Prior Art .....	63
3.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Select C40 of Rapamycin for Modification to Avoid Disrupting Its Activity .....	64
4.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Modified Rapamycin to Add Short, Flexible Side Chains with Solubilizing Substituents at C40 .....	67
B.	Ground 2: Claims 8 and 9 of the '772 Patent Would Have Been Obvious In View of Morris, Lemke, Yalkowsky, and Van Duyne and Rossmann, in further view of Hughes .....	75
1.	A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Reasonably Expect that Small Solubilizing Modifications to Rapamycin at C40 Would Retain Immunosuppressive Activity .....	76
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-3 and 10 of the '772 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over Routine Use of Computer-Aided Drug Design Software In View of Morris, Van Duyne, Lemke, and Yalkowsky .....	78
D.	Ground 4: Claims 8 and 9 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art in October 1992 .....	86

Declaration of William L. Jorgensen, Ph.D., in Support of  
Par Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 5,665,772

1. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Reasonably Expect that Solubilizing Modifications to Rapamycin at C40 Would Retain Immunosuppressive Activity .....87

- XI. Secondary Considerations Fail To Overcome The Strong Evidence Of Obviousness .....89

Declaration of William L. Jorgensen, Ph.D., in Support of  
Par Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 5,665,772

I, William L. Jorgensen, Ph.D. resident of Deep River, Connecticut, hereby  
declare as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

1. I have been retained by Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. (“Par”) to provide  
my opinions concerning certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,665,772 (Ex. 1001,  
“the ’772 Patent”) in support of Par’s Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of the ’772  
Patent. I have not previously been employed or retained by Par in any capacity.

2. From 1967 to 1970, I attended Princeton University, where I received  
an A.B. in Chemistry. I then attended Harvard University from 1970 to 1975,  
where I received a Ph.D. in Chemical Physics. My Ph.D. supervisor was Prof. E. J.  
Corey, a well-known synthetic organic chemist and Nobel Laureate.

3. From 1975 to 1979, I served as an Assistant Professor in the  
Department of Chemistry at Purdue University. While at Purdue, I was promoted  
to Associate Professor in 1979 and Professor in 1982. From 1984 to 1987, I served  
as the Head of the Organic Chemistry Division at Purdue.

4. In 1990, I joined the Department of Chemistry at Yale University as  
the Whitehead Professor of Chemistry. In 2009, I became the Sterling Professor of  
Chemistry, the position I hold today. I additionally served as the Director of the  
Division of Physical Sciences and Engineering at Yale from 2009 to 2012.

# 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.