

Case IPR2017-00900

Declaration of Richard Bergstrom, Ph.D. Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,329,680

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INNOPHARMA LICENSING, LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-00900  
Patent No. 8,329,680

---

**DECLARATION OF RICHARD BERGSTROM, Ph.D., UNDER 37 C.F.R.**  
**§ 1.68 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S.**  
**PATENT NO. 8,329,680**

Mail Stop: Patent Board  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| I. INTRODUCTION.....  | 1  |
| II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS .....                                 | 3  |
| III. MATERIALS CONSIDERED FOR THIS DECLARATION .....                    | 6  |
| IV. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS .....   | 6  |
| V. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF PHARMACOKINETICS AND<br>PHARMACODYNAMICS ..... | 9  |
| A. Pharmacokinetics .....   | 9  |
| B. Pharmacodynamics .....   | 18 |
| VI. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘680 PATENT AND ITS PROSECUTION HISTORY<br>.....    | 20 |
| A. Overview of the ‘680 Patent .....                                    | 20 |
| B. Overview of the Prosecution History of the ‘680 Patent.....          | 23 |
| VII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE PERTINENT ART.....                  | 29 |
| VIII. BROADEST REASONABLE CONSTRUCTION .....                            | 30 |
| IX. UNDERSTANDING OF THE LAW.....                                       | 31 |
| X. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART .....                             | 36 |
| A. Howell.....  | 36 |
| B. McLeskey .....   | 39 |
| C. O’Regan .....  | 40 |
| D. DeFriend.....  | 41 |
| XI. DETAILED INVALIDITY ANALYSIS.....                                   | 42 |
| A. The Claimed Therapeutically Significant Blood Plasma Fulvestrant     |    |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Concentrations Are Obvious.....   | 43 |
| (1) The Prior Art Expressly Discloses the Claimed Therapeutically<br>Significant Blood Plasma Fulvestrant Concentrations .....  | 43 |
| (a) Howell Discloses Fulvestrant Concentrations of At Least 2.5<br>ngml <sup>-1</sup> After Four Weeks.....   | 43 |
| (b) The Prior Art Discloses Fulvestrant Concentrations of At<br>Least 8.5 ngml <sup>-1</sup> After Four Weeks .....   | 45 |
| (i) Howell Teaches Fulvestrant Concentrations of At Least<br>8.5 ngml <sup>-1</sup> After Four Weeks .....  | 45 |
| (ii) Howell and DeFriend Teach Fulvestrant Concentrations<br>of At Least 8.5 ngml <sup>-1</sup> After Four Weeks .....  | 51 |
| (2) A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Be Motivated to<br>Achieve Therapeutically Significant Blood Plasma Fulvestrant<br>Concentrations.....                      | 56 |
| (a) A Person of Skill in the Art Would Be Motivated to Achieve<br>the Positive Results Reported in Howell.....  | 56 |
| (b) A Person of Skill in the Art Would Be Further Motivated to<br>Increase Dose and Blood Concentration to Achieve Complete<br>Downregulation of Estrogen Receptors .....   | 56 |
| (i) DeFriend Would Motivate a Person of Skill in the Art to<br>Double the Dose in Howell .....  | 58 |
| (ii) DeFriend Would Motivate a Person of Skill in the Art to<br>Use a Loading Dose.....   | 60 |
| (c) Rebuttal to AstraZeneca’s Arguments .....   | 63 |
| (3) A Person of Skill in the Art Would Have a Reasonable Expectation<br>of Success in Achieving Therapeutically Significant Blood Plasma<br>Fulvestrant Concentrations..... | 66 |
| (a) A Person of Skill in the Art Would Have a Reasonable  |    |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Expectation of Success in Achieving Fulvestrant<br>Concentrations of At Least 2.5 ngml <sup>-1</sup> For Four Weeks .....   | 66 |
| (b) A Person of Skill in the Art Would Have a Reasonable<br>Expectation of Success in Achieving Fulvestrant<br>Concentrations of At Least 8.5 ngml <sup>-1</sup> For Four Weeks ..... | 67 |
| (c) Rebuttal to AstraZeneca’s Arguments .....   | 69 |
| B. A Person of Skill in the Art Would Reasonably Expect that the<br>Formulation Disclosed in McLeskey Would Exhibit the Same or Very<br>Similar Pharmacokinetics as Howell .....      | 70 |
| XII. CONCLUSION .....   | 76 |

I, Richard Bergstrom, Ph.D. hereby declare as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of InnoPharma Licensing, LLC (“InnoPharma”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,329,680 (“the ‘680 patent”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate of \$375 per hour. My compensation is in no way dependent on the outcome of this matter.

2. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding whether the therapeutically significant blood plasma fulvestrant concentrations recited in claims 1-3 and 6 of the ‘680 patent would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention.

3. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed the ‘680 patent, the file histories of the ‘680 patent and related patents, and numerous prior art references from the time of the alleged invention.

4. I have been advised and it is my understanding that patent claims in an IPR are given their broadest reasonable construction in view of the patent specification, file history, and the understanding of one having ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of the purported invention.

5. In forming the opinions expressed in this Declaration, I relied upon

# 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.