

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC., DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.
and DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD.

Petitioner,

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2023-00724¹

Patent No. 10,335,462

REPLY DECLARATION OF WILLIAM J. JUSKO, PH.D.

¹ IPR2024-00009 (Dr. Reddy's Laboratories) has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS	13
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	15
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	19
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	21
V. THE '462 PATENT.....	23
VI. REFERENCES IN THE ART	24
A. SCOPE OF THE PRIOR ART.....	24
1. WO421 (EX1011).....	25
2. Lovshin (EX1012).....	28
3. NCT657 (EX1013).....	30
4. NCT773 (EX1014).....	31
5. WO537 (EX1015).....	32
6. Lund (EX1035)	33
7. Seino (EX1038).....	36
8. Tamimi (EX1047).....	38
9. FDA Exposure Response 2003 (EX1048).....	40
B. ADDITIONAL REFERENCES RELIED UPON BY DR. ROSENSTOCK	41
1. Knight (EX2005).....	41
2. Arrowsmith (EX2006)	46
3. Novo Nordisk Annual Report 2010 (EX2065).....	52
4. Report on the Deliberation Results (EX2067).....	59
5. Kim (EX2066).....	62
6. Rosenstock 2009 (EX2062)	63
7. Madsbad 2004 (EX2075).....	66
8. Nordqvist (EX2061).....	73
VII. PURPORTED FAILED AND WITHDRAWN GLP-1 RECEPTOR AGONISTS.....	76

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
VIII. UNPATENTABILITY OF THE '462 PATENT	84
A. GROUND 1: WO421 ANTICIPATED CLAIMS 1-3 OF THE '462 PATENT.....	84
1. WO421 anticipated claim 1	84
a. A skilled artisan would have understood that the 0.1 – 1.6 mg range in WO421 discloses the 1.0 mg dose and would have immediately envisaged the 1.0 mg dose	85
b. The 1.0 mg dose is not critical.....	96
(i) The claims do not require any particular level of efficacy	98
(ii) The claims do not require any particular level of tolerability	102
2. WO421 anticipated claims 2 and 3	105
B. GROUND 2: LOVSHIN ANTICIPATED CLAIMS 1-3 OF THE '462 PATENT.....	107
1. Lovshin anticipated claim 1	107
a. A skilled artisan would have understood that the 0.1 – 1.6 mg range in Lovshin discloses the 1.0 mg dose and would have immediately envisaged the 1.0 mg dose	107
b. The 1 mg dose is not critical	112
2. Lovshin anticipated claims 2 and 3.....	112
C. GROUND 3-5: CLAIMS 1-10 OF THE '462 PATENT WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....	114
1. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to pursue a method for treating type 2 diabetes with a once weekly 1.0 mg dose of semaglutide	114
2. A skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success pursuing a method for treating type 2 diabetes with a once weekly 1.0 mg dose of semaglutide	124

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
a. A skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success in optimizing to reach a method for treating type 2 diabetes with a once weekly 1.0 mg dose of semaglutide	126
b. The claims do not require that the once-weekly 1.0 mg dose of semaglutide have a particular level of efficacy or tolerability	135
(i) A skilled artisan would not have needed to have reported results from a semaglutide clinical trial to have had a reasonable expectation of success	138
(ii) A skilled artisan would not have needed to know the specific shape of the semaglutide dose response curve to have had a reasonable expectation of success	144
(iii) That the semaglutide phase III trial was “on hold” would not have dissuaded a skilled artisan from pursuing the claimed method	150
3. Ground 3: Claims 1-10 of the ’462 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over WO421	151
a. Claim 1 would have been obvious over WO ’421 considering the ’424 publication.....	151
b. Claims 2-3 would have been obvious over WO ’421 considering the ’424 publication.....	152
c. Claims 4-10 would have been obvious over WO ’421 considering the ’424 publication.....	152
4. Ground 4: Claims 1-10 of the ’462 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over WO537 Considering Lovshin	152
a. Claim 1 would have been obvious over WO537 considering Lovshin	153
b. Claims 2 and 3 would have been obvious over WO537 considering Lovshin	154
c. Claims 4-10 would have been obvious over WO537 considering Lovshin	155

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
5. Ground 5: Claims 1-10 of the '462 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over NCT657 and NCT773.....	155
a. Claim 1 would have been obvious over NCT657 and NCT773	156
b. Claim 2 and 3 would have been obvious over NCT657 and NCT773	161
c. Claims 4-10 would have been obvious over NCT657, NCT773, and the '424 publication	161
IX. CONCLUSION.....	162

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.