

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

ALLERGAN, INC. * Civil Docket No.
* 2:09-CV-97
VS. * Marshall, Texas
*
* August 4, 2011
SANDOZ, INC. * 1:15 P.M.

TRANSCRIPT OF BENCH TRIAL
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE T. JOHN WARD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: MS. JUANITA BROOKS
MR. ROGER DENNING
Fish & Richardson
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130

MR. JONATHAN SINGER
MS. DEANNA REICHEL
Fish & Richardson
60 South Sixth Street
3200 RBC Plaza
Minneapolis, MN 55402

MR. W. CHAD SHEAR
Fish & Richardson
1717 Main Street
Suite 5000
Dallas, TX 75201

APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE:

COURT REPORTERS: MS. SUSAN SIMMONS, CSR
MS. SHELLY HOLMES, CSR
Official Court Reporters
100 East Houston, Suite 125
Marshall, TX 75670
903/935-3868

(Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
transcript produced on CAT system.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: MS. SUSAN COLETTI
MS. A. MARTINA HUFNAL
MR. SANTOSH CONTINHO
Fish & Richardson
222 Delaware Avenue
17th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19899

MR. GREGORY LOVE
Stevens Love Firm
111 West Tyler Street
Longview, TX 75601

FOR THE DEFENDANTS: MR. WILLIAM E. "BO" DAVIS, III
(Sandoz, et al) The Davis Firm
111 West Tyler Street
Longview, TX 75601

MR. BARRY P. GOLOB
MR. KERRY B. MCTIGUE
MR. W. BLAKE COBLENTZ
Duane Morris
505 9th Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004

MR. RICHARD T. RUZICH
Duane Morris
190 South LaSalle Street
Suite 3700
Chicago, IL 60603

(Apotex) MR. HARRY L. GILLAM, JR.
Gillam & Smith
303 South Washington Avenue
Marshall, TX 75670

MR. STEPHEN P. BENSON
MR. DENNIS C. LEE
Katten Muchin Rosenman
525 West Monroe Street
Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60661

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: MR. LARRY PHILLIPS
3 (Watson) Siebman Reynolds Burg &
4 Phillips
300 North Travis Street

5 MR. GARY E. HOOD
6 Polsinelli Shughart
161 North Clark Street
7 Suite 4200
Chicago, IL 60601

8 MS. ROBYN H. AST
9 Polsinelli Shughart
100 South 4th Street
10 Suite 1000
St. Louis, MO 63102

11 *****

12 P R O C E E D I N G S

13
14 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

15 THE COURT: Please be seated.

16 Proceed.

17 MR. DENNING: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 ROBERT J. NOECKER, M.D., PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY

19 SWORN

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUING)

21 BY MR. DENNING:

22 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Noecker.

23 A. Good afternoon.

24 Q. The next reference that the Defendants looked
25 at with their experts yesterday that I want to show you

1 is DTX155.

2 A. 155.

3 Q. I believe this is the Airaksinen article?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And this is one in which they compared two
6 different concentrations of the Timpilo drug to -- to
7 Pilocarpine; is that correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And you already testified about Timpilo and
10 Pilocarpine and the effects of -- the adverse effects of
11 Pilocarpine on the eye, correct?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. Was -- did the addition of Timolol to
14 Pilocarpine and Timpilo make it better?

15 A. It did not seem to be. Did not seem to.

16 Q. If we could look at the graph on Page 589,
17 please, and we see on the left-hand side on the top,
18 looks like the -- a Timpilo with .5% Timolol and 2%
19 Pilocarpine; the middle one is .5% Timolol and 4%
20 Pilocarpine; and then the bottom is Pilocarpine by
21 itself.

22 Do you see that?

23 A. I do.

24 Q. And what does this graph show you?

25 A. Poor control of intraocular pressure. It's

1 important -- so this graph we have to be a little bit
2 careful with, because unlike the other graphs we looked
3 at earlier, which are frequently across times of day by
4 hour, this drop on this graph is mean average.

5 So in this study, they put a drop in of the
6 medication and then they checked -- they checked the eye
7 pressure, put a drop in, and then checked the eye
8 pressure two hours later. And then this data is mean
9 IOP of those two morning timepoints.

10 So this is a study where they only collected
11 morning data, so it doesn't tell us anything about the
12 effect on afternoon data.

13 And then they had a run-in period on the
14 beta-blocker. And this is over a three-week -- this is
15 days, 21 days to 42 days of average IOP. So, once
16 again, it should be capturing the best timepoint, and
17 then the morning -- the morning, you know, less
18 effective timepoint.

19 So it doesn't tell us anything about afternoon
20 pressure. But when you look at this, the eye pressures
21 are all over the board. So this is even day-to-day. So
22 this is not some fluctuation we were talking earlier
23 about within the day.

24 You know, this patient started, if this was a
25 patient in my practice, once again, Patient Mrs. Jones'

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.