

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN INSTITUTIONAL LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00324
Patent 8,114,833

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. Formulating Peptides Is Challenging and Unpredictable.....	4
B. GLP-1 Was Known to Have Unique Properties that Made It Difficult to Formulate.....	5
C. Parenteral Formulations and Isotonicity.....	6
D. The Prior Art Contained Red Flags that Would Have Steered Skilled Artisans Away From Propylene Glycol.....	7
III. THE '833 PATENT.....	9
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	13
V. GROUND 1: FLINK DOES NOT ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 1-15.....	15
A. The Anticipation Standard.....	16
B. Flink Does Not Disclose or Lead the Skilled Artisan to “Immediately Envisage” the Claimed Formulations	18
C. On A Complete Record, The Board’s Preliminary Conclusions Regarding Flink and Anticipation Should Not Stand	23
D. The Cases Mylan Relies On Do Not Control This IPR.....	27
E. Flink Does Not Anticipate the Specific Ranges of Propylene Glycol in Claims 1-4.....	30
F. Flink Does Not Enable the Claimed Formulations and Therefore Does Not Anticipate.....	32
VI. GROUND 2: CLAIMS 1-15 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER FLINK.....	34
A. Flink Does Not Teach Persons of Ordinary Skill to Use Propylene Glycol in a GLP-1 Formulation.....	35

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
(CONTINUED)**

	Page
B. One of Ordinary Skill Would Not Have Chosen Propylene Glycol or Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success In Using It	37
C. Flink Provides No Reason or Motivation to Combine Propylene Glycol and Disodium Phosphate Dihydrate in a GLP-1 Formulation.....	41
D. Propylene Glycol's Unexpectedly Superior Properties Are Powerful Evidence of Nonobviousness.....	45
VII. GROUND 3: CLAIMS 1-31 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ.....	48
A. [REDACTED].....	48
B. Betz Does Not Teach What Mylan Claims It Teaches.....	52
C. Mylan Provides No Credible Rationale for Combining the Teachings of Betz and Flink.....	55
D. Claims 16-22 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Flink In View of Betz	59
E. Claims 23-31 Would Not Have Been Obvious Over Flink In View of Betz.....	60
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Akzo v. ITC</i> , 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	25
<i>Application of LeGrice</i> , 301 F.2d 929 (CCPA 1962).....	21
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	13, 14
<i>Coherus Biosciences, Inc. v. Abbvie Biotechnology Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00822, Paper No. 14 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 7, 2017).....	17
<i>Complex Innovations, LLC v. AstraZeneca AB</i> , IPR2017-00631, Paper No. 13 (P.T.A.B. July 24, 2017)	17
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	48, 49
<i>Eaton Corp. v Rockwell Int’l Corp.</i> , 323 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	14, 15
<i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	26
<i>Endo Pharms., Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00651, Paper No. 12, (P.T.A.B. Sept. 29, 2014).....	17
<i>Griffin v. Bertina</i> , 285 F.3d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	14, 15
<i>In re Arkley</i> , 455 F.3d 586 (CCPA 1972).....	26
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	41
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	21, 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	Page(s)
<i>In re Petering</i> , 301 F.2d 676 (CCPA 1962).....	17, 18
<i>In re Samour</i> , 571 F.2d 559 (CCPA 1978).....	21
<i>In re Soni</i> , 54 F.3d 746 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	45
<i>In re Stepan Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	37, 41
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.</i> , 327 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	14
<i>Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.</i> , 780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>KVK-Tech, Inc. v. Shire PLC</i> , IPR2018-00290, Paper No. 58 (P.T.A.B. July 3, 2019).....	17
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	53, 61
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	49
<i>Millennium Pharms., Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	61
<i>Monarch Knitting Machinery Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	57
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	16
<i>Novartis Pharm. Corp. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 611 Fed.Appx. 988 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	61

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.