UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PFIZER INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,
Patent Owner.

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2020-01252
United States Patent No. 8,114,833
Issued: February 14, 2012
Filed: May 17, 2006

Title: Propylene Glycol-Containing Peptide Formulations Which Are Optimal for Productions and for Use in Injection Devices

---

EXPERT DECLARATION OF LAIRD FORREST, PH.D. IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1450
Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND 6
   - A. Education and Experience; Prior Testimony 6
   - B. Bases for Opinions and Materials Considered 10
   - C. Scope of Work 10
2. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS 11
3. LEGAL STANDARDS 12
4. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 14
5. THE '833 PATENT (EX. 1001) 15
6. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 19
7. BACKGROUND 19
   - A. GLP-1 Agonists, Including Liraglutide, Were Well Known in the Art 19
   - B. Parenteral Peptide Dosage Forms 20
   - C. Stability of Peptide Formulations and Selection of Excipients 30
     - i. Use of Propylene Glycol in Peptide Formulations 32
     - ii. Propylene Glycol is Safe 34
     - iii. Propylene Glycol's Advantages Over Other Isotonic Agents 34
8. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES 38
   - A. Flink (Ex. 1004) 38
   - B. Betz (Ex. 1005) 48
   - C. Other Art That Informs the Person of Ordinary Skill's Knowledge 51
     - i. U.S. Patent No. 6,268,343 ("Knudsen I") (Ex. 1006) 51
     - ii. Eur. Patent. App. Pub. No. EP0923950 ("Ibaraki") (Ex. 1007) 51
     - iii. Powell (Ex. 1008) 52
     - iv. Epperson (Ex. 1009) 53
     - v. Jacobs (Ex. 1011) 53

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

vi. Int'l Patent Pub. No. WO 1999/040788 ("Young") (Ex. 1025) 54
vii. Int'l Patent Pub. No. WO 03/072195 ("Khan") (Ex. 1014) 54
viii. Int'l Patent Pub. NO. WO 95/022560 ("Dix") (Ex. 1019) 55
ix. U.S. Patent No. 6,458,924 ("Knudsen II") (Ex. 1020) 56
x. Int'l Patent Pub. NO. WO 00/037098 (Ex. 1021).....56
xi. Handbook of Pharmaceutical Excipients 2000, 2003 (Exs. 1022-1023) 57
xii. Nail & Akers (Ex. 1024).....57
xiii. Bontempo (Ex. 1026).....60
xiv. Gatlin (Ex. 1027).....61
xv. Remington's 1990 (Ex. 1013).....64
xvi. Sturis (Ex. 1046) 66
xvii. Chang (Ex. 1059) 66
xviii. U.S. Patent No. 4,425,346 ("Horlington") (Ex. 1063) 67
xix. U.S. Patent No. 6,207,684 ("Aberg") (Ex. 1064).....68
xx. U.S. Patent No. 6,440,460 ("Gurny") (Ex. 1065).....68
xxi. Additional Prior Art References and Knowledge.....69
9. UNPATENTABILITY OF THE '833 PATENT 69
A. Claims 1-15 of the '833 Patent Were Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink.....69
i. Claim 1 Was Anticipated by or Would have Been Obvious Over Flink 69
1. Flink disclosed the GLP-1 agonist 71
2. Flink disclosed the claimed buffer 71
3. Flink disclosed the claimed isotonic agent.....74
4. It would have been obvious to select propylene glycol..74
5. Calculating an appropriate concentration of propylene glycol was obvious 77
6. Flink disclosed the claimed pH 80

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

ii. Claims 2-4 Were Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....81
iii. Claims 5-7 Were Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....81
iv. Claims 8 and 9 Were Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....82
v. Claim 10 Was Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....82
vi. Claim 11 Was Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....83
vii. Claim 12 Was Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious over Flink....84
viii. Claim 13 Was Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....84
ix. Claim 14 Was Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....85
x. Claim 15 Was Anticipated by or Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink....86
B. Claims 1-31 of the '833 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....87
i. Claims 1-15 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....87
1. The common problem of peptide instability in formulations....90
2. Flink taught that mannitol should not be used in formulations having a pH of 7.4....92
3. It would have been obvious to solve the problem of precipitation with propylene glycol....93
ii. Claim 16 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....95
iii. Claims 17-19 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....97
iv. Claims 20-22 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....97

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

v. Claims 23, 26, and 29 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....98

vi. Claims 24, 27, and 30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....99

vii. Claims 25, 28, and 31 Would Have Been Obvious Over Flink in View of Betz....101

10. NO SECONDARY CONSIDERATONS OVERCOME *PRIMA FACIE* OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CLAIMED INVENTIONS....102

A. The Methods Recited in the '833 Patent Produce No Unexpected Results....102

B. There Was No Long-Felt But Unmet Need....103

C. There Was No Industry Skepticism....104

D. Copying By Generic Drug Makers Is Irrelevant....104

E. A Blocking Patent Existed at the Time of the Claimed Invention....104

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.