

Case IPR2017-00905

Declaration of Diane J. Burgess, Ph.D. Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,466,139

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INNOPHARMA LICENSING, LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-00905  
Patent No. 8,466,139

---

**DECLARATION OF DIANE J. BURGESS, Ph.D., UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.68**  
**IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S.**  
**PATENT NO. 8,466,139**

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**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>III. MATERIALS CONSIDERED FOR THIS DECLARATION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>A. Overview of the '139 Patent .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>B. Prosecution History of the '680 Patent.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>i. The Sawchuk Declaration .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>ii. The Gellert Declaration.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>C. Prosecution History of the '139 Patent.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE PERTINENT ART .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VI. BROADEST REASONABLE CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>VII. UNDERSTANDING OF THE LAW .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>VIII. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF THE ASPECTS OF FORMULATION SCIENCE RELEVANT TO MY OPINIONS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>IX. DETAILED INVALIDITY ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>A. Summary of Opinions .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>B. Primary Prior Art Relied on in this Declaration .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>i. Howell 1996.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>ii. McLeskey 1998 .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>iii. O'Regan .....</b>	<b>45</b>

<b>C.</b>	<b>Ground 1: The Challenged Claims are Obvious Over Howell 1996</b>	<b>46</b>
	.....	
i.	<b>A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated by the Results in Howell 1996 to Develop a Formulation to Achieve Those Results</b>	<b>46</b>
ii.	<b>A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Developing a Formulation to Achieve the Pharmacokinetic Results Reported in Howell 1996 by Routine Experimentation</b>	<b>50</b>
iii.	<b>The Precise Amounts of the Formulation Recited in the Claims are the Result of Routine Experimentation</b>	<b>59</b>
iv.	<b>A Person Of Skill in the Art Would Not Have Been Motivated to Formulate Fulvestrant Using Alternative Routes of Administration</b>	<b>61</b>
v.	<b>Each Element of the Challenged Claims is rendered Obvious by Howell 1996</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Ground 2: The Challenged Claims are Obvious Over the Combination of Howell 1996 and McLeskey 1998</b>	<b>80</b>
	.....	
i.	<b>A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Howell 1996 and McLeskey 1998</b>	<b>80</b>
ii.	<b>A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Following the McLeskey 1998 Castor Oil-Based Formulation to Achieve the Pharmacokinetic Results Reported in Howell 1996</b>	<b>87</b>
iii.	<b>Dr. Illum’s Argument that it Was Unknown Whether the Castor Oil-Based Formulations Used in Howell 1996 and McLeskey 1998 Were Solutions or Suspensions is Irrelevant and Mistaken</b>	<b>92</b>
iv.	<b>Dr. Sawchuk’s Criticisms of the McLeskey 1998 Reference are Mistaken and Contradict Dr. Gellert’s Declaration</b>	<b>95</b>

v.	<b>The Combination of Howell 1996 and McLeskey 1998 Teaches Each Element of the Challenged Claim .....</b>	<b>107</b>
E.	<b>Ground 3: The Challenged Claims are Obvious Over the Combination of Howell 1996, McLeskey 1998, and O’Regan ....</b>	<b>113</b>
i.	<b>A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Howell 1996, McLeskey 1998, and O’Regan .....</b>	<b>113</b>
ii.	<b>O’Regan Confirms that a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Administering the McLeskey 1998 Castor Oil-Based Formulation Intramuscularly to Humans to Achieve the Pharmacokinetic Results Reported in Howell 1996 .....</b>	<b>115</b>
iii.	<b>The Combination of Howell 1996, McLeskey 1998, and O’Regan Teaches Each Element of the Challenged Claim .....</b>	<b>117</b>
F.	<b>Secondary Considerations Do Not Overcome the Prima Facie Case of Obviousness .....</b>	<b>126</b>
X.	<b>SUPPLEMENTATION.....</b>	<b>131</b>
XI.	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>132</b>

I, Diane J. Burgess, Ph.D. hereby declare as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of InnoPharma, LLC (“InnoPharma”) for the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,466,139 (“the ’139 patent” or “the patent”).

2. I have been asked to provide my opinions on the validity of claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 13, and 20 of the ’139 patent (“the challenged claims”).

3. In preparing this Declaration, I have reviewed the ’139 patent, the file history of the ’139 patent, and the file histories of the following related patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,774,122 (“the ’122 patent”), 7,456,160 (“the ’160 patent”), and 8,329,680 (“the ’680 patent”). I have also reviewed the petition for *inter partes review* of the ’139 patent filed by Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (IPR2016-01326) (“Mylan IPR”), the supporting declarations and exhibits, the Patent Owner’s Response to that Petition, the supporting declarations and exhibits, and the Board’s decision denying institution of *inter partes review* on the related ’680 patent (IPR2016-01325, paper 11). In addition, I have reviewed numerous prior art references that would have been available to one skilled in the art at and before 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

# 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.