

Declaration of Laird Forrest, Ph.D. in Support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 8,114,833

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,  
Patent Owner

---

U.S. Patent No. 8,114,833

Issue Date: February 14, 2012

Title: Propylene glycol-containing peptide formulations which are optimal for  
production and for use in injection devices

Case No. IPR2022-00657

---

**DECLARATION OF LAIRD FORREST, PH.D. IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR  
*INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,114,833**

Declaration of Laird Forrest, Ph.D. in Support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 8,114,833

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I.</b> INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	1
<b>A.</b> INTRODUCTION.....	1
<b>B.</b> QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE .....	1
<b>C.</b> MATERIALS CONSIDERED.....	6
<b>D.</b> SCOPE OF WORK .....	6
<b>II.</b> SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....	6
<b>III.</b> LEGAL STANDARDS .....	8
<b>IV.</b> PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	10
<b>V.</b> THE '833 PATENT.....	11
<b>VI.</b> CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	14
<b>VII.</b> TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	15
<b>A.</b> GLP-1 AGONISTS, INCLUDING LIRAGLUTIDE, WERE WELL KNOWN IN THE ART .....	15
<b>B.</b> PARENTERAL PEPTIDE DOSAGE FORMS .....	16
<b>C.</b> STABILITY OF PEPTIDE FORMULATIONS AND SELECTION OF EXCIPIENTS .....	26
1. USE OF PROPYLENE GLYCOL IN PEPTIDE FORMULATIONS .....	28
2. PROPYLENE GLYCOL IS SAFE.....	31
3. PROPYLENE GLYCOL'S ADVANTAGES OVER OTHER ISOTONIC AGENTS.....	31
<b>VIII.</b> SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES .....	35
<b>A.</b> FLINK (EX. 1004).....	35
<b>B.</b> BETZ (EX. 1005).....	45
<b>C.</b> OTHER ART THAT INFORMS THE PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL'S KNOWLEDGE .....	47

Declaration of Laird Forrest, Ph.D. in Support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 8,114,833

1.	U.S. PATENT NO. 6,268,343 (“KNUDSEN I”) (EX. 1006) .....	47
2.	EUR. PATENT APP. PUB. NO. EP0923950 (“IBARAKI”) (EX. 1007).....	48
3.	POWELL (EX. 1008) .....	49
4.	EPPERSON (EX. 1009).....	49
5.	JACOBS (EX. 1011).....	50
6.	INT’L PATENT PUB. NO. WO 1999/040788 (“YOUNG”) (EX. 1025).....	50
7.	INT’L PATENT PUB. NO. WO 03/072195 (“KHAN”) (EX. 1014).....	51
8.	INT’L PATENT PUB. NO. WO 95/022560 (“DIX”) (EX. 1019).....	52
9.	U.S. PATENT NO. 6,458,924 (“KNUDSEN II”) (EX. 1020) .....	53
10.	INT’L PATENT PUB. NO. WO 00/037098 (EX. 1021) .....	53
11.	HANDBOOK OF PHARMACEUTICAL EXCIPIENTS 2000, 2003 (EXS. 1022-1023).....	54
12.	NAIL & AKERS (EX. 1024).....	54
13.	BONTEMPO (EX. 1026).....	57
14.	GATLIN (EX. 1027).....	59
15.	REMINGTON’S 1990 (EX. 1013).....	61
16.	STURIS (EX. 1046).....	63
17.	CHANG (EX. 1059) .....	64
18.	U.S. PATENT NO. 4,425,346 (“HORLINGTON”) (EX. 1063) .....	64
19.	U.S. PATENT NO. 6,207,684 (“ABERG”) (EX. 1064) .....	65
20.	U.S. PATENT NO. 6,440,460 (“GURNY”) (EX. 1065).....	66

Declaration of Laird Forrest, Ph.D. in Support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 8,114,833

21.	ADDITIONAL PRIOR ART REFERENCES AND KNOWLEDGE .....	66
<b>IX.</b>	<b>UNPATENTABILITY OF THE '833 PATENT .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>CLAIMS 1-15 OF THE '833 PATENT WERE ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK.....</b>	<b>67</b>
1.	CLAIM 1 WAS ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	67
2.	CLAIMS 2-4 WERE ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	79
3.	CLAIMS 5-7 WERE ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	80
4.	CLAIMS 8 AND 9 WERE ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	80
5.	CLAIM 10 WAS ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	80
6.	CLAIM 11 WAS ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	81
7.	CLAIM 12 WAS ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	82
8.	CLAIM 13 WAS ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	83
9.	CLAIM 14 WAS ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	84
10.	CLAIM 15 WAS ANTICIPATED BY OR WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK .....	85
<b>B.</b>	<b>CLAIMS 1-31 OF THE '833 PATENT WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ.....</b>	<b>86</b>
1.	CLAIMS 1-15 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ .....	86
2.	CLAIM 16 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ .....	94

Declaration of Laird Forrest, Ph.D. in Support of  
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 8,114,833

3.	CLAIMS 17-19 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ.....	96
4.	CLAIMS 20-22 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ.....	97
5.	CLAIMS 23, 26, AND 29 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ.....	97
6.	CLAIMS 24, 27, AND 30 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ.....	98
7.	CLAIMS 25, 28, AND 31 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER FLINK IN VIEW OF BETZ.....	101
<b>X.</b>	<b>NO SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OVERCOME <i>PRIMA</i> <i>FACIE</i> OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CLAIMED INVENTIONS.....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>THE METHODS RECITED IN THE '833 PATENT PRODUCE NO UNEXPECTED RESULTS.....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>THERE WAS NO LONG-FELT BUT UNMET NEED.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>THERE WAS NO INDUSTRY SKEPTICISM.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>COPYING BY GENERIC DRUG MAKERS IS IRRELEVANT.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>E.</b>	<b>A BLOCKING PATENT EXISTED AT THE TIME OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION.....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>105</b>

# 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.