

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2023-00724
Patent 10,335,462

**EXPERT DECLARATION OF JULIO ROSENSTOCK, M.D.
IN SUPPORT OF PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,335,462**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| II. | BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS..... | 2 |
| III. | PRIORITY DATE AND ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL..... | 6 |
| IV. | MATERIALS RELIED UPON | 8 |
| V. | LEGAL STANDARDS..... | 9 |
| | A. Anticipation | 9 |
| | B. Obviousness..... | 10 |
| VI. | BACKGROUND ON THE STATE OF THE ART AND THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS..... | 14 |
| | A. The Invention of the '462 Patent..... | 14 |
| | B. Ozempic® (Semaglutide)..... | 21 |
| | C. Overview of the Prior Art..... | 23 |
| | 1. WO421 (EX1011)..... | 23 |
| | 2. Lovshin (EX1012)..... | 26 |
| | 3. NCT657 (EX1013)..... | 31 |
| | 4. NCT773 (EX1014)..... | 32 |
| | 5. WO537 (EX1015)..... | 34 |
| | 6. The '424 Publication (EX1016)..... | 35 |
| | D. References Showing the State of the Art | 35 |
| | 1. “Systematic Review of Animal Experiments Demonstrate Poor Contributions Toward Human Healthcare” (EX2005) (Published May 2008)..... | 35 |
| | 2. “Phase II failures: 2008–2010” (EX2006) (Published May 2011) | 37 |
| | 3. “Novo Nordisk Annual Report 2010” (EX2065) (Published February 1, 2011)..... | 38 |
| | 4. “Report on the Deliberation Results” (Liraglutide) (EX2067) (Published December 3, 2009)..... | 40 |
| | 5. “Differences in Drug Pharmacokinetics Between East Asians and Caucasians and the Role of Genetic Polymorphisms” (EX2066) (Published October 2004) | 41 |

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| 6. | “Potential of Albiglutide, a Long-Acting GLP-1 Receptor Agonists, in Type 2 Diabetes” (EX2062) (Published October 2009) | 42 |
| 7. | “Improved Glycemic Control With No Weight Increase in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes After Once-Daily Treatment With the Long-Acting Glucagon-Like Peptide 1 Analog Liraglutide (NN2211)” (EX2075) (Published June 2004)..... | 44 |
| 8. | “Experimental Diabetes Drug Taspoglutide Late-Stage Trials Suspended” (EX2061) (Published September 13, 2010) | 46 |
| E. | Other References that Drs. Bantle and Jusko Contend Inform POSITA’s Knowledge..... | 48 |
| 1. | Lund (EX1035) | 48 |
| 2. | Seino (EX1038)..... | 53 |
| 3. | Tamimi (EX1047)..... | 54 |
| 4. | FDA Exposure Response 2003 (EX1048)..... | 55 |
| F. | Background on Diabetes and Its Treatment | 56 |
| G. | Failed and Withdrawn GLP-1 Receptor Agonists | 60 |
| VII. | CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... | 63 |
| VIII. | FOUNDATIONS 1-2: CLAIMS 1-3 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED..... | 65 |
| A. | Ground 1: WO421 Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-3 | 65 |
| 1. | POSITA Would Have Understood that WO421’s “Range” Disclosure Is Not a Disclosure of a 1.0 mg Dose | 66 |
| 2. | POSITA Would Not Have At Once Envisaged the Claimed 1.0 mg Once-Weekly Semaglutide Dose from WO421 | 68 |
| 3. | Semaglutide’s FDA-Approved Dosing Shows That POSITA Would Not Have Rejected Doses Other Than Exactly One Tenth of a Milligram..... | 73 |
| 4. | The 1.0 mg Once-Weekly Dose Is Critical..... | 74 |
| 5. | WO421 Does Not Anticipate Claims 2-3 | 82 |
| B. | Ground 2: Lovshin Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-3..... | 84 |
| 1. | Lovshin Does Not Anticipate Claims 2-3..... | 92 |

IX. GROUNDS 3-5: CLAIMS 1-10 ARE NOT OBVIOUS94

A. No Motivation to Combine94

B. No Reasonable Expectation of Success100

 1. Dr. Bantle and Dr. Jusko Fail To Show POSITA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success in “Optimizing” to Reach a 1.0 mg Once-Weekly Dose102

 2. Dr. Bantle and Dr. Jusko Fail To Show a Reasonable Expectation of Success That a 1.0 mg Once-Weekly Dose of Semaglutide Would Have Been Safe, Effective, and Tolerable109

C. Ground 3: No Obviousness Based on WO421 In View of ’424 Publication (Claims 1-10)126

D. Ground 4: No Obviousness Based on WO537 In View of Lovshin127

E. Ground 5: No Obviousness Based on NCT657 and NCT773 In View of the ’424 Publication130

 1. Ground 5 Does Not Render Obvious the Challenged Claims131

X. CONCLUSION137

I, Julio Rosenstock, hereby declare under penalty of perjury:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by Groombridge, Wu, Baughman & Stone LLP, on behalf of Novo Nordisk A/S (“Novo Nordisk”) to provide assistance regarding U.S. Patent No. 10,335,462 (“the ’462 patent”). Specifically, I have been asked to provide my opinions regarding the validity of claims 1-10 of the ’462 patent (the “Challenged Claims”). Except as otherwise indicated, I have personal knowledge of the facts and opinions set forth in this Declaration. All statements herein made of my own knowledge are true and all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true. If called upon to do so, I would testify competently thereto.

2. I am being compensated for my time at a rate of \$1000 per hour which is my standard consulting fee for this legal work. I will be reimbursed for any expenses that I incur during the course of this work. My compensation is not contingent upon the results of my review of the evidence, the substance of my opinions, or the outcome of any proceeding involving the Challenged Claims. I have no financial interest in the outcome of this matter or in the pending litigations involving Novo Nordisk A/S and Novo Nordisk Inc.

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

3. I offer statements and opinions on behalf of Novo Nordisk, generally regarding the validity, novelty, prior art, obviousness considerations, and

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.