

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

NOVO NORDISK INC. and
NOVO NORDISK A/S,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS
INC.,

Defendant.

Civ. No. 23-cv-00101-CFC
ANDA CASE

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Plaintiffs Novo Nordisk Inc. and Novo Nordisk A/S (collectively Novo Nordisk) market Wegovy®, a drug product approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to treat obesity and the reference product for the abbreviated new drug application filed by Defendant Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. that led to this patent infringement litigation. Pending before me is the construction of two terms in claim 1 of the asserted U.S. Patent No. 9,764,003 (the #003 patent).

The active ingredient in Wegovy® is a GLP-1 receptor agonist called semaglutide. Claim 1 of the #003 patent reads:

A method for reducing body weight, comprising administering semaglutide once weekly *in an amount of at least 0.7 mg and up to 1.6 mg* to a subject in need thereof, wherein said semaglutide is *administered without another therapeutic agent*.

#003 patent at 35:31–35 (emphasis added).

The first disputed term is “in an amount of at least 0.7 mg and up to 1.6 mg.” Both parties ask me to give the term its plain and ordinary meaning. They dispute, however what that meaning is. Novo Nordisk proposes that I construe the term to mean “in doses greater than or equal to 0.7 mg and less than or equal to 1.6 mg,” D.I. 63 at 41, and argues that under this construction the claimed method allows for administrations of semaglutide in amounts less than 0.7 mg and above 1.6 mg. Mylan argues that the claimed method does not allow for administrations of semaglutide in doses less than 0.7 mg or above 1.6 mg, and its asks that I construe the term to mean “only in doses greater than or equal to 0.7 mg and less than or equal to 1.6 mg.” D.I. 63 at 41.

Novo Nordisk argues that “[i]t is black letter law that ‘[t]he transition ‘comprising’ in a method claim indicates that the claim is open-ended and allows for additional steps,’ even where such steps are unclaimed.” D.I. 63 at 42 (quoting *Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg. L.P.*, 327 F.3d 1364, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (second alteration in the original)). Novo Nordisk “is correct that, generally, the use of the transitional phrase ‘comprising’ does not exclude additional, unrecited steps.” *Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Texas Sys. v. BENQ Am. Corp.*, 533 F.3d 1362, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (citing *Dippin’ Dots, Inc. v. Mosey*, 476 F.3d 1337,

1343 (Fed. Cir. 2007)). But “[t]he presumption raised by the term ‘comprising’ does not reach into each of the [] steps to render every word and phrase therein open-ended—especially where . . . the patentee has narrowly defined the claim term it [] seeks to have broadened.” *Dippin’ Dots*, 476 F.3d at 1343. Thus, a patentee “cannot rely on the word ‘comprising’ to broaden the scope of a claim phrase that was limited during prosecution so as to gain allowance of the patent.” *Univ. of Texas*, 533 F.3d at 1373.

In this case, during its prosecution of the #003 patent, Novo Nordisk expressly capped the dosage of the method in claim 1 at 1.6 mg in order to obtain the patent. On September 22, 2016, the United States Patent & Trademark Office (PTO) rejected Novo Nordisk’s application for a previous version of claim 1 (at the time designated claim 13) as indefinite because the proposed claim did not have an upper dosage limit:

Claims 13, 16, 20, 21, 23, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(b) or 35 U.S.C. 112 (pre-AIA), second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the inventor or a joint inventor, or for pre-AIA the applicant regards as the invention. **This is a new rejection necessitated upon further consideration the claims and potential claim scope.**

Claim 13 (and dependent claims 16, 20, 21, 23, 28, and 29) are drawn to a method for treating obesity, comprising administering semaglutide once weekly in *an*

amount of at least 0.7 mg to a subject in need thereof, wherein said semaglutide is administered alone or in combination with an antiobesity agent.

The metes and bounds of the claim are deemed to be indefinite because there is no upper limit in the claims. Accordingly, the claim is interpreted as a method of administering semaglutide once weekly in an amount of at least 0.7 mg which without an upper limit, further includes an amount that is broadly interpreted as up to an infinite amount (0.7 mg - infinite amount). Claim clarification is required.

D.I. 64-7 at 4 (bold and italicized font in the original). In response to this rejection, Novo Nordisk added the words “and up to 1.6 mg” to then-claim 13.

D.I. 64-8 at 2. Based on that change (and others), the PTO issued claim 13 as claim 1 of the #003 patent.

Having narrowed claim 1 with an upper dosage limit to gain allowance of the claim, Novo Nordisk cannot rely on the word “comprising” to broaden the scope of the claim to recapture what it expressly and unambiguously relinquished. *Univ. of Texas*, 533. F.3d at 1373. Thus, I agree with Mylan that claim 1 does not allow for administrations of semaglutide in doses greater than 1.6 mg. Mylan, however, does not identify anything in the prosecution history of the #003 patent that suggests, let alone clearly shows, that Novo Nordisk disclaimed dosage amounts below 0.7 mg to obtain issuance of claim 1. For that reason, I cannot agree that claim 1 does not allow for dosage amounts below 0.7 mg.

Accordingly, I will construe “in an amount of at least 0.7 mg and up to 1.6 mg” to mean “in doses greater than or equal to 0.7 mg and never to exceed 1.6 mg.” This construction is also consistent with the fact that the patent’s written description discloses a dosage amount of less than 0.7 mg, *see, e.g.*, #003 patent at 21:15–17; 22:12–55, but does not disclose any dosage amount above 1.6 mg.

The second disputed term is “administered without another therapeutic agent.” Here again, both parties say I should give the term its plain and ordinary meaning but they disagree about what that meaning is. “Therapeutic agent” is not defined in the patent, and neither claim 1 nor any other claim makes clear what is the universe of therapeutic agents covered by “another therapeutic agent” in claim 1. Novo Nordisk asks me to construe “administered without another therapeutic agent” to mean “without coadministration of another medicament intended to reduce body weight.” Mylan originally sought the construction “without coadministration of another medicament,” but at the December 13, 2023 claim construction hearing, it said that it was not seeking to exclude the coadministration of all other medicaments but only those medicaments implicated by the patent’s written description and the discussion of the Madsbad et al. reference in the #003 patent’s prosecution history. *See* D.I. 76 at 27:10–15. Having become convinced during oral argument that the term “additional

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.