

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

HORIZON THERAPEUTICS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR: Unassigned  
U.S. Patent No. 9,561,197

---

**DECLARATION OF NEAL SONDHEIMER, M.D., Ph.D.**

*Inter Partes Review of USPN 9,561,197  
Declaration of Neal Sondheimer, M.D., Ph.D. (Exhibit 1002)*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Overview.....	1
II.	My background and qualifications .....	3
III.	List of documents considered in formulating my opinion .....	6
IV.	Person of ordinary skill in the art .....	8
V.	State of the art before April 20, 2012 .....	9
	A.    The urea cycle .....	9
	B.    Nitrogen scavenging drugs.....	12
	C.    PAA was well-known to cause neurotoxicity when present at excessive levels in plasma.....	15
	D.    PAA-to-PAGN conversion was known to be saturable.....	16
	E.    Determining a therapeutic window was well-known in the art by April 20, 2012.....	20
VI.	The '197 patent and its claims .....	21
	A.    Independent claims 1 and 2 .....	21
	B.    Claim construction .....	22
VII.	The basis of my analysis with respect to obviousness .....	25
	A.    A person of ordinary skill in the art reading Lee, Praphanphoj, Thibault, and Carducci would have had a reason and the knowledge to arrive at the methods of claims 1 and 2 with a reasonable expectation of success.....	26
	1.    A person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reason to administer GPB. ....	27
	2.    A person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reason to determine a patient's PAA:PAGN plasma ratio.....	28

*Inter Partes Review of USPN 9,561,197  
Declaration of Neal Sondheimer, M.D., Ph.D. (Exhibit 1002)*

3.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reason to adjust a patient’s dose of GPB based on the patient’s PAA:PAGN plasma ratio being outside a target range of 1 to 2 or 2.5. ....	35
4.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the methods of claims 1 and 2. ....	36
B.	Objective indicia of non-obviousness .....	38
1.	No unexpectedly superior results.....	39
2.	No long-felt, but unmet need or failure of others .....	40
3.	No teaching away.....	41
VIII.	Conclusion.....	41

*Inter Partes Review of USPN 9,561,197  
Declaration of Neal Sondheimer, M.D., Ph.D. (Exhibit 1002)*

I, Neal Sondheimer, do hereby declare as follows:

**I. Overview**

1. I am over the age of 18 and otherwise competent to make this declaration. I am a medical doctor with specialties in Pediatrics, Clinical Genetics and Clinical Biochemical Genetics. I am also qualified to give testimony under oath. The facts and opinions listed below are within my personal knowledge.

2. I am being compensated for my time in this proceeding at my standard consulting rate of \$650/hour. My compensation in no way depends on the outcome of this *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) proceeding or the content of my opinions. I am not employed by, nor receiving grant support from Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. (“Par”) or any related companies. I am receiving compensation from Par solely for my time spent working on this matter and based only on my standard hourly consulting fees.

3. I have been asked to review U.S. Patent No. 9,561,197 (“the ’197 Patent”) (EX1001) and other documents that are exhibits to Par’s Petition, and to provide my opinions on what those documents disclose. I understand that the ’197 patent issued on February 7, 2017 and resulted from U.S. Application No. 13/610,580, filed on September 11, 2012, which claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/636,256, filed on April 20, 2012. I understand that, based on that April 20, 2012 date, the earliest possible date to which the ’197

*Inter Partes Review of USPN 9,561,197  
Declaration of Neal Sondheimer, M.D., Ph.D. (Exhibit 1002)*

patent may claim priority is April 20, 2012. I have been asked to provide my analysis of the '197 patent based on prior art and the knowledge in the art before April 20, 2012. I also understand that the face page of the '197 patent states that the '197 patent is currently assigned to Horizon Therapeutics, LLC (“Horizon”).

4. I have also relied upon my experience in the relevant art and considered the viewpoint of a person of ordinary skill in the art before April 20, 2012.

5. Independent claims 1 and 2 of the '197 patent generally recite a method of treating a subject with a urea cycle disorder (“UCD”) comprising administering to the subject a dose of the nitrogen scavenging drug glyceryl tri-[4-phenylbutyrate] (“GPB”) in an amount effective to achieve a specific plasma ratio of phenylacetic acid (“PAA”)<sup>1</sup> and phenylacetylglutamine (“PAGN”), if the subject’s PAA:PAGN plasma ratio is outside a specific range.

---

<sup>1</sup> The '197 patent defines PAA as “phenylacetic acid.” (EX1001, 2:4-10, 2:38-55.)

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood that “phenylacetic acid” includes phenylacetic acid or its conjugate base, phenylacetate. As used herein, PAA means either phenylacetic acid or phenylacetate. Similarly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that “phenylbutyric acid”

# 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.