

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APOTEX INC.,
Petitioner

v.

NOVO NORDISK A/S,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2024-00631
Patent 10,335,462

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL -- FILED UNDER SEAL

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
EX2001	Docket Sheet from PTACTS, <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724
EX2002	Joint Stipulation to Modify Due Dates 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724 Paper 47
EX2003	June 7, 2024 Joint Stipulation to Modify Due Dates 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724, Paper 56
EX2004	Excerpted Patent Owner's Response, <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724, Paper 30
EX2005	Excerpted Declaration of George L. Bakris, M.D., <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724, EX2011
EX2006	Excerpted Declaration of Robin S. Goland, M.D., <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724, EX2054
EX2007	Excerpted Declaration of Michael J. Blaha, M.D., <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724, EX2055
EX2008	Excerpted Declaration of Christopher A. Vellturo, Ph.D., <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724, EX2300
EX2009	Excerpted Declaration of Patrick J. Sinko, Ph.D., <i>Mylan Pharms. Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , IPR2023-00724, EX2056
EX2010	June 10, 2024 Email from Counsel for Petitioner re: IPR2024-00631
EX2011	<i>Patent Exclusivity for N209637 (Semaglutide/Ozempic)</i> , Orange Book: Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations, U.S. Food & Drug Administration, available at https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/ob/patent_info.cfm?Product_No=001&Appl_No=209637&Appl_type=N
EX2012	Declaration of Sayem Osman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....2

A. Mylan’s IPR and Apotex’s Choice to File a Late Copycat Petition2

B. The Progress of the Mylan IPR Over the 8 Months Since Its Institution.....3

III. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER §314(A).....5

A. Discretionary Authority to Deny Under *General Plastic*6

B. Institution Should Be Denied Because Petitioner Brings the Same or Substantially the Same Art or Arguments.....8

C. Institution Should Also Be Denied Because the Remaining *General Plastic* Factors Weigh in Favor of Denial.....11

1. Factor 1: whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent.....12

2. Factor 2: whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition or should have known of it.....15

3. Factor 3: whether at the time of filing of the second petition the petitioner already received the patent owner’s preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board’s decision on whether to institute review in the first petition.....18

4. Factor 4: the length of time that elapsed between the time the petitioner learned of the prior art asserted in the second petition and the filing of the second petition.....19

5. Factor 5: whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time elapsed between the filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent.....20

6. Factor 6: the finite resources of the Board.....22

7. Factor 7: the requirement under 35 U.S.C. §316(a)(11) to issue a final determination not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices institution of review.....25

**IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO ADDRESS OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF
NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....26**

V. CONCLUSION29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3M Co. v. Bay Materials, LLC</i> , IPR2023-00243, Pap.8 (July 7, 2023)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. VB Assets, LLC</i> , IPR2020-01374, Pap.10 (Feb. 4, 2021)	29
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00854, Pap.9 (Oct. 28, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cent. Sec. Grp. – Nationwide, Inc. v. Ubiquitous Connectivity, LP</i> , IPR2019-01609, Pap.11 (Feb. 26, 2020)	6
<i>Deeper, UAB v. Vexilar, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01310, Pap.7 (Jan. 24, 2019).....	29
<i>Dish Network LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00969, Pap.20 (Nov. 25, 2020)	27
<i>Expedia, Inc. v. Int’l Bus. Machs. Corp.</i> , IPR2018-01459, Pap.7 (Jan. 29, 2019).....	17
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Pap.19 (Sept. 6, 2017).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Google Inc. v. Personalweb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00978, Pap.11 (Oct. 30, 2014)	5
<i>Intel Corp. v. Inst. of Microelecs., Chinese Acad. of Scis.</i> , IPR2019-00834, Pap.14 (June 19, 2020).....	20
<i>Ivantis, Inc. v. Glaukos Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00972, Pap.7 (Oct. 10, 2019)	20, 24
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	26
<i>Longi Green Energy Tech. Co. v. Hanwa Sols. Corp.</i> , IPR2020-00047, Pap.18 (Apr. 27, 2020).....	21, 23, 25

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.