

Filed: November 2, 2023

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES LTD.
and
SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 10,335,462 to Jensen
Issue Date: July 2, 2019
Title: Use of Long-Acting GLP-1 Peptides

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2024-00107

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

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)).....	3
	D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)).....	3
III.	Requirements For <i>Inter Partes</i> 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	9
	1. Disclosure	9
	2. Prosecution History.....	11
	D. Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100(b), 42.104(b)(3)).....	13
	E. Treating Diabetes with GLP-1 Agonists Was Well Known	14
	1. Diabetes.....	14
	2. GLP-1 Agonists Were Well Known Diabetes Treatments	15
	3. POSAS Knew Semaglutide was Being Used in Clinical Trials	16
	F. Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	19
	1. WO421	19
	2. Lovshin	20
	3. NCT657.....	21
	4. NCT773.....	22
	5. WO537	24
	6. '424 Publication.....	25
	7. Prior Art Informing A POSA's General Knowledge.....	25
	G. WO421 Anticipated Claims 1–3.....	25
	1. WO421 Anticipated Claim 1	25

2.	WO421 Anticipated Claims 2–3	35
3.	WO421 Is Enabled	35
H.	Lovshin Anticipated Claims 1–3	36
1.	Lovshin Anticipated Claim 1	36
2.	Lovshin Anticipated Claims 2–3	37
3.	Lovshin Is Enabled	37
I.	Claims 1–10 Were Obvious	37
1.	POSAs Were Motivated to Pursue the Claimed Method.....	38
2.	POSAs Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success	39
3.	Claims 1–10 Were Obvious Over WO421 Considering The '424 Publication ..	43
a.	Claim 1	43
b.	Claims 2–3	47
c.	Claims 4–10	47
4.	Claims 1–10 were Obvious over WO537 Considering Lovshin	49
a.	Claim 1	49
b.	Claims 2–3	52
c.	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	57
c.	Claims 4–10	57
J.	Secondary Considerations Fail to Overcome <i>Prima Facie</i> Obviousness	58
VI.	35 U.S.C. § 325(d) PROVIDES NO BASIS TO DENY INSTITUTION	58
VII.	35 U.S.C. § 314(a) PROVIDES NO BASIS TO DENY INSTITUTION	64
VIII.	Conclusion	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Adobe Inc. v. RAH Color Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2019-00646, 2019 WL 8106160 (PTAB Sept. 4, 2019)	47
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, 2020 WL 740292 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020)	45
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	49
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chemical Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	25
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Lab'ys, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	20, 22, 23, 26
<i>Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1120 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	35
<i>Celeritas Techs., Ltd. v. Rockwell Int'l Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	28
<i>Chester v. Miller</i> , 906 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	27
<i>ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	24
<i>Dayco Prods., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.</i> , 329 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	22
<i>Duke Univ. v. BioMarin Pharm. Inc.</i> , 685 F. App'x 967 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	20
<i>DyStar Textilfarben GmbH v. C.H. Patrick Co.</i> , 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	34
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	19

<i>Galderma Lab'ys, L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	29
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 946 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	29
<i>Grünenthal GmbH v. Antecip Bioventures II LLC</i> , PGR2019-00003, 2020 WL 2203740 (PTAB May 5, 2020).....	17
<i>Impax Lab'ys, Inc. v. Aventis Pharms., Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	27
<i>In re Aller</i> , 220 F.2d 454 (CCPA 1955)	34
<i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	27
<i>In re Boesch</i> , 617 F.2d 272 (CCPA 1980)	34
<i>In re Copaxone Consol. Cases</i> , 906 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	23, 36, 39, 43
<i>In re Corkill</i> , 771 F.2d 1496 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	35
<i>In re Geisler</i> , 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	34
<i>In re Kulling</i> , 897 F.2d 1147 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	34
<i>In re Luck</i> , 476 F.2d 650 (CCPA 1973)	34
<i>In re Montgomery</i> , 677 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	26
<i>In re Ozempic (Semaglutide) Patent Litigation</i> , No. 22-md-3038-CFC (D. Del.)	1

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.