

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 No. IPR2023-00724

Patent No. 10,335,462

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,335,462**

Novo Nordisk Exhibit 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Mandatory Notices.....	1
	A. Real Parties-In-Interest.....	1
	B. Related Matters.....	1
	C. Identification of Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)).....	2
	D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	3
III.	Requirements for Inter Partes Review.....	3
	A. Grounds for Standing	4
	B. Identification of Challenge and Statement of Precise Relief Requested	4
IV.	Threshold Requirement for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	5
V.	Statement of Reasons for the Relief Requested	5
	A. Summary of the Argument.....	5
	B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	8
	C. The '462 Patent	10
	1. Disclosure.....	10
	2. Prosecution History.....	11
	D. Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100(b), 42.104(b)(3))	14
	E. Treating Diabetes with GLP-1 Agonists Was Well Known	15
	1. Diabetes.....	15
	2. GLP-1 Agonists Were Well Known Diabetes Treatments.....	15
	3. POSAs Knew Semaglutide Was Being Used in Clinical Trials	17
	F. Scope and Content of the Prior Art	19
	1. WO421	20
	2. Lovshin.....	21
	3. NCT657.....	22
	4. NCT773.....	23

5.	WO537	25
6.	'424 Publication	25
7.	Prior Art Informing A POSA's General Knowledge.....	26
G.	WO421 Anticipated Claims 1-3	26
1.	WO421 Anticipated Claim 1	26
2.	WO421 Anticipated Claims 2-3.....	35
3.	WO421 is Enabled	36
H.	Lovshin Anticipated Claims 1-3	36
1.	Lovshin Anticipated Claim 1	36
2.	Lovshin Anticipated Claims 2-3	38
3.	Lovshin is Enabled.....	38
I.	Claims 1-10 Were Obvious	38
1.	POSAs Were Motivated to Pursue the Claimed Method	39
2.	POSAs Would have had a Reasonable Expectation of Success	40
3.	Claims 1-10 were Obvious over WO421 Considering the '424 Publication	44
a.	Claim 1.....	44
b.	Claims 2-3.....	47
c.	Claims 4-10.....	47
4.	Claims 1-10 were Obvious over WO537 Considering Lovshin.....	50
a.	Claim 1.....	50
b.	Claims 2-3.....	52
a.	Claims 4-10.....	52
5.	Claims 1-10 were Obvious over NCT657, NCT773, and the '424 Publication.	54
a.	Claim 1.....	54
b.	Claims 2-3.....	58
c.	Claims 4-10.....	58

J. Secondary Considerations Fail to Overcome *Prima Facie* Obviousness.....58

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Provides No Basis to Deny Institution59

VII. 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) Provides No Basis to Deny Institution65

VIII. Conclusion66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Adobe Inc. v. RAH Color Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2019-00646, 2019 WL 8106160 (PTAB Sept. 4, 2019)	62
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, 2020 WL 740292 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020)	59
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	65
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	33
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Lab 'ys, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	27, 30, 34
<i>Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	46
<i>Celeritas Techs., Ltd. v. Rockwell Int'l Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	37
<i>Chester v. Miller</i> , 906 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	36
<i>ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	32, 33
<i>Dayco Prods., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.</i> , 329 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	30
<i>Duke Univ. v. BioMarin Pharm. Inc.</i> , 685 F. App'x 967 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	27
<i>DyStar Textilfarben GmbH v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	44
<i>E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. v. Synvina C.V.</i> , 904 F.3d 996 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	41

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.