

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

Petitioner,

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,466,139

**DECLARATION OF LAIRD FORREST, Ph.D. IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND	5
A.	Education and Experience; Prior Testimony	5
B.	Bases for Opinions and Materials Considered.....	8
II.	SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	9
III.	LEGAL STANDARDS	10
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”)	11
V.	U.S. PATENT NO. 8,466,139 [Ex. 1001]	13
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	18
VII.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART	20
A.	Fulvestrant Was Well Known in the Prior Art as a Pure Antiestrogen	20
B.	The Prior Art Disclosed Fulvestrant Formulations.....	21
(a)	<i>Castor Oil</i>	22
(b)	<i>Ethanol</i>	23
(c)	<i>Benzyl Alcohol</i>	23
(d)	<i>Benzyl Benzoate</i>	24
C.	Intramuscular Injection of Fulvestrant Was Known as the Superior Route of Administration in the Prior Art.....	25
D.	Oil-Based Intramuscular Depot Injection Was Conventional in the Prior Art.....	26
E.	McLeskey [Ex. 1005].....	28
(a)	<i>A POSA Would Have Understood that the Formulation in McLeskey Was Expressed in %w/v</i>	30
(b)	<i>A POSA Would Have Known that the Formulation in McLeskey Was a Solution</i>	34
F.	Howell 1996 [Ex. 1006].....	35
G.	EP 0 346 014 (“Dukes 1989”) [Ex. 1007]	36
H.	Wakeling 1991 [Ex. 1008].....	37
I.	Wakeling 1992 [Ex. 1009].....	38
J.	Dukes 1992 [Ex. 1025]	39
K.	Dukes 1993 [Ex. 1026]	40
VIII.	CLAIMS 1-20 OF THE ’139 PATENT WERE UNPATENTABLE.....	41
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-20 of the ’139 Patent Were Obvious Over McLeskey	41
(a)	<i>Independent Claim 1 Was Obvious Over McLeskey</i>	42
(b)	<i>Independent Claim 11 Was Obvious over McLeskey</i>	47

(c)	<i>Dependent Claims 2 and 12 Were Obvious Over McLeskey</i>	49
(d)	<i>Dependent Claims 3 and 13 Were Obvious Over McLeskey</i>	51
(e)	<i>Dependent Claims 4 and 14 Were Obvious Over McLeskey</i>	52
(f)	<i>Dependent Claims 5 and 15 Were Obvious Over McLeskey</i>	55
(g)	<i>Dependent Claims 6 and 16 Were Obvious Over McLeskey</i>	55
(h)	<i>Dependent Claims 7 and 17 Were Obvious over McLeskey</i>	57
(i)	<i>Dependent Claims 8 and 18 Were Obvious over McLeskey</i>	59
(j)	<i>Dependent Claims 9 and 19 Were Obvious over McLeskey</i>	60
(k)	<i>Dependent Claims 10 and 20 Were Obvious Over McLeskey</i>	61
B.	Ground 2: All Claims of the '139 Patent Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 In View of McLeskey	64
(a)	<i>The POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine the Howell 1996 and McLeskey References</i>	64
(b)	<i>Independent Claim 1 Was Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	65
(c)	<i>Independent Claim 11 Was Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	70
(d)	<i>Dependent Claims 2 and 12 Were Obvious Over Howell in View of McLeskey</i>	73
(e)	<i>Dependent Claims 3 and 13 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	74
(f)	<i>Dependent Claims 4 and 14 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	76
(g)	<i>Dependent Claims 5 and 15 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	78
(h)	<i>Dependent Claims 6 and 16 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	79
(i)	<i>Dependent Claims 7 and 17 Were Obvious over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	80
(j)	<i>Dependent Claims 8 and 18 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	82
(k)	<i>Dependent Claims 9 and 19 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	83
(l)	<i>Dependent Claims 10 and 20 Were Obvious Over Howell 1996 in View of McLeskey</i>	84

IX.	THE CLAIMS OF THE '139 PATENT DID NOT ACHIEVE ANY UNEXPECTED RESULT	87
A.	A POSA Would Have Understood that Solubility of a Drug Does Not Depend Solely on Its Solubility in Each Solvent Individually	88
(a)	<i>Examples of Increased Solubility of a Solute in a Mixture of Solvents Were Disclosed in the Art</i>	88
B.	A POSA Would Have Expected that the Addition of Benzyl Benzoate Would Improve the Solubility of Fulvestrant	90
(a)	<i>The Solubility of a Solute in a Solvent (or Mixture of Solvents) Depends on Molecular Forces</i>	90
(b)	<i>Intermolecular Forces Between Fulvestrant and the Excipients in the '139 Patent Claims Would Have Led a POSA to Predict that Adding Benzyl Benzoate Would Have Improved the Solubility of Fulvestrant</i>	91
C.	To Confirm the POSA's Expectation that the Addition of Benzyl Benzoate Would Increase the Solubility of Fulvestrant in the Solvent Mixture, the POSA Could Have Performed Routine Solubility Calculations.....	92
X.	CONCLUSION.....	93

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND

A. Education and Experience; Prior Testimony

1. My name is M. Laird Forrest, Ph.D. I have been retained by counsel for Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“Mylan”). I understand that Mylan intends to petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,466,139 (“the ’139 patent”) [Ex. 1001], which is assigned to AstraZeneca AB. I also understand that Mylan will request that the United States Patent and Trademark Office cancel certain claims of the ’139 patent as unpatentable in that petition. I submit this expert declaration in support of Mylan’s petition.

2. I am currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas, a position I have held since 2013. I am also an Associate Professor in the Bioengineering Center, a position I have held since 2011, and an Associate Professor in the Department of Chemistry, a position I have held since 2011, both also at the University of Kansas.

3. I received a Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering from Auburn University in 1998, a Master of Science in Chemical Engineering from the University of Illinois in 2001, and a Ph.D. in Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering from the University of Illinois in 2003. I was a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences at the University of Wisconsin, Madison

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.