

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES LTD.
Petitioner,

v.

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01072
Patent No. 7,326,708

DECLARATION OF DR. STEVEN W. BALDWIN, PH.D.

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Submitted Electronically via the PTAB E2E System.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	3
III. LIST OF MATERIALS CONSIDERED.....	4
IV. LEGAL STANDARD.....	5
A. Anticipation.....	6
B. Obviousness	7
V. BACKGROUND	10
VI. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”)	11
VII. THE ’708 PATENT	12
VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	16
IX. ANTICIPATION	18
A. Ground 1: WO 03/004498 anticipates Claims 1-3, 17, 19, and 21-23 of the ’708 patent.....	18
1. Disclosure of WO ’498	19
2. Claim 1 of the ’708 Patent	29
3. Claim 2 of the ’708 Patent	32
4. Claim 3 of the ’708 Patent	33
5. Claim 17 of the ’708 Patent	34
6. Claim 19 of the ’708 Patent	35
7. Claims 21-22 of the ’708 Patent	36
8. Claim 23 of the ’708 Patent	38
B. Ground 2: Claims 1-3, 17, 19, and 22-23 Are Anticipated by the ’871 Patent....	39
1. Disclosure of the ’871 Patent.....	39
2. Claims 1 and 2	39
3. Claim 3.....	40
4. Claims 17 and 19	41
5. Claim 21.....	43
6. Claim 22.....	44
7. Claim 23.....	45
X. OBVIOUSNESS.....	45

A. Ground 3: Claims 3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498..... 46

1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art 46

2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art..... 46

B. Ground 4: Claims 1-3, 17, 19, and 21-23 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498 and Bastin..... 51

1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art 51

2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art..... 51

3. The Differences Between the Claims and Prior Art 52

C. Ground 5: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498, Bastin, and Brittain 60

1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art 60

2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art..... 60

3. The Differences Between the Claim and Prior Art..... 62

D. Ground 6: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious in View of WO '498 and Brittain 63

1. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Pertinent Art 63

2. The Scope and Content of the Prior Art..... 63

3. The Differences Between the Claim and Prior Art..... 63

XI. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS 64

I, Steven W. Baldwin, Ph.D., do hereby declare and state as follows:

1. I have been asked to provide testimony as to what one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood with respect to the patent at issue and various prior art discussed herein. I provide this testimony below:

I. INTRODUCTION

2. I am over the age of 18 and otherwise competent to make this Declaration.

3. I have been retained on behalf of Petitioner Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., for the above-captioned *inter partes* review (“IPR”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate, which is \$500 per hour. My compensation does not depend in any way on the outcome of the IPR.

4. It is my understanding that the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review in this matter (the “Petition”) involves U.S. Patent No. 7,326,708 (“the ’708 patent”) (EX1001).

5. The ’708 patent names Stephen Howard Cypes, Alex Minhua Chen, Russell R. Ferlita, Karl Hansen, Ivan Lee, Vicky K. Vydra, and Robert M. Wenslow, Jr. as the purported inventors.

6. For the purposes of this declaration, I have been told to assume the relevant priority date of the ’708 patent is June 24, 2003—the filing date of U.S.

Provisional Application No. 60/482,161¹. I further understand that the '708 patent is assigned to Merck, Sharpe & Dohme Corp. (“Merck,” “Patentee,” or “Patent Owner”).

7. As explained below, it is my opinion that Claims 1-4, 17, 19, and 21-23 of the '708 patent² are anticipated or would have been obvious to the skilled artisan as of the time of the priority date of the '708 patent. Therefore, these claims are invalid.

¹ I have not been asked to analyze whether this is indeed the correct priority date but rather assume that it is for the purposes of my declaration. I understand that Patent Owner has recently contended that the priority date is earlier than June 24, 2003. EX1015, 10. I express no opinion at this time as to whether June 24, 2003 is, in fact, the correct priority date. However, should this become an issue during the proceeding, I may be called upon to offer my opinion.

² I have not been asked to express an opinion about any other claim of the '708 patent, nor do I express such opinion because I have not undertaken such an analysis.

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.