

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE: OZEMPIC (SEMAGLUTIDE))	
PATENT LITIGATION)	MDL NO. 22-MD-3038 (CFC)
)	ANDA CASE
)	
)	
<hr/>)	
NOVO NORDISK INC. and)	
NOVO NORDISK A/S,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	C.A. No. 22-294 (CFC)
v.)	CONSOLIDATED
)	ANDA CASE
RIO BIOPHARMACEUTICALS INC.,)	
et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>)	
NOVO NORDISK INC. and)	
NOVO NORDISK A/S,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	C.A. No. 22-1040 (CFC)
v.)	ANDA CASE
)	
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. NOVO NORDISK’S OPENING POSITION	1
B. NOVO NORDISK’S REPLY POSITION	2
II. AGREED UPON CONSTRUCTIONS	4
III. DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS	7
A. THE ’462 PATENT.....	7
1. Novo Nordisk’s Opening Position on the Preamble.....	7
a. Introduction to the Patent.....	7
b. “A Method for Treating Type 2 Diabetes”	8
(1) The Preamble Gives “Life, Meaning, and Vitality” to the Claim and Therefore Is a Limitation	9
(2) The Preamble Provides Antecedent Basis for “A Subject in Need Thereof” and Therefore Is a Limitation.....	10
(3) The Specification Supports Construing the Preamble As Limiting	12
(4) The Preamble Should Be Construed According to the Definition Provided in the Specification.....	13
2. Defendants’ Answering Position on the Preamble	15
a. ’462 Patent: “A Method for Treating Type 2 Diabetes”	15
(1) The preamble is a statement of intended result	15

- (2) Plaintiffs’ “antecedent basis” and specification arguments also fail18
 - (a) The claim body provides all the context needed18
 - (b) Any need for antecedent basis does not convert the full preamble into a claim limitation nor impart efficacy19
 - (c) Plaintiffs’ specification argument fails20
- (3) If the entire preamble is a limitation, Defendants’ definition is correct based on the specification21
- 3. Novo Nordisk’s Reply Position on the Preamble23
 - a. “A Method for Treating Type 2 Diabetes”23
 - (1) Contrary to Defendants’ Argument, the Preamble Is Far More Than a Statement of Intended Result23
 - (2) The Body of Claim 1 Lacks the Necessary Antecedent Basis for “A Subject in Need Thereof”27
 - (3) The Focus of the Specification Supports Construing the Preamble as a Limitation28
 - (4) Defendants Cannot Refute that “As Used Herein” Signifies a Definition, But Nonetheless Persist with Their Arbitrary Construction29
- 4. Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position on the Preamble32
 - a. The Preamble is Not a Limitation32
 - b. The Preamble Imparts No Efficacy Requirement33
 - c. Plaintiffs’ “Antecedent Basis” and Specification Argument Also Fail34

B. THE '383 AND '953 PATENTS.....34

1. Introduction to the Patents34

 a. Novo Nordisk’s Opening Position.....34

 b. Defendants’ Answering Position37

2. “Limiter” and “Driver”38

 a. Novo Nordisk’s Opening Position.....38

 (1) “Limiter” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning38

 (2) “Driver” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning39

 (3) “Limiter” and “Driver” Are Not Means-Plus-Function
 Limitations41

 b. Defendants’ Answering Position44

 (1) “Limiter”44

 (a) “Limiter” is a means-plus-function limitation.....44

 (b) If not a means-plus-function limitation, “limiter” should be
 construed commensurate with the specification.....46

 (2) “Driver”49

 (a) “Driver” is a means-plus-function limitation.49

 (b) If not a means-plus-function term, “driver” should be
 construed commensurate with the specification.....50

 c. Novo Nordisk’s Reply Position53

 (1) “Limiter” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning53

(2) “Driver” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning	56
(3) Defendants Fail To Show Why “Limiter” and “Driver” Should Be Treated as Means-Plus-Function Limitations	58
d. Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position	60
(1) “Limiter”	60
(a) “Limiter” Has No Plain Meaning	60
(b) Plaintiffs’ Construction Underscores the Need to Construe “Limiter” as a Means-Plus-Function Limitation	61
(2) “Driver”	63
3. “Defining a Passage”	65
a. Novo Nordisk’s Opening Position	65
b. Defendants’ Answering Position	66
c. Novo Nordisk’s Reply Position	70
d. Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position	70
4. “Housing”	71
a. Novo Nordisk’s Opening Position	71
b. Defendants’ Answering Position	72
c. Novo Nordisk’s Reply Position	75
d. Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position	77
5. “Coupled”	79

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.