

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS II LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

NPS PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

Patent Owner.

---

Cases IPR2015-00990 and IPR2015-01093  
(Patent 7,056,886 B2)<sup>1</sup>

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO INTRODUCTION IN PETITIONER'S  
RESPONSE TO MOTION PRESENTING PATENT OWNER'S  
OBSERVATIONS REGARDING CROSS-EXAMINATION  
OF ANTHONY PALMIERI, Ph.D.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the Board's Scheduling Order in these IPRs, "the word-for-word identical paper is filed in each proceeding identified in the heading." *See, e.g.*, IPR2015-00990, Paper 29, footnote 1.

## **I. Introduction**

This is in response to Petitioner's objections in the Introduction to its Response to Patent Owner's Observations Regarding Cross-Examination of Anthony Palmieri, Ph.D. *See, e.g.*, IPR2015-00990, Paper 58 ("Paper 58") at 1-5. Petitioner objects to the Observations because they are allegedly formatted improperly, are too long, are argumentative, and introduce new exhibits. Petitioner is incorrect because the Observations:

- (1) use a three-part format as suggested by the Board (*i.e.*, identify the witness and testimony, cite to Petitioner's Reply and Reply Declaration, and briefly explain the relevancy of the testimony to Petitioner's submissions);
- (2) scrupulously avoid any argument;
- (3) refer to prior inconsistent testimony of Petitioner's witnesses; and
- (4) do not introduce "new" evidence.

## **II. The Observations Identify the Exhibit, Testimony, and Relevant Portions of the Reply and Reply Declaration Completely and Succinctly**

Each Observation meets all of the Board's criteria for Observations. The cross-examination transcript exhibit number (Ex. 2171) is identified in the first paragraph of each paper. Pages and lines of the transcript are clearly identified by "page:lines" citations. The witness is identified, and citations to the transcript are given in each Observation. Patent Owner's format avoids repetition of non-substantive introductory recitals about the same Exhibit, while completely and

succinctly providing everything the Board requires in form, order, and substance.

These Observations are for two IPRs and concern over 400 pages of Reply cross-examination testimony by the witness, much of it inconsistent and disrupted by baseless objections from Petitioner's counsel. Patent Owner's format allowed a single, identical 15 page paper (rather than requesting more pages merely for repetitive non-substantive recitals) to be filed in the two IPRs, as instructed by the Board. Citations to entire passages rather than just several lines of testimony were often needed due to the witness' constant requests to have questions repeated, his reluctance or refusal to give straight answers to simple questions, and his tendency to give testimony unconnected to the questions asked. His testimony to a lack of knowledge or memory about the substance of his declarations in these IPRs spans many pages. Furthermore, the citations are appropriate to provide context for the testimony to avoid objections that the testimony was misrepresented in the Observations. The Board has accepted multiple citations in an Observation. *See, e.g., Farmwald v. Parkervision, Corp*, IPR2014-00947, Paper 55.

It should be noted that Petitioner also made multiple citations (*see, e.g.,* IPR2015-00990, Paper 57) and multi-page citations (*see, e.g., id.* at II.2., II.4., II.5., II.7., II.9., II.12., II.14., II.19., II.20., II.21.; Paper 56, Resp. II.A.ii., II.A. iii., II.D.iii., II.H.i.), and did not use the precise phrasing suggested by the Board. *See, e.g., id.* at Resp. to Obs. 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10.

### **III. Each Observation Explains Its Relevancy in only Several Sentences**

Each observation includes three or fewer sentences that explain the relevancy of the cited cross-examination testimony, *i.e.*, a short paragraph. Each Observation includes citations to Petitioner's Reply or the Witness's Reply Declaration showing to what the Observation relates. Finally, each Observation suitably groups the testimony citations according to a common issue of relevance. For example, Observation 1 is about testimony concerning Dr. Palmieri's expertise; Observation 3 is about Dr. Palmieri's view of Dr. Carpenter's testimony; Observation 5 is about Dr. Palmieri's opinions of the '886 patent, etc. The Observations are brief paragraphs that average only one-half page each.

### **IV. Patent Owner's Observations Are Not Argumentative**

Petitioner complains that Observation 3 is argumentative because it says that Dr. Palmieri "misstated" what Dr. Carpenter said. Paper 58 at 3. That is a statement of relevance based in fact, as the citations show.

Observations 24 and 25 are deemed argumentative because they state that the cited testimony "evidences [Dr. Palmieri's] lack of expertise and his use of hindsight." *Id.* at 3. Lack of expertise and hindsight are relevant issues in these IPRs. Argument would include application of facts to law with reasons why the citations demonstrate a lack of expertise and use of hindsight. The Observations deliberately avoid that.

It should be noted that in Petitioner's Response to Observations, Petitioner argues relevancy to Dr. Palmieri's expertise and qualifications (Paper 58 at 5, 6), to obviousness of the claims (*id.* at 7-9), in that the '886 patent does not recognize any of the 'complexities'" (*id.* at 7-8), in that the results in Figures 5 and 6 are not surprising and unexpected (*id.* at 9), a "logical" correlation that can be drawn (*id.* at 10), and in that testimony "demonstrates that that [sic] optimum pH can be easily ascertained" (*id.* at 13). Petitioner's double standard shows its objections are baseless.

#### **V. Contradictory Prior Testimony of the Petitioner's Own Witnesses Is Allowed**

Petitioner complains that Patent Owner cited testimony from Dr. Palmieri's first cross-examination. *Id.* at 5. The citations to the first cross-examination show that Dr. Palmieri previously testified differently than he did at his second cross-examination. This is precisely the reason and need for Observations, especially when cross-examination comes after the last substantive submissions.

*Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.*, IPR2013-00506, -00507, -00508, Paper 37, p. 4, n. 2 does not support Petitioner. The *Medtronic* Board did not expect earlier testimony of a different witness under the circumstances in that case. *Medtronic* does not prohibit impeachment of a witness by showing that he took two different, irreconcilable positions on the same issue in the same proceeding. Nor does *Medtronic* prohibit rebuttal exhibits that were introduced during cross-

# 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.