

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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

**JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
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 fail .....	18
(a) The claim body provides all the context needed .....	18
(b) Any need for antecedent basis does not convert the full preamble into a claim limitation nor impart efficacy .....	19
(c) Plaintiffs’ specification argument fails .....	20
(3) If the entire preamble is a limitation, Defendants’ definition is correct based on the specification .....	21
3. Novo Nordisk’s Reply Position on the Preamble .....	23
a. “A Method for Treating Type 2 Diabetes” .....	23
(1) Contrary to Defendants’ Argument, the Preamble Is Far More Than a Statement of Intended Result .....	23
(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 Limitation .....	28
(4) Defendants Cannot Refute that “As Used Herein” Signifies a Definition, But Nonetheless Persist with Their Arbitrary Construction . .....	29
4. Defendants’ Sur-Reply Position on the Preamble .....	32
a. The Preamble is Not a Limitation .....	32
b. The Preamble Imparts No Efficacy Requirement .....	33
c. Plaintiffs’ “Antecedent Basis” and Specification Argument Also Fail .....	34

B. THE '383 AND '953 PATENTS.....	34
1. Introduction to the Patents .....	34
a. Novo Nordisk’s Opening Position.....	34
b. Defendants’ Answering Position .....	37
2. “Limiter” and “Driver” .....	38
a. Novo Nordisk’s Opening Position.....	38
(1) “Limiter” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning .....	38
(2) “Driver” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning.....	39
(3) “Limiter” and “Driver” Are Not Means-Plus-Function Limitations .....	41
b. Defendants’ Answering Position .....	44
(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 Position .....	53
(1) “Limiter” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning .....	53

- (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.