

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	4
	A. Peptide Formulation	4
	B. GLP-1 Formulation	7
	C. Parenteral Formulations and Isotonicity.....	8
	D. Propylene Glycol	10
III.	The '833 Patent.....	14
	A. The Invention of the '833 Patent.....	14
	B. The '833 Patent Claims	17
IV.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	17
V.	Claim Construction.....	17
VI.	Ground 1: Mylan Failed To Show a Reasonable Likelihood that Any of Claims 1-15 Are Anticipated by Flink	18
	A. Flink's Claim 14 and the Unclear Network of Claims on Which It Depends Do Not Anticipate '833 Patent Claims 1-10	18
	B. Even Beyond Claim 14, Flink Does Not Disclose the Formulations Claimed in the '833 Patent	25
	C. Caselaw Supports Rejection of Mylan's Anticipation Theory	30
	D. Flink's Claims 21-25 Do Not Anticipate '833 Patent Claims 11-15 ..	34
VII.	Ground 2: Mylan Failed To Show a Reasonable Likelihood That Any of Claims 1-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink.....	35
	A. The Inventors Solved an Unknown Problem, Making Their Invention Non-Obvious as a Matter of Law	36

:

B.	Flink Does Not Motivate Persons of Ordinary Skill To Combine Propylene Glycol with Disodium Phosphate Dihydrate	41
C.	Mylan Has Not Identified Any Motivation To Use Propylene Glycol or Established a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	44
VIII.	Ground 3: Mylan Failed to Show a Reasonable Likelihood That Any of Claims 1-31 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz	47
A.	Betz Does Not Teach What Mylan Claims It Teaches.....	47
B.	Mylan Provides No Credible Rationale for Combining the Teachings of Betz and Flink	52
C.	Claims 16-22 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Flink in View of Betz.....	57
D.	Claims 23-31 Would Not Have Been Obvious over Flink in View of Betz.....	58
IX.	Conclusion	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986)29, 35, 41, 44

Aquestive Therapeutics, Inc. v. Neurelis, Inc.,
IPR2019-00449, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 1, 2019).....25

Complex Innovations, LLC v. AstraZeneca AB,
IPR2017-00631, Paper No. 13 (P.T.A.B. July 24, 2017)30

Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
IPR2013-00509, Paper No. 10 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2014).....34

Endo Pharm., Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.,
IPR2014-00651, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 29, 2014).....26, 29

Grünenthal GMBH v. Antecip Bioventures II LLC,
PGR2017-00022, Paper No. 50 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 14, 2018)26, 29, 30

In re Arkley,
455 F.2d 586 (C.C.P.A. 1972)33

In re Chudik,
851 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2017)23

In re Huai-Hung Kao,
639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)59

In re Kotzab,
217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000)42, 47

In re Stepan Co.,
868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)42

Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.,
512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)24

Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.,
780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015)32

iii

<i>King Pharms., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	60
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	36, 41, 58
<i>Millennium Pharm., Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	59
<i>Monarch Knitting Machinery Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	41, 55
<i>Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. 3M Co.</i> , IPR2015-02002, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 4, 2016).....	25, 33
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	25
<i>Novartis Pharms. Corp. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 611 Fed. App'x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	36, 41, 48, 58
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	44, 55
<i>Otonomy, Inc. v. Auris Med., AG</i> , 743 F. App'x 430 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	26, 27, 30, 34
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	59
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	24
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	46, 53, 57
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00384, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 30, 2013)	18
<i>W.L. Gore v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.3d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	19

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.