

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

**DECLARATION OF PAUL DALBY, PH.D., IN SUPPORT OF PETITION
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,335,462**

MPI EXHIBIT 1007 PAGE 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Qualifications and Background.....	8
A. Education and Experience; Prior Testimony	8
B. Basis for Opinions and Materials Considered.....	12
C. Retention and Compensation	12
II. Summary of Opinions	13
III. Legal Standards.....	14
IV. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	16
V. The '462 Patent (Ex. 1001)	18
A. The Formulation Claims of the '462 Patent	18
B. The Prosecution History of the '462 Patent.....	20
VI. Claim Construction.....	23
VII. Background on GLP-1 Compound Formulations Used to Treat Diabetes	24
A. Parenteral formulations and components thereof were well- known.....	24
B. GLP-1 compounds were well-known.....	25
C. GLP-1 agonists and related formulations were well-known	28
D. Parenteral dosage forms for peptide-based drugs.....	29
1. Tonicity and osmolarity of the parenteral formulation.....	31
2. pH and buffering capacity of the parenteral formulation.....	32
3. Avoiding particulates in the parenteral formulation	33
4. Vehicles and diluents of the parenteral formulation	33
5. Excipients of the parenteral formulation.....	34
VIII. Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	35
A. WO 2011/138421 (“WO421”) (Ex. 1011).....	36
B. U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US2007/0010424 ('424 publication) (Ex. 1016).....	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
C. Clinical Trial No. NCT00696657 (NCT657) (Ex. 1013).....	40
D. Clinical Trial No. NCT00851773 (NCT773) (Ex. 1014).....	42
E. WO 2006/097537 (“WO537”) (Ex. 1015).....	44
F. Lovshin (Ex. 1012).....	48
G. Other Art That Informs the POSA’s Knowledge	49
1. Lund (Ex. 1035)	49
2. U.S. Patent No. 7,022,674 (“’674 patent”) (Ex. 1075).....	51
3. U.S. Patent No. 6,458,924 (“’924 patent”) (Ex. 1073).....	53
4. U.S. Patent No. 6,284,727 (“’727 patent”) (Ex. 1071).....	53
5. U.S. Patent No. 6,268,343 (“Knudsen patent”) (Ex. 1034)....	54
6. U.S. Patent No. 5,512,549 (“’549 patent”) (Ex. 1017).....	55
7. U.S. Patent No. 5,164,366 (“’366 patent”) (Ex. 1072).....	56
8. U.S. Patent No. 5,118,666 (“’666 patent”) (Ex. 1056).....	57
9. Victoza label (Ex. 1039).....	57
10. WO 03/002136 (“WO136”) (Ex. 1041).....	58
11. WO 00/37098 (“WO098”) (Ex. 1074)	60
12. Additional prior art and references	61
IX. Unpatentability of the Claims of the ’462 Patent	61
A. Grounds 3 and 5: Claims 4–10 of the ’462 patent would have been obvious over WO421 considering the ’424 publication or over NCT657 and NCT773 considering the ’424 publication.....	61
1. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide as an isotonic aqueous solution for subcutaneous injection with a reasonable expectation of success	63
2. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide with propylene glycol and phenol with a reasonable expectation of success	67

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
3. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide with a phosphate buffer, such as sodium dihydrogen phosphate, with a reasonable expectation of success	72
4. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide with a pH in the range of 7.0-9.0, or at a pH of 7.4, with a reasonable expectation of success.....	75
5. The dependent limitations of claim 4 would have been obvious.....	79
6. The dependent limitations of claim 5 would have been obvious.....	81
7. The dependent limitations of claim 6 would have been obvious.....	82
8. The dependent limitations of claim 7 would have been obvious.....	83
9. The dependent limitations of claim 8 would have been obvious.....	84
10. The dependent limitations of claim 9 would have been obvious.....	85
11. The dependent limitations of claim 10 would have been obvious.....	88
12. Conclusion.....	89
B. Ground 4: Claims 4–10 of the '462 patent would have been obvious over WO537 considering Lovshin.....	90
1. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide as an isotonic aqueous solution for subcutaneous injection with a reasonable expectation of success	91
2. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide with propylene glycol and phenol with a reasonable expectation of success	93

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
3. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide with a phosphate buffer, such as sodium dihydrogen phosphate, with a reasonable expectation of success	94
4. A POSA would have been motivated to formulate semaglutide with a pH in the range of 7.0-9.0, or at a pH of 7.4, with a reasonable expectation of success.....	96
5. The dependent limitations of claim 4 would have been obvious.....	98
6. The dependent limitations of claim 5 would have been obvious.....	100
7. The dependent limitations of claim 6 would have been obvious.....	101
8. The dependent limitations of claim 7 would have been obvious.....	102
9. The dependent limitations of claim 8 would have been obvious.....	103
10. The dependent limitations of claim 9 would have been obvious.....	104
11. The dependent limitations of claim 10 would have been obvious.....	106
12. Conclusion.....	107
C. No Secondary Considerations Overcome <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness.....	107
1. The formulations recited in the '462 patent produce no unexpected results.....	107
2. There was no long-felt but unmet need for the formulations recited in the '462 patent.....	108
3. There was no praise of the formulations recited in the '462 patent.....	109

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.