

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
MSN LABORATORIES PRIVATE LTD.,
and MSN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.
Petitioners,

v.

BAUSCH HEALTH IRELAND LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-00722¹
Patent 7,041,786

SECOND DECLARATION OF BLAKE R. PETERSON, PH.D.

¹ IPR2023-00016 has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	3
III. A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART WOULD HAVE SELECTED HUMAN UROGUANYLIN FOR MODIFICATION	4
A. Enterotoxin Activity Would Not Dissuade a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art From Modifying Human Uroguanylin	9
B. Bausch Fails to Establish Topoisomerism Would Have Dissuaded a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art From Modifying Uroguanylin.....	15
IV. A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART WOULD HAVE SUBSTITUTED ASP ³ WITH GLU ³ IN HUMAN UROGUANYLIN.....	35
A. Potential Uroguanylin Interconversion as a Motivation to Modify	36
B. The Conservative, Evolutionary Conserved [Glu ³]-Substitution Supports the Modification	43
C. The Prior Art Does Not Indicate That Asp ³ Was Required to Maintain Activity.....	51
D. [Glu ³]-Substitution Would Have Been Expected to Modulate Protonation Favorably as a Matter of Routine Optimization	65
E. Aspartimide Formation Provides Additional Motivation for Making [Glu ³]-Human Uroguanylin	74
V. REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF SUCCESS	76
VI. BAUSCH’S EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS DO NOT DEMONSTRATE UNEXPECTED SUPERIORITY FOR WHAT IS CLAIMED AS COMPARED TO THE CLOSEST PRIOR ART.....	79
A. Summary of Bausch’s Experiments	79
A. Bausch’s Experimental Results Are Not Commensurate with the Scope of the Claims	101
B. Bausch’s Experimental Results Do Not Compare to the Closest Prior Art.....	104

C. Bausch’s cGMP and Affinity Results Do Not Show An
Unexpected Improvement Nor Any Difference in Kind.....116

D. Bausch’s Heat Stability Results Show Neither an Unexpected
Improvement Nor Any Difference in Kind120

E. Bausch’s Topoisomerism Experiment Shows Neither an
Unexpected Improvement Nor Any Difference in Kind.....121

VII. CONCLUDING STATEMENTS122

VIII. APPENDIX – LIST OF EXHIBITS124

I, Blake R. Peterson, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am the same Blake R. Peterson who previously filed a declaration (EX1002) in this proceeding. EX1002 contains the legal standards I was given to apply to this case, as well as my opinions regarding the level of skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art (POSA) and the obviousness of claims 1-6 of the '786 patent (7,041,786, EX1001) in view of the prior art. My qualifications are discussed in EX1002 as well as in my CV (EX1003). I also was deposed by attorneys for the Patent Owner (Bausch). EX2026.

2. I have been asked to review the declarations of Dr. Shailubhai (EX2023), Dr. Davies (EX2024), and Dr. Waldman (EX2025), and the materials they discussed. I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding those declarations and the materials they discussed from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art. For purposes of my evaluation, I understand that the critical date for this patent is January 17, 2002. EX2024, ¶4. My opinions are based on my skills, knowledge, training, education, and experience, and my examination of the materials used in preparing this testimony, including the declarations and cited materials discussed above. I also have reviewed the transcripts of the depositions of Drs. Davies (EX1060), Shailubhai (EX1061), and Waldman (EX1062). My opinions are based on the current record, so I reserve the ability to

refine my opinions based on additional facts.

3. In summary, it is my opinion that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the critical date would have recognized that human uroguanylin was a most promising peptide for modification, and that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been dissuaded from selecting human uroguanylin for modification by the potency of ST enterotoxins or by topoisomeric conversion properties.

4. It is also my opinion that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the critical date would have been motivated to make [Glu³]-human uroguanylin for several reasons, discussed at length in my first declaration (EX1002). It is further my opinion that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been dissuaded from doing so in favor of making the peptide more like the ST enterotoxins, and none of the arguments presented by Drs. Davies or Waldman undermine the motivations for the modification discussed in my first declaration.

5. Furthermore, it is my opinion that the experimental data for human uroguanylin and [Glu³]-human uroguanylin discussed by Drs. Shailubhai, Davies, and Waldman do not demonstrate any unexpected, significant, and material improvement between the two compounds. They certainly do not demonstrate a difference in kind between the two compounds. Moreover, the data relate to only a portion of what is encompassed by the claims of the '786 patent and do not provide an apples-to-apples comparison of [Glu³]-human uroguanylin to the most similar

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.