

Filed: March 12, 2021

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN INSTITUTIONAL LLC and PFIZER INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00324¹
U.S. Patent No. 8,114,833

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO
EXCLUDE EVIDENCE**

¹ IPR2020-01252 has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. NOVO’S MOTION FAILS TO COMPLY WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c).....2

II. PETITIONER’S REPLY EVIDENCE APPROPRIATELY REPLIES TO THE PATENT OWNER RESPONSE.....3

A. The Scope of Petitioner’s Reply is Not a Proper Ground for a Motion to Exclude3

B. Petitioner’s Reply Evidence is Proper Reply4

 1. Evidence Related to Similarities Between hGH and GLP-15

 2. Evidence Related to Mannitol Precipitation Upon Evaporation6

 3. Evidence Related to the Betz Priority Application.....8

C. Dr. Forrest’s Testimony and Exhibits Are Not Prejudicial.....10

D. Exhibits 1091-1098, 1103, and 1114-1115 are Relevant.....12

III. NOVO’S OBJECTION TO EVIDENCE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE IS BOTH UNTIMELY AND UNFOUNDED.....13

IV. CONCLUSION15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>10X Genomics, Inc. v. Univ. of Chicago</i> , IPR2015-01157, Paper 51 (PTAB Nov. 15, 2016).....	4
<i>Anacor Pharm., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 889 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	1, 5
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	4
<i>BioMarin Pharma Inc., v. Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. L.P.</i> , IPR2013-00537, 2015 WL 1009197 (PTAB Feb 23, 2015)	2, 5, 11
<i>Blackberry Corp. v. Zipit Wireless, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01508, Paper 49 (PTAB Mar. 29, 2016)	3
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	9
<i>Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Boston Sci. SciMed, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00444, Paper 42 (PTAB Jun. 28, 2018)	3
<i>Global Tel*Link Corp. v. Securus Techs, Inc.</i> , PGR2015-00013, Paper 50 (PTAB Dec. 7, 2016).....	14, 15
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00804, 2018 WL 1869685 (PTAB Apr. 18, 2018)	1
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00517, Paper 87 (PTAB Feb. 11, 2015).....	4
<i>Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC</i> , IPR2013-00007, Paper 51 (PTAB Mar. 27, 2014)	1, 3
<i>Lupin Ltd. v. Senju Pharm. Co.</i> , IPR2015-01099, Paper 69 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2016).....	4
<i>Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Int’l. GmbH</i> , IPR2016-01563, Paper 14 (PTAB Dec. 7, 2016)	9

Nippon Suisan Kaisha Ltd. v. Pronova Biopharma Norge AS,
PGR2017-00033, 2019 WL 237114 (PTAB Jan. 16, 2019).....3

Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Finjan Inc.,
IPR2015-01979, Paper 62 (PTAB Mar. 15, 2017).....3

Silicon Labs, Inc. v. Cresta Techs. Corp.,
IPR2014-00881, Paper 47 (PTAB Oct. 21, 2015).....2, 13, 14

Toyota Motor Corp. v. Am. Vehicular Scis. LLC,
IPR2013-00424, Paper 50 (PTAB Jan. 12, 2015)4

Twitter, Inc. v. Vidstream, LLC,
IPR2017-00829, Paper 68 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2019)11

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)8, 9, 10

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.613

37 C.F.R. § 42.231, 3, 11

37 C.F.R. § 42.642, 13

Federal Rule of Evidence 403.....10

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.23, Petitioner opposes Patent Owner Novo Nordisk A/S's ("Novo") Motion to Exclude (Paper 52). The Board should deny Novo's motion in its entirety for lacking any merit.

A motion to exclude "is neither a substantive sur-reply, nor a proper vehicle for arguing whether a reply or supporting evidence is of appropriate scope." *Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC*, IPR2013-00007, Paper 51, 34 (PTAB Mar. 27, 2014). But Novo's motion presents nothing more. Petitioner's Reply evidence is appropriate because it fairly and directly responds to arguments and evidence first raised in Novo's Response. As the Federal Circuit recognized, a petitioner may introduce new evidence after the petition stage if the evidence is in reply to evidence introduced by the patent owner, or if it is used to document the knowledge that POSAs bring to bear in reading the relied-upon prior art. *Anacor Pharm., Inc. v. Iancu*, 889 F.3d 1372, 1380-81 (Fed. Cir. 2018). Novo misconstrues the rules; contrary to its arguments, "[n]ew evidence, including new testimonial evidence, filed in support of a reply, is not *per se* improper," as "[a] Petitioner's Reply...may only respond to arguments raised in Patent Owner's Response." *Hospira, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, IPR2017-00804, 2018 WL 1869685, at *1 (PTAB Apr. 18, 2018). The challenged evidence meets this standard.

Novo moves to exclude Dr. Forrest's Reply Declaration ("the Forrest Reply Declaration" (Ex. 1106)) in its entirety and Exhibits 1091-1098, 1103, and 1114-

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.