

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:
(Sandoz, et al)

MR. WILLIAM E. "BO" DAVIS, III
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
(Watson) Siebman Reynolds Burg &
3 Phillips
4 300 North Travis Street
Sherman, TX 75090

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
Suite 1000
10 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'

1 pressure is in the 20s, we put you on this drug or two
2 drugs. We don't know what your eye pressure is going to
3 be the next time you come in.

4 Maybe one time it's 18, kind of below the
5 overflow limit. The next time, it's above on the next
6 visit. So this is not somebody we say, okay, see you in
7 six months. I'm sure everything will be fine.

8 So this is poor eye pressure control, and
9 we -- you know, we wouldn't use this, because it's
10 showing the poor IOP control of this combination drug.

11 Q. Thank you, Dr. Noecker.

12 And just to -- before we move on, what does
13 Airaksinen teach a person of ordinary skill in the art
14 about combining Brimonidine and Timolol in a fixed
15 combination drug?

16 A. Nothing. And it might give you pause about
17 combination drugs in general.

18 Q. Thank you, Dr. Noecker.

19 Let's move on to Defense Exhibit 148, which
20 was the Clineschmidt article.

21 MR. DENNING: Thank you, Mr. Exline.

22 Q. (By Mr. Denning) This is the article in which
23 they were comparing Cosopt on the one arm versus BID
24 Timolol and TID Dorzolamide monotherapies; is that
25 right?

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. And if we turn to Table 3 of this study --

3 MR. DENNING: Which appears on -- on Page
4 1955, Mr. Exline.

5 Q. (By Mr. Denning) -- what time periods are they
6 measuring with this study?

7 A. They're looking at the pre-dose in the
8 mornings of 8:00 a.m., putting the drop in, and then two
9 hours, once again, at the time we'd expected to be the
10 most efficacious. So morning time points, two hours
11 apart.

12 Q. Okay. Does this show anything about that
13 afternoon trough at all in this paper?

14 A. It doesn't give us any afternoon information.

15 Q. Okay. Well, let's look at what it shows
16 for -- for the morning pressure.

17 MR. DENNING: If we could go and,
18 Mr. Exline, highlight on the bottom for month 3 and the
19 change, the second to the rightmost column, and then
20 highlight for the combination and for Dorzolamide -- I'm
21 sorry -- second to the right, Mr. Exline.

22 There you go. Right there.

23 Q. (By Mr. Denning) So what -- what do we see
24 here as the comparison between Dorzolamide as a
25 monotherapy and then the Cosopt combination?

1 A. So the combination of Cosopt combination drug
2 had a -- a mean change of minus 4.4, kind of the best --
3 best timepoint, the 10:00 a.m. timepoint.

4 Q. Would you -- and compared to 2 points lower
5 for Dorzolamide; is that right?

6 A. Correct. So about 2 milliliters of mercury
7 better. So when determining how much benefit Timolol is
8 giving us, adding on top of the Dorzolamide, it's about
9 2 millimeters is what we see in this study.

10 Q. And what -- what impact does it have that this
11 is at hour 2 versus if it were at hour 8?

12 A. Once again, this is the best timepoint,
13 because it only goes -- gets worse from here. So this
14 kind of tells us a best-case scenario, that two hours
15 post-dosing is as good as it's going to get. So we --
16 by inference, we would suspect that it will be less of a
17 beneficial effect in the afternoon.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. We don't know exactly how much, but that's --
20 it's going to be the best. That's all we can tell you.

21 Q. Okay. And at hour 0 up above for the same --
22 for the same 2 in month 3, we see a difference from 2.8
23 to 1.4; is that right?

24 A. That's right. It's about 1.4, 1-1/2, yes.

25 Q. Okay. Earlier when we looked at the

1 demonstrative from opening that showed the afternoon
2 trough, do you remember that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And there was a -- the afternoon trough was
5 about 3.25, I think, in that demonstrative.

6 Do you remember that?

7 A. I think it was 3.5.

8 MR. DENNING: Mr. Exline, are you able to
9 pull that up?

10 A. You're talking about the difference between
11 TID Brimonidine and BID Brimonidine?

12 Q. (By Mr. Denning) That's -- that's exactly
13 right. That's what I was talking about.

14 A. I recall it being 3.5 millimeters of mercury.
15 That's 3.25 --

16 Q. I think you may remember from Ms. Batoosingh's
17 testimony when they looked at the actual underlying
18 document. It was -- it was different.

19 A. Perhaps.

20 Q. But in any event, does -- the 1.5 to
21 2 millimeters of mercury benefit that we just saw from
22 the Clineschmidt paper with regard to Cosopt, would that
23 be enough to make up any afternoon trough in the
24 difference between Brimonidine BID and TID?

25 A. Like I said, it doesn't give us really any

1 information regarding Brimonidine, but if you were to
2 make the inference about what's the benefit of adding
3 the Timolol in terms of eye pressure reduction, the most
4 these other papers indicate it might be in the best,
5 best-case scenario only at the morning is 1-1/2 to
6 2-ish, so not at the magnitude.

7 But, really, the inference I think you can
8 draw is that magnitude may fall short. It's not going
9 to be -- adding Timolol is just not going to be
10 adequate.

11 Q. Okay. So what would one of -- what, if
12 anything, would one of skill in the art learn from
13 Clineschmidt about the ability to reduce the number of
14 doses of Brimonidine from three doses to two doses by
15 adding Timolol in combination?

16 A. That it would not be adequate to make up for
17 the deficit we see in the afternoon -- that afternoon
18 dip in IOP control.

19 Q. Okay. You may set that exhibit aside.

20 Dr. Tanna also looked at DTX200, and let's
21 look at that briefly, if we could, please. This is the
22 Boyle reference?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Now, again, this is a study looking at Cosopt,
25 correct?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. And Cosopt, meaning the combination of
3 Dorzolamide and Timolol, correct?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Okay. What does that teach you as a person of
6 skill in the art about combining Brimonidine and
7 Timolol?

8 A. It doesn't teach you anything, because
9 different -- Dorzolamide and Brimonidine are different
10 drugs.

11 MR. DENNING: And, again, if we can --
12 Mr. Exline, if you could look at Table 2, which is on
13 Page 1948.

14 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Again, the only time
15 measurements made with -- in the Boyle paper were at
16 hour 0 and hour 2; is that correct?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. So does that tell us any meaningful
19 information about what the midday IOP control would be,
20 even for this combination?

21 A. All you can do is surmise that it's not going
22 to be as good in terms of eye pressure lowering.

23 Q. Okay. And does the Boyle paper about Cosopt
24 and the 0- and 2-hour measurements, what does that teach
25 a person of skill in the art, if anything, about the --

1 combining Brimonidine and Timolol and the effects that
2 that might be, if they were in a combination drug
3 together?

4 A. Nothing specific to the Brimonidine/Timolol
5 combination, but, once again, specific to the addition
6 as Brimonidine -- or Timolol as a tool, it will fall --
7 it may fall short or probably will fall short in the
8 afternoon.

9 Q. Okay. And if you could look at Table 5 in
10 this paper as well.

11 This -- this one deals with the ocular and
12 local adverse experiences. Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And can you tell me, are there any -- did the
15 combination in this study experience any reduction in
16 adverse experiences than the individual therapies?

17 A. It didn't -- it didn't reduce any. It may
18 have stung a little bit more.

19 Q. It may have stung a little bit more.

20 Okay. Thank you. You can set -- you can set
21 that to one aside.

22 And the last one of the articles that they
23 showed yesterday that I'm going to show you is DTX201.

24 MR. DENNING: If you could pull that up?

25 Q. (By Mr. Denning) This is the Hutzelmann

1 reference.

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And this study, again, compared Cosopt on the
4 one arm versus Dorzolamide BID/Timolol BID concomitant
5 therapy, correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And, again, if we look at -- if we look at
8 Table 2, which appears on Page 1251 --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. -- we can see that they, again, took the
11 measurements only at hour 0 and hour 2; is that right?

12 A. That's correct. Yes.

13 Q. I'm sorry. So, again, it tells us nothing
14 about the afternoon trough; is that correct?

15 A. Right, same story.

16 Q. Okay. And if we look at the mean change.

17 MR. DENNING: I'm sorry, Mr. Exline.
18 Please go back to that table.

19 Thank you.

20 Q. (By Mr. Denning) If we look at the change
21 column, second from the right, at month 3, we see the
22 combination and the concomitant are both at the exact
23 same pressure reduction; is that right?

24 A. Right. So in terms of efficacy, it's neutral
25 for the morning.

1 Q. Okay. So based on what you read in
2 Hutzelmann, Dr. Noecker, what does it teach, if
3 anything, one of skill in the art about combining
4 Brimonidine and Timolol in a single combination
5 treatment for intraocular pressure?

6 A. There's certainly nothing here specific for
7 Brimonidine. And in terms of the addition of Timolol in
8 a fixed combination, it doesn't seem like it's going to
9 solve efficacy problems.

10 Q. Okay. So you can set that one aside as well,
11 Dr. Noecker.

12 We've been through most of the art that the
13 Defendants relied on yesterday at trial. Have you
14 reviewed all of the art that Dr. Tanna and Dr. Laskar
15 talked about yesterday?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And in your opinion, Dr. Noecker, as one of
18 skill in the art, do these references -- would these
19 references motivate a person of skill to develop a
20 single composition drug of 0.2% Brimonidine and 0.5%
21 Timolol?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Why not?

24 A. I have not seen compelling information that
25 would lead me to -- looking at the -- all this prior

1 art, that there's a benefit to doing so. Basically,
2 looking at Timolol to solve efficacy problems that are
3 associated with Brimonidine.

4 Q. And in your opinion, Dr. Noecker, do these
5 references provide a motivation to one of skill in the
6 art that making a fixed combination of 0.2% Brimonidine
7 and 0.5% Timolol could allow you to reduce the number of
8 dosage of Brimonidine from three doses a day to two
9 doses a day without losing efficacy?

10 A. No, I don't see any evidence here that would
11 lead me to believe that, that you could successfully
12 reduce the dosing interval from three times a day to
13 twice a day --

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. -- of Brimonidine.

16 Q. Thank you, Dr. Noecker.

17 We need to do one more -- one more run through
18 the claims now in light of all of these references.

19 MR. DENNING: So, Mr. Exline, if you
20 could please pull up AGX512. And I think we can be even
21 more efficient than last time.

22 Q. (By Mr. Denning) So here we have --

23 MR. DENNING: Do we have the other 512,
24 Mr. Exline?

25 There we go. Thank you.

1 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Here we have all of the
2 asserted -- all the claims at issue of the four patents
3 that we're talking about. And, again, we have
4 highlighted all of the limitations that relate to the
5 .2% Brimonidine and .5% Timolol.

6 And my question -- those limitations appear in
7 Claim 1 of the '976, 1 and 7 of the '258, 4 of the '149,
8 and 1 and 4 of the '463.

9 My question for you, Dr. Noecker, on the
10 obviousness analysis, is there anything in
11 DeSantis/Timmermans, in light of all of the other
12 references that you've seen in this Court, that would
13 have taught one of skill in the art to choose the
14 specific combination of 0.2% Brimonidine and 0.5%
15 Timolol in a single combination?

16 A. I don't see any teaching in this prior art
17 that would lead me to do so.

18 MR. DENNING: Okay. If we could pull up
19 the AGX513, please, Mr. Exline.

20 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Now, we have put up only the
21 claims that have the preservative BAK in it as well as
22 the concentrations. And I want to direct your attention
23 to Claim 2 of the '258, 8 of the '258, 2 of the '463,
24 and 5 of the '463, each of which additionally claim the
25 limitation of BAK preservative, Benzalkonium Chloride

1 preservative, at 0.001% to 0.01%.

2 And looking at those four claims, Dr. Noecker,
3 is there anything in DeSantis/Timmermans, in light of
4 all of the other references that you have seen in this
5 courtroom, that would teach one of skill in the art to
6 choose a specific combination of 0.2% Brimonidine and
7 0.5% Timolol in a composition with 0.001% to 0.01%
8 Benzalkonium Chloride?

9 A. No.

10 Q. And with respect to claims 3 and 9 of the '258
11 and 3 and 6 of the '463, each of which include the
12 limitation of BAK at a concentration of 0.005%, my
13 question, Dr. Noecker, is, is there anything in
14 DeSantis/Timmermans, in light of all of the references
15 that you've seen in this courtroom, that would teach one
16 of skill in the art to choose a specific combination of
17 0.2% Brimonidine and 0.5% Timolol with a preservative
18 concentration of 0.005% Benzalkonium Chloride?

19 A. No.

20 MR. DENNING: And finally, if we could go
21 to 514, Mr. Exline.

22 Q. (By Mr. Denning) We have Claim 4 of the '149
23 patent displayed, and this is the one that talks about a
24 method of reducing the number of daily topical
25 ophthalmic doses of Brimonidine administered topically

1 to an eye of the person in need thereof for the
2 treatment of glaucoma or ocular hypertension from three
3 to two times a day without loss of efficacy.

4 And with respect to that limitation,
5 Dr. Noecker, my question is, is there anything in
6 DeSantis/Timmermans, in light of all of the other
7 references that you've -- you've seen in this courtroom,
8 that would teach one of skill in the art a method of
9 reducing the dose of Brimonidine from three doses to two
10 doses without reducing efficacy in the treatment of
11 glaucoma or ocular hypertension?

12 A. No.

13 Q. And why not?

14 A. Many of the -- much of the prior art does not
15 really address the key timepoint, which is that
16 afternoon trough, which is what's led to the labeling of
17 Brimonidine. So we really don't have a lot of
18 information or reason to believe that the addition of
19 the Timolol to the Brimonidine would allow us to reduce
20 the dosing interval without losing efficacy.

21 Q. So now, looking back at 512, 513, and 514, my
22 ultimate question, Dr. Noecker, is, in light of the
23 DeSantis/Timmermans reference and all of the other prior
24 art that you've seen in this courtroom, is it -- what is
25 your opinion regarding whether these claims of these

1 four patents would be obvious to one of ordinary skill
2 in the art in 2002?

3 A. They would not be obvious.

4 Q. Now, in addition to -- to doing your
5 anticipation and -- and obviousness analysis, have you
6 also considered what are called objective considerations
7 of non-obviousness?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay.

10 MR. DENNING: If you could -- if you
11 could please pull up AGX111R.

12 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Okay. This is the -- this is
13 the graph we've seen a couple times in your examination,
14 and this is where you show the afternoon trough and the
15 difference between Alphagan TID and Alphagan BID,
16 correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. With that in mind, if you could please
19 grab PTX77 from your PTX binder.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. And this is the Sherwood paper as it's been
22 called, correct?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. And what are the treatment arms in this study?

25 A. This had Combigan, which was twice daily fixed

1 combination Brimonidine/Timolol. And then we had
2 monotherapy with Timolol twice a day. And then we had
3 Brimonidine monotherapy used three times a day. Those
4 are three treatment groups.

5 Q. Okay. So we're comparing on the one hand
6 Combigan in which patients are getting Brimonidine twice
7 a day. And on the other hand, we're giving this
8 concomitant -- concomitant therapy in which they're
9 getting Brimonidine three times a day; is that correct?

10 A. They're getting monotherapy three times a day.

11 Q. Thank you for correcting me.

12 So there are three arms in this study. On the
13 one hand, they're getting Combigan, which has
14 Brimonidine, two times a day. On the second hand,
15 they're getting Brimonidine three times a day. And then
16 on the third hand, they're getting Timolol without any
17 Brimonidine; is that correct?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. Okay. Thank you for correcting me.

20 MR. DENNING: If we could look at
21 Figure 3 of this -- of this study, which appears on
22 Page 1235 of the journal.

23 A. Yes.

24 MR. DENNING: One more page. There you
25 go, Mr. Exline.

1 If you could blow up that figure in the
2 top right corner.

3 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Can you tell us what this --
4 what this figure is showing, Dr. Noecker?

5 A. This is a result of the -- a graph of the
6 result of this study in which they evaluated the -- the
7 eye pressure, the eye pressure lowering of each of these
8 three treatment regimens at four different timepoints
9 during the day.

10 So in the morning before the dose, the eyedrop
11 administration at 10:00 a.m., which is this peak best
12 timepoint; 3:00 p.m., which is the problematic
13 timepoint; and then 5:00 p.m., which is the final, end
14 of the day for everybody, I guess, in the study.

15 So what we see is, once again, 10:00 a.m. the
16 pressure is a little higher in the morning before
17 everybody gets their medicine. 10:00 a.m. is kind of
18 the expected peak efficacy of these drugs. So the lines
19 go down; the points go down, and we see kind of the
20 best-case scenario at 10:00 a.m.

21 And then we start seeing the afternoon, we see
22 the change in pressure. We see that the timepoint that
23 we worry about, once again, is this 3:00 p.m. timepoint.
24 So the circles are the Combigan, the triangles are the
25 Timolol, and the squares are Brimonidine.

1 And so being lower on the graph is better. We
2 see Combigan occupies the lowest position in terms of
3 IOP-lowering; Timolol next; and then Brimonidine at
4 the -- at the top.

5 And then it goes back down later on in the day
6 after dosing. So we see -- we see good or the best
7 efficacy with the combination formulation.

8 Q. And particularly, if we look at the 3:00 p.m.
9 and 5:00 p.m. timeframes, that's the afternoon trough
10 we've been talking about, correct?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. And in both of those instances, the -- the
13 subjects who were on the Combigan treatment, Brimonidine
14 only twice a day, had lower mean IOPs than those
15 patients who were getting Brimonidine three times a day
16 in the Brimonidine monotherapy arm, correct?

17 A. That's right. Somewhat surprising.

18 Q. And that's even after the folks who were on
19 the Brimonidine three-times-a-day therapy had their
20 second dose of Brimonidine at 3:00 p.m.?

21 A. Uh-huh.

22 Q. And by 5:00 p.m., that had kicked in.

23 A. Right.

24 Q. Their pressures are still higher than those
25 people who were on the Combigan treatment and haven't

1 taken any eyedrop since 8:00 a.m. that morning; is that
2 correct?

3 A. Right. Even with the additional dose, it's
4 still numerically better to be on the combination.

5 Q. Is this something that you as one of skill in
6 the art would have found surprising in 2002?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And why is that?

9 A. I think, based on our experience, we'd expect
10 that it would be kind of a neutral effect, that we
11 wouldn't see this beneficial effect from adding the
12 Timolol onto the Brimonidine to be able to be -- have a
13 positive effect.

14 We suspect that it might have some positive
15 effect, but that magnitude is really what's rather
16 striking. It really eliminated that -- that difference
17 we saw in those other studies, which was the TID dose,
18 three-times-a-day dosing, and twice-a-day dosing.

19 Q. Okay. Thank you, Dr. Noecker.

20 Let's also -- let's change subjects slightly
21 and talk about side effects. We've heard about ocular
22 allergy a couple of times, and I don't mean to belabor
23 the point, but did you bring some pictures to -- to show
24 the Court what ocular allergies really are?

25 A. Yes.

1 MR. DENNING: And, Mr. Exline, if we
2 could please bring up the first of those. I think it's
3 called 510.

4 Q. (By Mr. Denning) What are we seeing in AGX510,
5 Dr. Noecker?

6 A. A bad-looking eye. So what we see here is the
7 eye is red. So the conjunctivae of vessel, the kind of
8 clear covering that has the blood vessels, they're very
9 engorged. So this would also show up in study reports
10 as hyperemia. We've looked at tables reporting that
11 side effect. So eye redness or vessel engorgement.

12 We see that the skin of the eyelid around the
13 eye is kind of thickened and red and scaly. The color
14 is not the best on this picture, but they kind of get
15 this rubbery, flaky appearance on the skin that's
16 really, really itchy. You can kind of see from across
17 the room.

18 And then what we're trying to show here is the
19 eyelid is pulled down, and we're trying to show the
20 inner surface of the eyelid. It doesn't come out so
21 great here, but you get these bumps called follicles.
22 We were talking earlier about folliculosis. It looks
23 like little fish eggs in there. So it's these little
24 blister-like bubbles, hundreds of them on the inside of
25 the eyelid, which kind of tells us that this is allergy

1 due to Brimonidine. So these people are miserable.

2 MR. DENNING: And if we could go to
3 AGX511, please, Mr. Exline, the second of the two
4 pictures you brought.

5 Q. (By Mr. Denning) What do we see here,
6 Dr. Noecker?

7 A. So this is a patient of mine who's
8 receiving -- we have another picture of Alphagan allergy
9 in one eye, in her right eye -- this is the left one in
10 this picture, she's getting nothing. So kind of
11 normal-looking eye.

12 In her other eye, you see, once again, the
13 vascular engorgement, the hyperemia, the kind of pinking
14 around the eyelids, the eyelid changes. That's
15 basically what you see on this. And a complaint of
16 extremely itchy eye.

17 And this particular patient, who actually was
18 one of my favorites, and she was somebody -- she came
19 from Indiana, Pennsylvania. So she came from 80 miles
20 away to see me, because she was on this drug and just
21 miserable. She said, look, I walk around town and
22 everyone tells me I look like a vampire.

23 And I helped her. I stopped the drug. I
24 changed her therapy around because she was allergic. I
25 said you have an allergy, and we stopped it, and she was

1 one of my happiest -- I know her well. I can tell you
2 everything about her. She was my most loyal patient.
3 Referred a hundred other people from this little town to
4 come in and see me just because we recognized her
5 allergy. We stopped it and made her a very happy
6 person.

7 Q. In your experience, Dr. Noecker, are allergies
8 common with Brimonidine as a monotherapy?

9 A. Over time, yes. We don't see them right away,
10 but the longer patients are on the drug, they -- they
11 tend to occur. The original Alphagan, why clinicians
12 grew not to love it is because the rate would approach
13 25 percent, and over a longer period of time, probably a
14 little bit higher than that.

15 Q. When you say the original Alphagan, you mean
16 the Alphagan .2%?

17 A. The .2% formulation.

18 Q. Okay. In your experience, are allergies as
19 common with Combigan, which also has .2 percent
20 Brimonidine?

21 A. No, it's dramatically less.

22 Q. Was that surprising to you as one of skill in
23 the art?

24 A. Definitely.

25 Q. If you could please, sir, pull up PTX9A, one

1 of the PTX exhibits. And we can see this is the
2 clinical study 12T, the Combigan conducted as part of
3 the Phase 3 studies -- sorry -- that Allergan conducted
4 as part of the Phase 3 studies for Combigan; is that
5 right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. And if you could turn to Table 12.2.2,
8 which is on Page 89 of this clinical study, there's a
9 table.

10 MR. DENNING: Mr. Exline, if you could
11 please blow that up for us.

12 Q. (By Mr. Denning) And what does this table show
13 us, Dr. Noecker?

14 A. These are adverse events that were recorded in
15 this clinical study divided by organ system.

16 Q. And it shows on the left the -- the results
17 with the combination therapy or what is Combigan, in the
18 middle with Brimonidine as a TID monotherapy, and then
19 on the right is Timolol; is that correct?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. Okay. And what -- what do you notice in the
22 difference between the first two columns, the
23 combination and the Brimonidine?

24 A. That -- that the, I guess, adverse -- we'll
25 use the term adverse event, since this is in a study

1 protocol, allergic conjunctival folliculosis is much
2 less in the combination group. Eye pruritis, which is
3 itching, is much less in the combination group. The
4 blepharitis rate, which you can presume may be allergic
5 blepharitis, is lower. The allergic conjunctivitis rate
6 is lower with the combination drug. Those are the
7 things that pop out first.

8 Q. Now, the people getting the combination
9 therapy were only getting Brimonidine two times a day
10 versus three times a day for those in the Brimonidine
11 monotherapy.

12 Were these results surprising nonetheless to
13 you as one of skill in the art?

14 A. Yes. And I think it's -- I think it's -- part
15 of it is why allergy occurs with Brimonidine, and I can
16 explain that.

17 Q. Please do so.

18 A. So it really -- and we -- we've learned a lot
19 of this basically because of the subsequent generations
20 of lower concentration Alphagan. So with Alphagan P
21 .15% and Alphagan P, what we saw on patients on those
22 drugs is that their allergy rates dropped precipitously.
23 It's because they were getting less drug exposure.

24 Why allergy occurs with Brimonidine is kind of
25 interesting. So it has nothing to do with the way the

1 drug lowers eye pressure. So a lot of times these
2 patients have great eye pressures. The bad thing is
3 they have a red, itchy eye that's driving them nuts.
4 So what happens with Brimonidine, it gets oxidized.
5 Alpha-agonists are easily oxidized medications. And so
6 just by being exposed to the air, oxygen is there; it
7 turns it into this new compound, which is what people
8 get allergic to. So the more drug that's kind of not
9 going into the eye and hanging out on the surface until
10 it gets washed away, increases the chance that they're
11 going to get an allergy. So it's how much is in that
12 time, in that two-minute period where there's drug on
13 the eye. That's when the oxidation occurs.

14 Now, the bad thing in terms of allergy that
15 Alpha-2 agonists do is they shrink cells. So other
16 drugs don't do that. So you have this allergenic stuff
17 hanging on the surface, and then the gap, the
18 drug-shrunk cells increases the space between cells so
19 that allergenic compounds get underneath the surface
20 where all the immune cells are. And then people's eyes
21 kind of blow up.

22 Clinically, we would see people would get
23 allergic conjunctivitis and have come off the drugs
24 during allergy season, probably because their allergic
25 to the pollen, too, and that space made it easier for

1 the other stuff to get under there as well. So you have
2 these biannual, bi-seasonal -- whatever the word is --
3 twice-a-year spikes in the spring and fall where
4 allergies would tend to spike of people on Alphagan.
5 So that -- that's why it's particularly bad with
6 Brimonidine Alpha-2 agonists.

7 Q. Okay. And so does it surprise you that --
8 were these results surprising to you, even though the
9 doses of Brimonidine in the combination therapy, too,
10 were less than the doses of Brimonidine in the
11 Brimonidine arm, which were three?

12 A. Yes, initially, until we figured out why.

13 MR. DENNING: If we could -- if you could
14 pull up PTX9B, and we'll go through this one a little
15 more quickly.

16 Q. (By Mr. Denning) But this is the 13T study
17 from the Combigan clinical trials.

18 MR. DENNING: And, Mr. Exline, if you
19 could go to the third page of this where it says
20 clinical study -- back one, please -- forward one,
21 please.

22 I think we have the wrong document,
23 Mr. Exline. If that's 9B, then I wrote down the wrong
24 number. I could do the ELMO, if that's easy.

25 Okay. That must have been my mistake

1 writing down the wrong (sic) for you.

2 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Okay. This is the -- the 13T
3 study; is that correct, Dr. Noecker?

4 A. That's the title on this page, yes.

5 Q. Okay. And this was comparing the combination
6 of twice daily with -- with Alphagan three times daily;
7 is that right?

8 A. That's right.

9 Q. Okay. And if we look at the data on the next
10 page, we can see that the combination arm is on the --
11 the left-hand column, and the Brimonidine arm is in the
12 middle; is that right?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Okay. And did we see a reduction in allergy
15 in the 13T study like we did in the 12T study?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. For example, I see eye pruritis has gone from
18 13 occurrences to 3 occurrences; is that right?

19 A. That's right.

20 Q. Foreign body sensation from 10 to 2?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And conjunctival folliculosis from 9 to 2?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay. And before you understood what was
25 happening through this study, were those results

1 surprising to you?

2 A. Yes, not predicted at all.

3 MR. DENNING: If we go to JTX,
4 Mr. Exline, please, and if we can go to Column 7,
5 Lines 6 through 11, please.

6 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Did the inventors disclose in
7 the patent the -- the allergic benefits to this
8 combination drug?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. We see here it says: The incidences of oral
11 dryness, eye pruritis, foreign body sensation, and
12 conjunctival folliculosis were statistically
13 significantly lower with the combination than with the
14 Brimonidine, while burning and stinging were
15 statistically significantly higher with the combination
16 than with Brimonidine; is that right?

17 A. Yes, it is.

18 Q. Okay. Yesterday -- we're going to turn to
19 another reference, one of them that Dr. Tanna looked at
20 yesterday, which was the Goni reference, DTX23.

21 MR. GOLOB: Your Honor, he doesn't
22 discuss the Goni reference in his report at all nor does
23 he talk about the study that goes with it.

24 MR. DENNING: Your Honor, if I may. I
25 don't intend to ask his opinion. I just want to look at

1 some of the data in the Goni reference.

2 THE COURT: Let's see where he goes.

3 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Dr. Noecker, do you have the
4 Goni reference in front of you?

5 A. What was the DTX number?

6 Q. It was DTX23.

7 A. Yes, I have it.

8 Q. Okay. And what drugs were being evaluated in
9 the Goni reference; do you know?

10 A. This is a 12-week study comparing the fixed
11 combination Brimonidine/Timolol with the individual
12 components --

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. -- use.

15 MR. DENNING: And if I could -- Mr.
16 Exline, if you could go to Page 583 and blow up the top
17 paragraph in the upper left, the study design paragraph,
18 please.

19 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Okay. Is that where it says
20 this was a 12-week study --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- Dr. Noecker?

23 And how long were the 12T and the 13T studies
24 that we just looked at?

25 A. A year.

1 Q. A year?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Okay. Dr. Noecker, you can set the Goni
4 reference aside.

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. And I want to look at one more, which is
7 PTX123, which is the Motolko reference, Dr. Noecker.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. This is a comparison of patients receiving
10 Brimonidine monotherapy versus a fixed combination of
11 Brimonidine and Timolol, essentially comparing
12 Brimonidine to Combigan?

13 A. That's right.

14 Q. Now, in this instance, both arms of this study
15 had Brimonidine BID; is that correct?

16 A. That's right.

17 Q. So there was no difference in which the people
18 taking Combigan were only getting Brimonidine twice a
19 day and the people doing Alphagan were getting three
20 times a day, here in this Canadian paper, they were two
21 times a day in each arm, correct?

22 A. That's right.

23 Q. Okay. And what's being measured in the
24 Motolko paper?

25 A. Ocular allergy.

1 Q. Okay.

2 MR. DENNING: If you could turn to Page 3
3 of the study and blow up Figure 1 in the upper
4 right-hand corner, please, Mr. Exline.

5 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Now, this study shows 18
6 months of data; is that right?

7 A. That's right.

8 Q. Is there a reason why 18 months is important
9 in examining allergies?

10 A. Well, in this particular case, just when
11 the -- when the allergy becomes more prevalent or the
12 incidence rises, it's time-dependent. So the longer we
13 look for it, the more that we'll see. And it tends to
14 be a side effect that only gets worse with time. It's
15 not like you can ride it out and it will get better.
16 It's a one-way trip. The longer you're on the drug, the
17 more likely you are to be getting it.

18 Q. Okay. So if you're assessing the allergy
19 effects of a drug, would you look at an 18-month or a
20 year-long study or a 12-week study?

21 A. For this particular drug, definitely 18
22 months.

23 Q. And we see here in the dark circles, the
24 Brimonidine dosed twice a day, and then in the open
25 circles, we see the Combigan dosed twice a day, correct?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And what does this data show you?

3 A. So it shows that the -- the rate of allergy in
4 patients who are only getting Brimonidine is -- is much,
5 much higher than those who are getting Combigan. So
6 that -- and this is a side effect of, once again, you
7 can see as time goes on, it's becoming more and more
8 prevalent.

9 So it's a time that we're seeing side effects.
10 So the rate -- when you have the Timolol in there, it
11 seems to be -- the rate -- it lowers it significantly.

12 Q. And was that something that was a surprise to
13 a person of ordinary skill in the art in 2001/2002?

14 A. Definitely, until we figured it out.

15 Q. Okay. Set aside ocular allergies now.
16 We also heard earlier in this trial from Dr. Whitcup
17 about sleepiness. Do you remember that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. What is the nature of sleepiness observed with
20 Brimonidine?

21 A. So it tends to be related to the dosing. So
22 somnolence that's reported upon is really
23 dose-dependent. So the story we get in our patients is
24 that we say, okay, take your eyedrop twice a day or
25 three times a day. So they take their 7:00 a.m. drop

1 and about a half an hour later, they get really sleepy
2 and fall into their cereal. So it's not really -- it
3 kind of goes away.

4 So it's not like taking Benadryl or an
5 antihistamine where you're kind of drowsy all day long.
6 It really tends to be very much related and short-term
7 related to the dosing. So you get it very shortly after
8 dosing, kind of when you see the peak effect of the
9 drug, peak absorption.

10 Q. Okay. Do you see that high rate of somnolence
11 with Combigan?

12 A. Surprisingly, no.

13 MR. DENNING: If you can turn to JTX9E,
14 and we can put it up on the screen.

15 Thank you, Mr. Exline.

16 Q. (By Mr. Denning) This is the Allergan 24T
17 study, a Phase 3 study with Combigan; is that correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And if you could turn to Page -- that ends in
20 the Bates No. 22630, and there's a safety assessments
21 conclusion paragraph.

22 Do you see that sir?

23 We'll put it up on the screen for you.

24 A. Yes. Yes.

25 Q. And what's discussed in the first bullet point

1 under the safety assessments conclusion?

2 A. So this study, which was looking for
3 sleepiness -- I mean, so it wasn't kind of an incidental
4 finding in the study. They were kind of seeking out
5 this side effect.

6 There was a highly favorable statistically
7 significant difference between the treatment groups
8 favoring combination with 9.2 percent responders in the
9 combination group, and 19.3 percent responders in the
10 concurrent group.

11 The risk ratio was 2.10, indicating a greater
12 than twofold risk for sleepiness with concurrent or the
13 combination.

14 Q. So somehow combining the Timolol with the
15 Brimonidine cut the sleepiness side effect in half?

16 A. That's right. The Timolol is protected for
17 that Brimonidine-based side effect.

18 Q. Okay. And you said that was a surprise. Why
19 was that a surprise?

20 A. Because we -- it was something we've never
21 observed with using these drugs for patients who happen
22 to be on both drugs together. And it hadn't been
23 reported in any other situation. So it was -- it was
24 unique.

25 Q. Finally, Dr. Noecker --

1 MR. DENNING: If we can pull up PTX1, the
2 '149 patent, and if we could go to Column 1, please, and
3 Line 7 to 28 at the top, just that first paragraph.

4 Thank you.

5 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Do you see starting about
6 Line 16 in the '149 patent, Column 1, Dr. Noecker, it
7 says: There is, moreover, a long-felt need for an
8 effective and safe topical ophthalmic pharmaceutical
9 composition, including Brimonidine and Timolol, which
10 has increased stability and requires a lower effective
11 concentration of preservative as compared to the
12 individual agents alone.

13 Do you see that?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. In your opinion, did that long-felt need exist
16 in the industry in 2002?

17 A. It did.

18 Q. And then it says: Finally, there is a need to
19 increase the efficacy of many topical ophthalmic agents
20 without increasing the systemic concentration of such
21 topical agents, since it is well-known that many of the
22 topically applied ophthalmic agents cause systemic side
23 effects, drowsiness, and heart effects.

24 Do you see that, sir?

25 A. I do.

1 MR. GOLOB: Your Honor, he did not opine
2 on this. He opined that there was a long-felt need for
3 a combination product. He did not mention Brimonidine
4 and Timolol. He does not speak about systemic
5 concentrations or anything like that. He just talks
6 about a combination, a fixed combination period.

7 THE COURT: I don't know where the report
8 is. Let me see it.

9 MR. DENNING: I'd be happy to modify my
10 question, Your Honor, if that speeds up the process.

11 THE COURT: All right.

12 Q. (By Mr. Denning) Dr. Noecker, did you think in
13 2002 there was a long-felt need in the industry for a
14 fixed combination drug to treat glaucoma?

15 A. Yes, because, once again, statistically, about
16 a third of our patients needed more than one therapy.
17 So while we had the prostaglandin analogs on the scene,
18 we still had patients who would end up on multiple
19 therapy. And some of those patients would be on
20 Brimonidine and Timolol, and this would -- a fixed
21 combination drug would help simplify therapy to decrease
22 dosing and to decrease costs, fulfill a need in terms of
23 compliance, et cetera.

24 Q. And did any other company develop a .5%
25 Brimonidine and .2% -- I'm sorry -- a .2% Brimonidine

1 and .5% Timolol combination before 2002?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Did any other company develop a fixed
4 combination drug with .2% Brimonidine and .5% Timolol
5 before Allergan filed this patent application in 2002?

6 A. No.

7 MR. DENNING: One second, Your Honor.

8 Nothing further, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Cross-examination?

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. GOLOB:

12 Q. Are you ready, Dr. Noecker?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Good afternoon. I thought we were going to
15 say good morning, but it's good afternoon.

16 I want to get a clarification on something, if
17 I could right off the bat. I thought I heard your
18 counsel ask you about whether you were giving an opinion
19 on Claims 1 through 3 of the '149 patent.

20 And I believe you are not, correct?

21 A. Between Claims 1 through 3, no. Claim 4.

22 Q. Okay. So you're not giving any opinions on
23 Claims 1 through 3 of the '149 patent?

24 A. No.

25 Q. With respect to invalidity?

1 A. No.

2 Q. Okay. In your rebuttal report, you cite the
3 standard for obviousness, right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And there was no U.S. requirement in the
6 definition of your obviousness standard, right?

7 A. No -- I'm sorry?

8 Q. There was no requirement of it being somebody
9 in the United States, right?

10 A. Right.

11 Q. Okay. And you also discuss an ordinary -- a
12 person of ordinary skill in the art as well, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And your definition doesn't include a
15 limitation of the United States as well either, right?

16 A. Didn't use the words United States, no.

17 Q. Okay. Now, you talked about some drugs
18 earlier today that were available around the world. I
19 think we talked about some combinations like Xalacom and
20 Probeta and a few others.

21 Do you recall that?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. So does the drug have to be available
24 in the United States to be considered prior art?

25 A. No.

1 Q. All right. So I think you had a lot of
2 discussion, but I just want to get some dates and make
3 sure I'm pinning it down here.

4 You're agreeing that Cosopt was available on
5 the market and publicly available prior to April 2002,
6 right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And so was Timpilo prior to 2002; it was
9 available?

10 A. Not in the United States.

11 Q. No. It was available somewhere in the world?

12 THE COURT: Okay. I've been asleep up
13 here. You think I don't write this down, that I don't
14 know which one at this stage of this ballgame. And if
15 you really think I'm that bad, you need to disqualify
16 me. I'm obviously incompetent.

17 MR. GOLOB: No, we don't, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Why don't we move on then.

19 MR. GOLOB: Okay. All right.

20 THE COURT: I mean, if you want to lump
21 them together for something, let's go, but come on.

22 MR. GOLOB: Okay. All right. I'll move
23 on, Your Honor.

24 Q. (By Mr. Golob) So in your report, Dr. Noecker,
25 you talk about all these fixed combinations, right?

1 That you talked about earlier, you talked about them in
2 your report, right?

3 A. I talked about some fixed combinations, yes.

4 Q. But you don't give any timeframes with respect
5 to their relation to any FDA analysis, right?

6 You do an FDA analysis, right? And you talk
7 about the FDA and what -- that it would be very
8 difficult to get through the FDA, and then you talk
9 about all these other products, right?

10 A. We've talked about the drugs that failed at
11 the FDA.

12 Q. Right.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. But you don't give any timeframe for when they
15 failed at the FDA or maybe they haven't even failed yet,
16 right?

17 A. I don't think there were any dates of failure.

18 Q. Okay. And there's certainly no date of
19 failure prior to April of 2002, right?

20 A. For which?

21 Q. For any of those combination products that you
22 talked about?

23 A. Are you speaking for Xalacom, the post --

24 Q. I don't want to list them unless I bunch them
25 altogether.

1 THE COURT: Go ahead and list them.
2 That's not what your question was. Go ahead, Mr. Golob.

3 MR. GOLOB: Okay.

4 THE COURT: You've got cross-examination.
5 You'd better use it as effectively as you can.

6 Q. (By Mr. Golob) So you talked about several
7 fixed combinations that were available outside the
8 United States but weren't available in the United
9 States, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And you also talked about that they weren't
12 available in the United States, because they didn't get
13 through the FDA, right?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. But you didn't talk about any timeframe for
16 whether they were known to be failed before April 2002
17 or after April 2002, right?

18 A. I did not provide specific dates, correct.

19 Q. Okay. So you stated that most people in the
20 industry were surprised by Combigan getting FDA
21 approval, right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And, again, that was way after the patents
24 were filed, right?

25 A. Several years.

1 Q. It's good to be turning pages.

2 THE COURT: I don't want you to do
3 anything -- fail to do anything you think's necessary.

4 MR. GOLOB: I understand, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: But I don't need to be told
6 things I've been told eight to ten times. That's what
7 I'm hoping we don't do.

8 Q. (By Mr. Golob) So I want to move just very
9 briefly to Timolol and Brimonidine just very briefly.

10 You would agree with me that .5% Timolol was
11 the most prescribed beta-blocker for treatment of
12 glaucoma and ocular hypertension prior to April 2002,
13 right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And you would agree with me that .2%
16 Brimonidine was known prior to 2002 for treating
17 glaucoma and ocular hypertension, right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And both of them were preserved in BAK as you
20 well know, right?

21 A. The .2% formulation and some of the .5%
22 formulation and some .25%.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. They're alternative formulations available.

25 Q. Right. But the most widely prescribed one was

1 .5% Timolol, and it was preserved in BAK, right?

2 A. Of the Timolol -- yes.

3 Q. Now, you said something today on direct, and
4 you said that there was a .2 -- .25% Timolol that was
5 actually preferred, which is different from what you
6 just said to me now.

7 I just asked you if .5% Timolol was the most
8 prescribed, and you said yes, but earlier in your
9 direct, you said .25 Timolol was preferred.

10 A. Yes. That's what I said, for initial therapy.

11 Q. Okay. And all the studies you looked at up
12 here earlier today, they were all .5% Timolol, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Now, I think we heard in opening -- you were
15 here for Ms. Brooks' opening?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. You heard that Allergan made gallant
18 efforts to try to get .2% Brimonidine to be dosed twice
19 a day, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And you know that outside of the U.S.,
22 Brimonidine at .2% is approved for use two times a day,
23 right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Okay. And I believe in your deposition, we

1 asked you if you yourself had dosed .2% Brimonidine less
2 than three times a day, and you said yes, right?

3 A. Sometimes, yes.

4 Q. Okay. Now, I believe you also said that -- on
5 direct a few times, that the .2% Brimonidine had some
6 problems, and you actually thought it was kind of in
7 disfavor by 2001; is that -- I don't want to
8 mischaracterize your statement, but that's kind of what
9 you said, right?

10 A. Yes. We were -- clinicians were getting tired
11 of the allergy rate.

12 Q. Okay. And the FDA approval for Alphagan P .15
13 was August 2001, right?

14 A. I think so.

15 Q. So it would have just come out just prior to
16 the patents in this case being filed, right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. All right. If you could turn to Exhibit
19 DTX276. Well, if I can find it.

20 MR. GOLOB: Of course -- I apologize.
21 I'm skipping around a little, Your Honor, so I'm looking
22 for the document, but it's up there.

23 Q. (By Mr. Golob) That's an article that you
24 authored, right?

25 A. Do I have this in a binder?

1 Q. You should. It's 276.

2 A. Oh, I have it here. I see it now.

3 Q. Okay. Is that an article that you wrote?

4 A. Yes, it is.

5 Q. And it's dated March/April 2002?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And you're the sole author, right?

8 A. Yes. There's a number -- there's a group
9 along with that whose names are listed elsewhere, but,
10 yeah, I was the author on this.

11 Q. Right. It looks like you get all the credit
12 on this one, right?

13 A. Lucky me.

14 Q. Now, do you recall doing this study?

15 A. I don't. This is a long time ago.

16 Q. So that would be a no?

17 A. Not the intricate details.

18 Q. Okay. But this is a study, as it says, about
19 Brimonidine .2% as a replacement for beta-blockers in
20 geriatric patients with glaucoma, right?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. And at the expense of getting the wrath of the
23 Court for both of us, we're not going to ask what the
24 definition of geriatric is, right?

25 THE COURT: I probably qualify for that,

1 too.

2 A. I'll pass.

3 Q. (By Mr. Golob) So if you could turn to the
4 page that is the sixth page, and it is just above the
5 acknowledgments, the paragraph there. And it says: In
6 many elderly patients, therefore, long-term use of
7 topical non-selective beta-blockers may not adequately
8 lower IOP.

9 Replacement therapy with Brimonidine twice
10 daily significantly reduced IOP and improved quality of
11 life. Brimonidine was also safe and well-tolerated in
12 this large geriatric population.

13 Do you see that?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And it was the .2% Brimonidine that you were
16 recommending here, right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Thank you.

19 Now, I -- I don't want to belabor the point,
20 but you were well aware of BAK as the preservative of
21 choice, basically, in the 2001/2002 timeframe?

22 A. I'm not sure I would use preservative of
23 choice.

24 Q. It was the overwhelmingly most -- most
25 overwhelmingly used preservative at that time?

1 A. Probably not in artificial tear preparations
2 or dry eye therapies --

3 Q. Doctor --

4 A. -- but in glaucoma therapies, yes.

5 Q. Yeah. So we're talking about glaucoma, in
6 glaucoma for sure, right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. So I want to spend a little bit of time on
9 DeSantis, and I know the Court has probably heard what
10 he thinks all he needs about DeSantis, so we're going to
11 try to --

12 THE COURT: I didn't say that now.

13 MR. GOLOB: No. I've heard all I want to
14 hear about DeSantis.

15 Q. (By Mr. Golob) But let's talk about the
16 patents for one second here, Dr. Noecker.

17 The patents in this case are directed to a
18 fixed combination glaucoma product, right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And the claims have three ingredients in them,
21 right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. So the claims have Timolol, right?

24 A. Timolol is there, yes.

25 Q. Brimonidine?

1 A. (No response.)

2 Q. Is that a yes?

3 A. Brimonidine?

4 Q. I'm talking about the patents in this suit.

5 A. Oh, patents-in-suit.

6 Q. The four --

7 A. I thought we were talking about DeSantis. I'm
8 sorry.

9 Q. No. We're talking about Allergan's four
10 patents.

11 A. Okay. Yes.

12 Q. They are directed to a fixed combination
13 glaucoma product, right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And they have three ingredients in the claims,
16 right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. They have Timolol, right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Brimonidine?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And BAK?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. There's no other ingredients in the claims,
25 right?

1 A. I'd have to check closely, but we'll go with
2 no for right now.

3 Q. Okay. So let's talk about DeSantis. So
4 DeSantis was directed to treating glaucoma and ocular
5 hypertension, right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And DeSantis is a fixed combination glaucoma
8 product, right?

9 A. Could you be more specific? Are we talking in
10 the claims or --

11 Q. Anywhere in the patent. It talks about a
12 fixed combination of a therapeutically effective amount
13 of one or more Alpha-2 agonists and beta-blocker, right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. And as we've seen, Timolol is both in
16 the title and in the claim as a beta-blocker, right?

17 A. Timolol does appear in the title, and Timolol
18 does appear in the claim.

19 Q. Okay. And I think, if I understand your
20 argument about Timmermans, you said the word Brimonidine
21 is not in there, right?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. Okay. But when you look at the structure, you
24 know, as somebody skilled in the art, that that's
25 Brimonidine, right?

1 A. After a fair amount of thought, yes, we can
2 identify it. If we look up what Brimonidine looks like
3 and look at in the paper and attach the groups together,
4 yes, we can -- we can figure that out.

5 Q. So when I asked you at your deposition if you
6 agreed with me that Brimonidine was disclosed in
7 Timmermans and you said yes, you didn't have any of that
8 qualification, did you?

9 A. I'll go with that answer.

10 Q. Okay. And, in fact, in DeSantis, when
11 Brimonidine is -- is identified in the text, it's
12 identified as the -- the U number, but it's also
13 identified as the tartrate, right?

14 A. In Timmermans, you're talking about?

15 Q. In Timmermans, yes.

16 A. I'd need to look at that specifically.

17 MR. GOLOB: Can you put -- no.
18 Timmermans, 124. So if you go to Page 20 -- the 28th
19 page, or maybe it's the 12th page maybe. Go to the next
20 page, please.

21 I believe it's the paragraph that says --
22 the third one down and the fourth one down. It may be
23 one more up. I'm sorry. You know what? I'll come back
24 to it, and I'll find it for you.

25 I'm sorry, Your Honor.

1 Q. (By Mr. Golob) All right. So let's get back
2 to DeSantis.

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. So DeSantis incorporates Timmermans by
5 reference, right?

6 A. Timmermans is listed in the references, right.

7 Q. Right. And, again, Timmermans is not listed
8 for its purpose of being cardiac drugs; it's listed for
9 showing clonidine and clonidine derivatives, right?

10 A. It's included in that big list of clonidine
11 derivatives, yes.

12 Q. Right. Okay. Now, let's talk about the
13 alpha-agonists, because you made this -- you had this
14 chart where you had this 2.6 million number, something
15 like that?

16 A. Potential combinations, yes.

17 Q. Right. So when you read, as one of skill in
18 the art, DeSantis and you see Alpha-2 agonists, you're
19 telling the Court that as one of skill in the art, you
20 are looking at whatever that number was, 197 plus 56,
21 and you're not thinking to yourself, well, what are the
22 possible ones I could choose and know there's only three
23 that are even remotely available on the market?

24 A. What do you mean remotely available? There's
25 more than that available on the market. Which market

1 are you talking about?

2 Q. So in the U.S. market, how many Alpha-2
3 agonists were available in April of 2001?

4 A. Are you talking about ophthalmic --

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. -- eyedrop medications?

7 Q. I'm talking about ophthalmic eyedrop
8 medications.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. There was .2% Brimonidine, right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. What else?

13 A. In terms of alpha-agonist?

14 Q. Yeah.

15 A. Apraclonidine 1.1%.

16 Q. Okay. That was in disfavor, I believe you
17 said, right?

18 A. For -- for -- I don't know if I used the word
19 disfavor, but --

20 Q. That's the word you used in your deposition --

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. -- okay?

23 A. I'll go with that.

24 Q. Clonidine was the other one, right? And it's
25 not available in the U.S.?

1 A. And Apraclonidine .5%.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. So there's two different concentrations. And
4 then we had Alphagan P .15%.

5 Q. In 2001? In April 2001?

6 A. April 2001. So Alphagan P may have come out
7 after that.

8 Q. But the --

9 A. But it was known.

10 Q. So there were a very limited number that were
11 known to you, right, that were commercially available in
12 the United States?

13 A. As glaucoma medications.

14 Q. Yes.

15 A. But there's many -- in medicine, there's many
16 other, you know, blood pressure medications, such as
17 Timolol originally was a blood pressure medication,
18 so...

19 Q. But if you're sitting there as somebody
20 skilled in the art, you're going to think about making a
21 combination glaucoma product, and you're reading
22 DeSantis, your first thought isn't to think about, well,
23 what are the Alpha-2 agonists that are on the market
24 that might work?

25 That's not how you're thinking. You're

1 thinking, oh, my, there's 172 of them; I better check
2 them all out?

3 A. Well, in some ways, we want to do better,
4 because as I said before, we weren't like -- we don't
5 look at those drugs as perfect drugs, and I think when
6 you're coming out -- trying to come out with a new
7 therapy, you'd like it to be better.

8 So I think you do take a look at, you know,
9 what could be better. We do have some of these
10 compounds which do exist as antiblood pressure
11 medications, which is a long history of crossover from
12 blood pressure medications becoming glaucoma
13 medications. So I don't think -- I'd look at others to
14 try to do better.

15 Q. How many combination products are available
16 for glaucoma around the world where the base product
17 isn't previously approved?

18 A. (No response.)

19 Q. So you have two actives in the fixed
20 combination, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. How many fixed combinations are you aware of
23 that are available somewhere that have as one element of
24 their fixed combination a drug that's not been approved
25 in that -- in wherever it is?

1 A. (No response.)

2 Q. None, right?

3 A. I'm not aware, but I'm not sure of the --
4 outside the U.S., to be honest with you.

5 Q. You're not aware of any, right?

6 A. (No response.)

7 Q. Xalacom, you're not aware -- those two drugs
8 are approved, right, Latanoprost and Timolol?

9 A. Approved for?

10 Q. Well, they're individually approved as
11 monotherapy in the place where Xalacom is approved,
12 right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. I think I understand.

16 Q. So -- right. So no company that you're aware
17 of has made a fixed combination glaucoma product in any
18 country where the two actives weren't formerly approved
19 as monotherapy, correct?

20 A. With the active ingredient itself, yes.

21 Q. Yes.

22 A. There's certainly different, you know --

23 Q. It's a yes or no?

24 A. It's a yes.

25 Q. Thank you.

1 So -- and as we said, DeSantis discloses BAK,
2 correct?

3 A. Benzalkonium Chloride?

4 Q. Yes.

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. So -- and you knew -- we don't have to
7 say it 50 times, but you knew and you talked about .2%
8 Brimonidine was available and .5% Timolol was available
9 as of April 2001, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. I want to talk about an exhibit that you used.

12 MR. GOLOB: And, Mr. Exline, I know
13 you're not employed by us. I'll give you 20 bucks, if
14 you want. But could you put up AGX516?

15 Q. (By Mr. Golob) So this is a slide we used
16 earlier, right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And this slide showed basically that DeSantis
19 was cited in the '258 patent, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. So -- and Counsel asked you if the
22 inventors submitted it to the Patent Office, right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Do you know when it was submitted to the
25 Patent Office?

1 A. Not off the top of my head.

2 Q. Well, would you be surprised if it was
3 submitted in June of 2009?

4 A. Would I be surprised? No.

5 Q. Okay. And, in fact, would you be surprised if
6 it was submitted by the inventors after the Defendants
7 in this case gave it to Allergan in its infringement --
8 in its invalidity contentions?

9 A. No.

10 Q. And how many of the patents that you're
11 opining on had issued already by June of 2009?

12 A. I have to check the dates.

13 Q. All of the others. '149 issued in 2006. You
14 can look in your book. You have 1, 2, 3, and 4 as your
15 JTX, but I'll submit that to you.

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. '976 issued in 2008, and the '463 issued in
18 2008. None of them have DeSantis cited in them, right?

19 A. Of the others, no.

20 Q. I'm getting corrected. It was added after the
21 Defendant sent Paragraph 4 letters, not after they sent
22 their invalidity contentions.

23 A. I'll take your word for that.

24 Q. Okay.

25 THE COURT: It was good that he corrected

1 that, because, otherwise, somebody else was going to
2 correct it.

3 MR. GOLOB: Absolutely.

4 THE COURT: They're getting all excited
5 at that table.

6 MR. GOLOB: And if it was Ms. Brooks, you
7 know she said she loves to be right, so that would be
8 definitely something she would do.

9 THE COURT: All right. We all got that
10 out of the way. Now let's move along.

11 Q. (By Mr. Golob) Now, you talked a little bit
12 about Claim 4 of the '149 patent, which is JTX1.

13 MR. GOLOB: Could you put that up for me,
14 please, Savi?

15 If you can go to Claim 4, please. I'm
16 sorry. That's the wrong claim. I need the method of
17 manufacture claim in the -- in the '463. Exhibit JTX3,
18 please.

19 Q. (By Mr. Golob) So you see this claim is about
20 an article of manufacture comprising package material
21 and a composition within, right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. So prior to April 2002, drugs were
24 available in articles of manufacture, right?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. They came in a bottle?

2 A. Came in a bottle, yes.

3 Q. The bottle came in a box?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. They had a package insert in them?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. They had indication on the package insert?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Earlier you talked a lot about a drug called
10 Timpilo. Do you recall that?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And you made a lot of comments about four
13 times a day was better than the combination; is that
14 right?

15 A. Could you be more specific?

16 Q. I think you talked a lot about the fact that,
17 you know, the Pilocarpine was better alone than when
18 you -- it still needed to be four times a day, even
19 though you were adding the Timolol to it?

20 A. I think we were talking about efficacy data at
21 specific time points, if I'm not mistaken.

22 Q. I thought you were talking about that the four
23 times a day was -- yeah. Okay. So you were talking
24 about the four times a day was actually better, right?

25 A. In terms of efficacy at specific time points?

1 Q. In terms of in general.

2 A. Well, I'm not sure I said that.

3 Q. Okay. So -- because you realize that Timpilo
4 is supposed to be dosed twice daily when it's the
5 combination product, right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay.

8 MR. GOLOB: Now, I do have that
9 Timmermans, so I'll actually just put it on the, ELMO,
10 if that's okay. Oh, okay.

11 A. Which -- which number is it for me to look up
12 in my books?

13 Q. (By Mr. Golob) This is 124.

14 Do you see the UK-14,304-18 is Brimonidine,
15 right?

16 A. Is it DTX124?

17 Q. DTX124.

18 A. I just like to look. And what page are we on?

19 Q. It looks like 13.

20 A. I'm there.

21 Q. Okay. You see the paragraph that I have on
22 the screen? It says -- it mentions UK-14,304-18, and
23 it's the tartrate form, right?

24 A. There's tartrate in parenthesis, yes.

25 Q. Right. So that's Brimonidine Tartrate, right?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Now, I want to move to -- you talked about a
3 few things that you were surprised about.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Now, when you were talking about -- and I
6 guess this goes toward your unexpected results analysis,
7 right?

8 A. Can you be more specific?

9 Q. Well, you said that you were -- there was
10 unexpected results with respect to -- at least in your
11 report -- the reduction in ocular side effects, right?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And also the reduction in oral dryness?

14 A. Systemic side effect, yes.

15 Q. Okay. And general systemic side effects,
16 right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And when you talk about these reductions, you
19 said you were surprised, right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. But you didn't produce to us any
22 baseline data from which you would then be surprised of
23 it, right?

24 A. Did I -- I'm not sure what you mean baseline
25 data. I think I gave you my clinical experience.

1 Q. Let me ask it this way: So all of these
2 comparisons were done where there was one less dose of
3 Brimonidine, right?

4 A. Not all the comparisons.

5 Q. Well, the comparisons that you use in your
6 report, the 12T and the 13T and the 19T, right?

7 A. Okay. Those studies, yes.

8 Q. Yeah. Those are the ones you used to say: I
9 was surprised --

10 A. Okay. Yes.

11 Q. -- right? Those are all situations where
12 you're comparing the combination drug, and the
13 comparison is to some other kind of format, but that
14 format has Brimonidine three times a day in it, right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Okay. So -- and you testified that you would
17 expect that you'd have some reduction in side effects
18 because of the less dose of Brimonidine, right?

19 A. I think that's a theoretical thing, but
20 that -- maybe. Maybe, maybe not, because the
21 concentration didn't drop.

22 Q. It's more than --

23 A. The dosing interval dropped; the concentration
24 didn't.

25 Q. But it's more than theoretical, because that's

1 what the results of the studies were, right?

2 A. Right, but that wasn't predictable.

3 Q. The conclusions don't say it was because of
4 the drop in Brimonidine?

5 A. Can you point me to a specific sentence?

6 Q. Sure.

7 MR. GOLOB: If we put up DTX33, please.
8 Yeah, this is not going to work.

9 COURTROOM DEPUTY: It's done.

10 MR. GOLOB: Oh. Thank you.

11 Q. (By Mr. Golob) So this is the clinical summary
12 report that's already been used at DTX33, right?

13 A. Right. Which one is this?

14 Q. It's DTX33. Do you see it's the -- titled the
15 Clinical Summary?

16 Do you see that?

17 A. I see the DTX number.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. Which clinical study is it?

20 Q. So if you go to Page 3, do you see in the
21 middle, it says Phase 3, 12T, 13T, 19T?

22 Do you see that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay. So on the next page, it says: Overview
25 Results.

1 Do you see that?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. It says: Since patients receiving combination
4 treatment had a reduced exposure to Brimonidine due to
5 the BID dosing -- in other words, the combination
6 product was only two times a day, but Brimonidine was
7 three times a day in the other arm, right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. It was expected that the combination treatment
10 would have a better safety profile compared to
11 Brimonidine monotherapy.

12 Do you see that?

13 A. I see that sentence, yes.

14 Q. Okay. So it was expected that there would be
15 a reduction in the side effects, right, because of the
16 reduction in Brimonidine? You have one less dose;
17 there's a third less, right?

18 A. I understand the logic. I'm not sure that
19 that's reality, because one less dose -- when you look
20 at which side effect you're talking about, a lot of it
21 is concentration dependent. Once again, we talked about
22 the transient appearance of the drug.

23 Q. Okay. But -- so my question is to you: You
24 didn't provide any data to say: If we did this study,
25 maybe the allergy conjunctivitis would go from 5.2% to

1 3.2%, but it went down to 1.4%, and that's why we're
2 surprised.

3 You gave us no baseline data. All you're
4 giving me is your subjective belief that you were
5 surprised, correct?

6 A. Based on the decade of clinical experience,
7 yes.

8 Q. But you didn't give me any baseline data to
9 say: This is what I would have expected based on my 15
10 or so years of clinical work, and this is where it came
11 out to be, correct?

12 A. Well, we have -- we have studies in the
13 literature that we can cite that, you know, document the
14 side effect profile of Brimonidine fairly well.

15 Q. What I'm saying is, you didn't do it. You
16 didn't provide to us anything in your expert report
17 where you said anything but your subjective belief that
18 you were surprised, correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Now, as to unexpected results in general, you
21 recall at your deposition we asked you if you had
22 compared Combigan -- or the claimed invention -- I'm
23 sorry -- if you had compared the claimed invention to
24 the closest prior art.

25 Do you recall that?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Okay. And you, in fact, asked -- you didn't
3 even know what closest prior art meant. Remember that?

4 A. In my deposition?

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. Yeah. It was 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon on
7 Sunday in New York City. It was -- correct. I didn't
8 answer.

9 Q. Well, it wasn't our fault that it was Sunday,
10 right?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Your schedule didn't permit anything else, did
13 it?

14 A. No.

15 Q. So -- but when we asked you, you didn't know
16 what closest prior art meant, right?

17 A. At that time, I couldn't come up with a good
18 answer.

19 Q. And you didn't actually do an analysis of what
20 the closest prior art was, did you?

21 A. I think -- yeah, we took into -- I took into
22 account what existed, yes.

23 Q. I didn't ask you that. I asked you if you put
24 in your report: I did an analysis to determine the
25 closest prior art, and here's what it is.

1 A. I don't think I included that statement.

2 Q. Okay. So you did not come up with what you
3 thought was the closest prior art and do an analysis of
4 that to the claimed invention, correct?

5 A. I don't think I included that statement in my
6 report.

7 Q. Okay. In fact, you compared the claimed
8 invention to several different therapies, right?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. So you didn't pick one and say: This is the
11 one, and I'm going to do the comparison, right?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And now, I want to talk a minute about your
14 long-felt need analysis.

15 The statement in the patent, you would agree
16 with me, that that might have been a little
17 self-serving, recognize a long-felt need?

18 You saw -- your counsel put up a statement and
19 said: Oh, there's a recognized long-felt need. That
20 was in the patent, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. It was a little bit self-serving, wouldn't you
23 say? I mean, the inventors are saying it's a long-felt
24 need, right, for a combination product? Is that what
25 they're saying?

1 A. That's what they said, yes.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. And I agreed.

4 Q. In your report, you say: There was a
5 long-felt need for a fixed combination product for the
6 treatment of glaucoma for many years, and in my opinion,
7 the inventions of the patents-in-suit satisfied a
8 long-felt need in the art.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. So -- but you've acknowledged that
11 there were other fixed combinations on the market prior
12 to that time, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Cosopt?

15 A. Cosopt.

16 Q. You also state in a separate portion of your
17 report that, quote: Indeed given that Combigan and
18 Cosopt are the only fixed combination products on the
19 market in the U.S., that long-felt need still exists.

20 A. I think it partially filled it, yes.

21 Q. But it still exists.

22 A. I think there's a long-felt need in general.
23 I think Combigan certainly solves it for that subset of
24 patients who, you know, take -- the possibility of the
25 taking Timolol and Brimonidine exists, which is not all

1 patients. It's not the entire universe of patients we
2 treat. But it satisfied a need for those patients
3 without a doubt.

4 Q. But it didn't satisfy a long -- I mean, you
5 can't have it both ways. You said it does and it
6 doesn't. So -- you know what I mean? One time you say
7 it does, and one time you say it still exists, right?
8 Let's just take a yes or no to that.

9 A. I think in general terms --

10 Q. Wait. Wait. Can I get a yes or no first?

11 A. I don't understand your question.

12 Q. In one part of your report, you say it solved
13 a long-felt need, right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And in the other part of the report, you say
16 the long-felt need still exists, right?

17 A. I think those are two different long-felt
18 needs.

19 Q. Can I get a yes or no?

20 A. Those statements appear in the report, yes.

21 Q. Right. Exactly. Thank you.

22 Now, when you were doing all those numbers for
23 DeSantis and got up to that 2.6-million-dollar number,
24 one of the things you were talking about was --

25 THE COURT: I don't think he said

1 dollars. Am I confused on what this case is?

2 MR. GOLOB: Did I say dollars?

3 THE COURT: I thought you did.

4 THE WITNESS: Yes, you did.

5 MR. GOLOB: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: I'm used to those kind of
7 numbers being thrown around, but I thought I'd really
8 missed something.

9 MR. GOLOB: Okay. Sorry. I'm used to it
10 being about dollars, too. I've never been in a patent
11 case where somebody says there's 2.6 million
12 possibilities for a combination.

13 THE COURT: Well --

14 Q. (By Mr. Golob) But -- so talking about that
15 slide where you've got 2.6 million possible
16 combinations -- do you recall that slide?

17 A. Yes, I do.

18 MR. GOLOB: Thank you. I was going to
19 thank -- thank you, Savi.

20 Q. (By Mr. Golob) Okay. 2.68, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Okay. One of the -- there's three
23 concentrations each you talk about, right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And you said that that's because the FDA

1 requires you to test in the early stages three different
2 concentrations, right?

3 A. That was the logic we were following, yes.

4 Q. Okay. And how is that relevant to obtaining a
5 patent, the three possible different combinations that
6 you might have to test at the FDA?

7 A. Well, I think it was actually that -- the FDA
8 is thrown in there for -- to give context. I mean,
9 theoretically, I guess -- I mean, I think this number is
10 very conservative, because what you want to do in
11 choosing different com -- you don't want to throw out an
12 active ingredient or a formulation because you
13 underestimated the amount of active ingredient you
14 needed.

15 So it's -- it's basically pointing out that
16 it's standard practice, especially in early phase
17 studies, to do a spectrum, kind of a high, medium, low,
18 to make sure that you don't miss, just because you got
19 the concentration -- the active ingredients were good,
20 but you missed because the concentration was wrong or
21 the formulation was wrong. Maybe you changed something
22 different.

23 Q. So let's try my question. But that has
24 nothing to do with whether you can get a patent on a
25 combination alpha-agonist, beta-blocker, and a

1 preservative, right?

2 A. I think it puts it into the context of what --
3 what information is available.

4 Q. Dr. Noecker, can I get a yes or no?

5 A. I'm sorry.

6 Q. And then if you need to say something --

7 A. I apologize.

8 Q. -- your counsel is going to stand up and
9 get -- give you all the chance you want on redirect.

10 A. I apologize. What was the question?

11 Q. No problem.

12 Whether or not you need to test different
13 concentrations for FDA approval has nothing to do with
14 obtaining a U.S. patent.

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Okay. So you can get a patent on a
17 composition that doesn't get FDA approval. That's what
18 DeSantis shows, right?

19 A. You can get a patent on that, yes.

20 Q. Okay. And, in fact, as we just discussed, the
21 first patent in this case, the '149 patent, issued in
22 2006, right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And it didn't get an FDA approval till 2007,
25 right?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. So they got a patent without getting FDA
3 approval, right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. All right. So one more thing about DeSantis.
6 So I believe earlier in your testimony, you said
7 Brimonidine was a great drug.

8 Do you recall that?

9 A. Great at some things.

10 Q. Okay. And Timolol was the most widely used
11 beta-blocker around at this 2002 timeframe, right,
12 before the patents were filed?

13 A. I think it's still the most prescribed
14 beta-blocker.

15 Q. Right. And the great drug, Brimonidine,
16 you're talking about, we're still talking about in that
17 April 2002 timeframe, right?

18 A. Which Brimonidine? Brimonidine .15%?

19 Q. No. Brimonidine .2%.

20 A. I like .15% better.

21 Q. But you said Brimonidine was a great drug,
22 right?

23 A. Had several favorable attributes.

24 Q. Okay. And BAK was overwhelmingly used in
25 ophthalmics, right?

1 A. I'm not sure about that. In glaucoma
2 medications, maybe --

3 Q. I'm sorry.

4 A. -- but in other -- there's a growing
5 realization that no new products contain BAK.

6 Q. In glaucoma medications, BAK was the
7 overwhelming choice, right?

8 A. I would not say it was the overwhelming
9 choice. I'm saying it was used. I don't think we liked
10 it, but we used it.

11 Q. Okay. It was the most often used? Can we go
12 with that?

13 A. We'll go with that, yes.

14 Q. Okay. So then you see -- you already told me
15 that DeSantis discloses Timolol, right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. And DeSantis, through Timmermans,
18 discloses Brimonidine, right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Okay. And DeSantis discloses BAK, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And DeSantis is a fixed combination ophthalmic
23 drug to treat glaucoma and ocular hypertension, right?

24 A. Are you reading --

25 Q. No. I'm just looking at you and asking you a

1 question.

2 A. It disclosed a fixed combination of
3 Apraclonidine and Timolol, yes.

4 Q. It disclosed a fixed combination of an Alpha-2
5 agonist and a beta-blocker, right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. For treating glaucoma?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Yet you saw nothing in there, right? That's
10 what you said. Nothing. A needle in a haystack, right?

11 A. I said needle in a haystack, yes.

12 MR. GOLOB: I pass the witness, Your
13 Honor.

14 THE COURT: Redirect?

15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. DENNING:

17 Q. Dr. Noecker, would it surprise you if the
18 Alphagan P .15% was approved by the FDA on March 16th,
19 2001?

20 A. No.

21 Q. And counsel for defense said August 2001.
22 Would it surprise you if it was actually March 2001?

23 A. Actually, it makes A lot more sense. I
24 actually should remember that, because other drugs were
25 approved on that date. Now that you jogged my memory,

1 you're correct.

2 Q. Okay. And that was more than a year before
3 the inventors filed for these patents-in-suit, correct?

4 A. That's right.

5 MR. DENNING: No more questions, Your
6 Honor.

7 MR. GOLOB: No redirect, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: You may step down.

9 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Who will be your next
11 witness?

12 MS. BROOKS: Your Honor, with that, the
13 Plaintiffs would rest their rebuttal case.

14 MR. GOLOB: Your Honor, we have JMOLs on
15 quite a few different points, if I could point them out.

16 THE COURT: Are you going to have any
17 surrebuttal?

18 MR. GOLOB: We will. But they have not
19 put up any evidence with respect to Claims 1 through 3.

20 THE COURT: Well, you know, this Court
21 granted a summary judgment as to Claims 1 through 3. I
22 don't think they're relevant at this stage. I think we
23 mooted those, Counsel, at your request. I took them out
24 of the case.

25 MR. GOLOB: I understand that, Your

1 Honor. We DJ'ed them, and just for completeness of the
2 record for appeal, we just wanted to --

3 THE COURT: Well, you can make your
4 motions, but I just want it clear that you took them out
5 of this case as far as this Court's been concerned. At
6 your request, I granted the summary judgment.

7 MR. GOLOB: Okay. Would you like us to
8 wait until the end of all of the evidence?

9 THE COURT: I'm happy for you to do
10 whatever you want to to preserve your record.

11 MR. GOLOB: Okay. So we will make a
12 judgment, notwithstanding the verdict, that Claims 1
13 through 3 of the '149 patent are invalid for
14 anticipation, obviousness, lack of written description,
15 and lack of enablement.

16 We'll also make a JMOL that all of the
17 claims of the remaining patents that are asserted are
18 invalid under both anticipation and obviousness.

19 THE COURT: Denied.

20 I'll see y'all at 3:15.

21 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

22 THE COURT: Be ready to go with your
23 surrebuttal.

24 (Recess.)

25 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

1 THE COURT: Please be seated.

2 All right. Who will be your first
3 witness?

4 MR. DAVIS: Your Honor, before we call
5 our first witness, the attorneys would like to proffer
6 our deposition designations into evidence. We've
7 prepared binders for each party, and we'd like to put
8 those in evidence.

9 THE COURT: All right. Have y'all got it
10 in electronic form so that you can put it in as an
11 exhibit?

12 MR. DAVIS: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Just as the docket --
14 whatever the next docket -- whatever the docket number
15 is in the file, and the Court has got a hard copy as I
16 requested. Thank you.

17 (Witness sworn.)

18 THE COURT: Let's proceed.

19 JOEL W. HAY, Ph.D., DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. MCTIGUE:

22 Q. Good day, Dr. Hay.

23 Would you please introduce yourself to the
24 Court.

25 A. Afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Joel Hay.

1 Q. Dr. Hay, who are you currently employed by?

2 A. Currently employed by the University of
3 Southern California.

4 Q. And what is your job title at USC, Dr. Hay?

5 A. I'm a professor and founding chair of
6 pharmaceutical economics and policy.

7 Q. How long have you been at USC?

8 A. More than 20 years.

9 Q. I'd like to direct you to DTX273 in your
10 notebook. Do you recognize this document?

11 A. Yes. This is the report I prepared for this
12 case.

13 Q. Dr. Hay, can you please just briefly describe
14 your educational background, experience, prior to
15 joining the faculty at USC?

16 A. Yes. I got my bachelor degree from Amherst
17 College in 1974; got a master's degree and Master of
18 Philosophy from Yale University; and then I got my Ph.D.
19 in economics from Yale University in 1980.

20 Q. Doctor, after you finished graduate school,
21 what was the next thing you did in research?

22 A. After graduate school, I became an assistant
23 professor first at the University of Southern California
24 and then at the University of Connecticut Health
25 Sciences Center. And both of those positions, I was

1 working on health economics and pharmaceutical
2 economics.

3 Q. And when did you finish up at the University
4 of Connecticut?

5 A. I believe that was around 1982. At that
6 point, I then moved to Project HOPE Center for Health
7 Affairs --

8 Q. What is that?

9 A. -- in Millwood, Virginia.

10 That's a -- Project HOPE is a global
11 non-profit charity that provides American healthcare
12 services and education to less developed countries
13 around the world and also health policy services.

14 Q. Where did you go after Project HOPE, Dr. Hay?

15 A. After Project HOPE, I went to the Hoover
16 Institution at Stanford University. That's a think tank
17 that looks at a variety of both international and
18 domestic policy issues. I was the health and
19 pharmaceutical economist at Hoover.

20 Q. Is it correct, Dr. Hay, that throughout your
21 career, you have studied economics and economical issues
22 associated with healthcare?

23 A. Healthcare and pharmaceuticals, yes.

24 Q. Do you have any areas of specialty within the
25 field of economics?

1 A. Well, my primary focus is on pharmaceutical
2 economics.

3 Q. What is pharmaceutical economics?

4 A. Pharmaceutical economics is the application of
5 economic theory, principles, methods, and investigation
6 techniques to pharmaceutical markets, pharmaceutical
7 industry, pharmaceutical R&D, intellectual property, the
8 value of different pharmaceutical products.

9 Q. Are there any areas of particular interest for
10 you in your research?

11 A. Well, I certainly, along with that, look at
12 issues of outcomes research, econometrics, quality of
13 life evidence, health policy, evidence-based medicine,
14 but it's all generally in the rubric of pharmaceutical
15 economics.

16 Q. Doctor, have you published peer-review
17 articles in these areas?

18 A. Absolutely. I've published over 300 scientist
19 abstracts, posters, and presentations and over 150
20 peer-reviewed scientific publications in the scientific
21 literature on these topics.

22 Q. Are you an editor of any of these
23 peer-reviewed journals?

24 A. I was founding editor and chief of Value in
25 Health, The Journal of the International Society of

1 Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research.

2 Q. That's a mouthful. I'm going to call it
3 pharmaceutical economics. It's the same thing, right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Have you ever worked in the private sector or
6 as a consultant on pharmaceutical economics?

7 A. Yes, I have. I've worked for a number of
8 different government agencies, federal, state, local.
9 I've worked for international agencies. I've worked for
10 non-profits.

11 I've done consulting in the pharmaceutical
12 industry for most of the big pharmaceutical companies.
13 And I've done legal expert consulting, again, for
14 pharmaceutical companies, both generic and brand name.

15 Q. Doctor, have you ever testified in a patent
16 case as an expert on the topic of commercial success or
17 a pharmaceutical product in general?

18 A. Yes. I've testified in federal court in two
19 commercial success patent cases for pharmaceutical
20 products. In one case, I testified for the plaintiffs;
21 in the other case, I testified for the defendants.

22 Q. Have you ever been disqualified as an expert
23 in the area of commercial success?

24 A. No.

25 MR. MCTIGUE: Your Honor, Defendants

1 present Professor Joel Hay as an expert in the field of
2 pharmaceutical economics, including the analysis of
3 secondary indicia of non-obviousness, such as commercial
4 success.

5 THE COURT: Allow him to testify
6 according to the disclosures of his expert report filed
7 in this case.

8 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Dr. Hay, what is your opinion
9 as to whether or not Combigan is a commercial success?

10 A. My opinion is that Combigan is not and hasn't
11 been a commercial success. The clear weight of the
12 evidence shows that it's not a commercial success.

13 In addition, I see no nexus between any
14 indicators of commercial success shown for Combigan and
15 the claims of the patents-in-suit.

16 Q. Dr. Hay, did you review any reports from the
17 other experts retained in this matter?

18 A. Yes. I reviewed the reports of Dr. Noecker
19 and Dr. Tanna.

20 Q. As part of your analysis, did you review the
21 patents-in-suit?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And other than the patents-in-suit and the
24 various expert reports, what Allergan documents did you
25 review in forming your opinions?

1 A. I reviewed a number of Allergan documents. I
2 looked at business plans, marketing research, market
3 documents, financial documents, a number of different
4 Allergan documents.

5 Q. Doctor, were you in the courtroom this morning
6 when Mr. LeCause testified?

7 A. Yes, I was.

8 MR. MCTIGUE: Savi, would you please put
9 up the gross sales slide that Mr. LeCause testified to
10 today?

11 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Doctor, this is a
12 demonstrative slide counsel used in their opening, and
13 obviously, they switched it today to make an adjustment
14 to -- I know you have some issue with your color, but
15 there is a green line, and they adjusted that, so it's
16 no longer trending down; it's almost flat.

17 But other than with that representation to
18 you, this is the gross sales slide that was used this
19 morning.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Dr. Hay, does this indicate commercial success
22 to you?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Why not?

25 A. This -- this chart only has these two lines,

1 gross sales and marketing spend, and there's some very
2 important things that are missing from this chart.

3 Q. Do you agree in using gross sales in the
4 commercial success analysis for Combigan?

5 A. Absolutely not. If you want to determine
6 commercial success, you have to look at what kinds of
7 rebates, discounts, coupons, and charge-backs are
8 included to get those gross sales.

9 Q. Dr. Hay, did Mr. LeCause take into account
10 these rebates, coupons, and/or price discounts for
11 Combigan in his determination this morning?

12 A. No.

13 Q. How does this affect your analysis?

14 A. It definitely would change the slopes, change
15 these lines.

16 Q. Did you prepare any demonstrative slides in
17 response to this demonstrative slide?

18 A. Yes, I did.

19 MR. MCTIGUE: Please bring up Hay 1.

20 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Now, we have put the --
21 again, the blue line and the green line. The blue line
22 here represents gross sales, correct, Doctor?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And the green line with that one
25 representation that it's now trending flat is what

1 Plaintiffs used this morning.

2 Did you add anything to this, Doctor?

3 A. Yes, I did. Using the data from that
4 financial P&L, profit and loss, document that
5 Mr. LeCause looked at this morning, I added in the net
6 sales and the sum of all marketing and discounts.

7 I extended it out through 2011, because there
8 was also data for the first quarter and -- and so I just
9 did a simple straight extrapolation of that.

10 Q. So if I understand, this red line is a
11 combination of what Mr. LeCause looked at, which used to
12 be the green line, and what you've determined is the
13 rebates, discounts, coupons, or charge-backs, correct?

14 A. Right. It's the sum of the marketing
15 expenditures and all the rebates and discounts.

16 Q. And then the blue line, which I'll submit to
17 you is the second line, what is that again?

18 A. That's now the net sales. And as you can see,
19 the net sales that flattened out as of 2011 are actually
20 starting to decline.

21 Q. Professor, this goes to the end of 2011.
22 We're not at the end of 2011, so how did you do your
23 analysis?

24 A. Well, even the first quarter of 2011 shows a
25 decline in annualized sales for 2011. And so that's how

1 I compute it. I just annualize the first quarter of
2 2011.

3 The important thing to look at in this slide,
4 though, is that the gap between net and gross sales
5 continues to widen from time period to time period.
6 And, in fact, if you just look at even the first quarter
7 of 2011, there's a 50 percent increase in rebates and
8 discounts in that one time period.

9 So we're seeing really all of the increase in
10 gross sales being accounted for by increased discounts,
11 rebates, and coupons.

12 Q. Dr. Hay, what's the source of the information
13 for the graph that you've created here?

14 A. Well, as I said, this is from that profit and
15 loss financial statement, and I've got some concerns
16 about that data. It's -- it's not audited. There are a
17 lot of discrepancies in that data.

18 There are a lot of entries, which I'm not sure
19 what exactly they mean, but this was what I had to work
20 with, in terms of -- of looking at net sales and -- and
21 rebates.

22 Q. Did you do any analysis on your own, outside
23 of Plaintiff's profit and loss statement, to render your
24 opinion, Dr. Hay?

25 A. Well, I certainly looked at a number of other

1 data sources. In particular, I looked at the IMS data.

2 Q. What is IMS data?

3 A. IMS Health is a major third-party data
4 collection service for the pharmaceutical industry.
5 They collect information on pharmaceutical sales,
6 pharmaceutical prescriptions, marketing expenses, detail
7 expenses, journal advertising, contacts, free samples,
8 all of the things that go into marketing and promotion.
9 And it's widely used by the industry, because they want
10 to keep track of how effective their marketing efforts
11 are.

12 Q. And so did you utilize this IMS data to do any
13 comparisons yourself?

14 A. Yes, I did.

15 Q. Okay.

16 MR. MCTIGUE: Okay. Could you bring up
17 Hay 2, please.

18 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Doctor, if you could orient
19 myself and the Court to what we're looking at here,
20 please.

21 A. Okay. So this is IMS Health data, which we
22 could only get back to 1998, for the entire class of
23 drugs in the glaucoma IOP category. And these are all
24 the drugs that have been launched in the last 15 years
25 still on the market. And so there's one drug that's --

1 that's off of here, because it was withdrawn from the
2 market.

3 But basically what this shows is that if you
4 adjust for time from launch -- and you sort of have to
5 do that, because Combigan is, I think, about the most
6 recent drug launched into this market -- you can see
7 that from year of launch forward, Combigan is that
8 lowest line down in the bottom. I think that's a gold
9 color.

10 It's performed the worst in terms of any of
11 these drugs, in terms of garnering market share over
12 time. So that by year four from launch, it's way below
13 any of these other drugs.

14 Q. Doctor, if you included another drug within
15 this -- the one that you said wasn't on the market
16 anymore, would it change your opinion?

17 A. No. That would be just another drug that
18 didn't do well.

19 Q. Dr. Hay, these four years are not the same
20 four years, are they?

21 A. No, no. For example, Xalatan, which is way up
22 there on the top, I believe was launched somewhere
23 around 1996. And that's why I only had two years of
24 data on it, because my set only goes back to 1998.

25 But you can see that one did extremely well,

1 in terms of garnering market share in the first four
2 years.

3 Q. Well, I want to talk about the relevant market
4 and why, for instance, you included Xalatan.

5 Dr. Hay, why did you select these products?

6 A. Well, I read the expert report of Dr. Noecker,
7 and I couldn't find any definition of the relevant
8 market in -- in that expert report. Nothing from the
9 other side gave me a definition of the -- of what the
10 relevant market is. So I didn't have anything
11 specifically to rebut in terms of a relevant market.

12 So to decide what are the appropriate
13 comparators, which is what an economist does -- this is
14 what economists in this area specialize in, is defining
15 what is in the relevant market -- we look at what drugs
16 are reasonable substitutes for each other.

17 And all the evidence that I could see in this
18 case suggested that all of these drugs and maybe other
19 things belonged in the relevant market. For example,
20 maybe even laser treatments, maybe even surgery, maybe
21 even some other types of interventions might belong in
22 the relevant market.

23 So I -- I didn't define the outer limits of
24 the market, but it was pretty clear from what I saw in
25 this case that all of these drugs are in the relevant

1 market.

2 Q. Doctor, just -- again, what is the source of
3 the data in this chart?

4 A. The source of this data is IMS Health sales
5 revenue -- gross sales revenue, as reported for each of
6 these drugs going back over time. And it's adjusting
7 for the fact that the market is actually changing over
8 time. The market, I think, is growing over time.

9 So we're not trying to penalize Combigan
10 because it was a bigger market; we're saying, out of all
11 the drugs available at each point in time from time of
12 launch, what percentage of the market did each of these
13 drugs get.

14 Q. Doctor, there's been talk of monotherapy,
15 concomitant therapy. What, if any, consideration did
16 you give to initial monotherapy medications as being in
17 the relevant market?

18 A. Well, I heard Mr. LeCause this morning, as
19 well as his deposition testimony, indicate that Combigan
20 is sometimes used as initial therapy. Certainly I've
21 seen nothing to suggest that Allergan wasn't concerned
22 about initial therapies, as well as adjunctive and
23 combination therapies.

24 And so -- in fact, they don't even break out
25 their sales for Combigan by initial versus second line

1 versus third line, nor do they do that for any of the
2 other products. So I think it's reasonable to conclude
3 that all of these drugs are in the relevant market.

4 Q. So if all the IOP lowering agents are in the
5 relevant market for Combigan, what does this do to
6 Combigan's share?

7 A. Well, what it says is that by 2010, Combigan's
8 share was only about 5.4 percent of the entire market.

9 Q. Professor Hay, did you consider any other
10 assertions by Allergan's marketing executives in
11 determining the relevant market?

12 A. Yeah. I saw the testimony of Mr. Bogard,
13 who's a senior director of global marketing research for
14 Allergan, and he stated that Combigan is a -- definitely
15 a small share of the glaucoma market.

16 Q. Okay. I want to switch gears from what the
17 market is to what are some of the metrics you used.

18 Doctor, first explain to us, what does the
19 term cumulative revenue mean to you?

20 A. Cumulative revenue would be the dollar sales
21 that a product garners year on year on year. So, for
22 example, if in the first year they sold a hundred
23 dollars worth, second year \$200 worth, third year \$300
24 worth, then the cumulative revenue over three years
25 would be \$600.

1 Q. Okay. Now that we know what it is, why is it
2 relevant to your analysis?

3 A. Well, again, it's a measure of how rapidly a
4 product is able to garner sales, and obviously, faster
5 is better.

6 Q. Did you prepare a table on your analysis of
7 the cumulative revenue of Combigan?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay.

10 MR. MCTIGUE: Please pull up Hay 3.

11 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Again, Dr. Hay, if you could
12 orient us to the table.

13 A. Okay. So here, as I did with the previous
14 slide, I tried to keep things on a level playing field
15 by taking every drug from the year of launch, not to
16 penalize Combigan, and you can see that, nevertheless,
17 by five years out of launch -- and this, again, is
18 annualizing the Q12011 data -- Combigan, which is the
19 third line down -- but these are the alphabetic, so that
20 doesn't mean it's No. 3 -- is actually the worst
21 performing of all of these drugs by year five from the
22 year of launch.

23 For example, Xalatan by year five had achieved
24 \$900 million plus in cumulative revenue.

25 Alphagan P, by year five from launch, had

1 achieved \$865 million dollars.

2 Combigan, which performed the worst, had only
3 achieved about \$350 million by year of launch.

4 Q. Doctor, Combigan launched in late 2007,
5 correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So at least for year one, what did that do to
8 Combigan's revenues?

9 A. Well, it kept those revenues somewhat small,
10 because it launched in October of '07. But even if you
11 look at -- at Combigan compared to the other drugs in
12 year four, it doesn't do as well as the -- as any of the
13 other ones.

14 Q. You said Combigan was one of the more recent
15 launches, correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did you adjust for inflation in this chart?

18 A. No. And if I had adjusted for inflation,
19 Combigan would look even worse, because most of these
20 drugs, like Xalatan, Alphagan P, Cosopt, et cetera,
21 launched much earlier, and so the numbers would actually
22 be much larger for them.

23 Q. Did Allergan's expert or the testimony you
24 heard today indicate that Allergan examined cumulative
25 revenue for any of their glaucoma medications for

1 purposes of their Combigan commercial success analysis?

2 A. I didn't see any evidence that Allergan's
3 expert or -- or any of the testimony of the Allergan
4 people, like Mr. LeCause, even considered the
5 performance of Combigan in terms of sales, or anything
6 else for that matter, relative to any of these other IOP
7 drugs.

8 Q. Okay. We've talked a little bit about
9 financial performance. I'm going to switch gears with
10 you, and I want to talk about the second part of your
11 analysis.

12 Beyond your opinion that Combigan has not been
13 a commercially successful product in the glaucoma
14 market, do you have any opinion on whether the sales of
15 Combigan are driven by factors other than the claimed
16 invention?

17 A. Yeah. I think the evidence that I've seen
18 overwhelmingly suggests that the sales of Combigan are
19 driven by marketing, discounting, rebates, coupons, the
20 kinds of things we saw in those two lines that I added
21 to the initial chart there.

22 Q. What are some of the materials that you
23 reviewed to determine that aspect of your commercial
24 success analysis?

25 A. Well, again, IMS provides information that

1 allows you to look at marketing expenditures and other
2 things. They don't allow you to look at discounts and
3 rebates. So for that, I had to use this same profit and
4 loss financial statement that we've already talked about
5 a couple times.

6 Q. And did you prepare a slide on this analysis?

7 A. Yes.

8 MR. MCTIGUE: Can we bring up Hay 4,
9 please?

10 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Dr. Hay, I think this is a
11 chart on marketing and promotional expenditures. It
12 is -- got a lot of numbers on it. So if you could
13 explain for the Court what this chart is telling us.

14 A. Yeah. Okay. Well, this is only part of the
15 chart, and there's a lot of other numbers on here, which
16 I had problems with as well.

17 But in any case, if you take this chart at
18 face value, what Allergan says internally is that
19 cumulatively over the 2007 to 2010 period, they were
20 spending 35 percent of their gross sales on marketing,
21 even more, their net sales.

22 Q. So if I understand you correctly, this is out
23 of Allergan's profit and loss statement as they've
24 asserted to us, correct?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And you just bifurcated it and shortened it
2 down in your expert report, right?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Okay. So what numbers on this chart are
5 yours, and what numbers are Allergan?

6 A. All the numbers are Allergan's except for the
7 bottom row, where I computed the percentage of gross
8 sales, which is represented by the sum of all of the
9 marketing and promotion expenses, for example, the 5099,
10 the 5041, and the 5299.

11 Q. So cutting to the chase, this 35 percent
12 number, what does that number represent, Doctor?

13 A. What that says is that for every dollar of
14 gross sales, 35 cents was spent on marketing and
15 promotion --

16 Q. And did you --

17 A. -- not to mention the discount.

18 Q. And did you analyze that 35 percent relative
19 to the market?

20 A. Yeah. I looked at IMS data, which also only
21 has gross sales. So that's why I couldn't compare to
22 net sales for the IMS data.

23 But for gross sales on the IMS data, I looked
24 at the entire pharmaceutical industry. And what they
25 show is that on average, a branded pharmaceutical

1 company only spends about 6 percent of its gross sales
2 on marketing and promotion.

3 So what we're seeing here is that Combigan
4 spent five or six times as much as the average brand
5 name pharmaceutical.

6 Q. Doctor, I want to turn to share of voice.
7 Can you tell us what a share-of-voice analysis is in a
8 commercial success setting?

9 A. Yeah. Share of voice is, out of all the money
10 that's spent for a certain therapeutic category, in this
11 case, glaucoma medications, all the money that's spent
12 by all the drugs in that class on marketing and
13 promotion, what percentage of that was spent by a
14 specific product, in this case, Combigan.

15 Q. Did Mr. LeCause or Allergan's expert analyze
16 whether any of Combigan's sales were driven by share of
17 voice?

18 A. No. They didn't even look at marketing
19 expenditures or share of voice.

20 Q. Did you?

21 A. Yeah. What I found was that in --
22 cumulatively through 2010, Combigan spent 11.5 percent
23 of the \$1.4 billion spent on marketing and promotion for
24 this class. They had more than 10 percent of that.
25 They had 11.5 percent, and they only garnered 3.2

1 percent of the market over that same period.

2 Q. Did you prepare a table on your analysis,
3 Professor Hay?

4 A. Yes, I did.

5 MR. MCTIGUE: Can you bring up Hay 5 for
6 me. Thank you.

7 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Again, this is out of your
8 expert report, is it not?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. Could you orient the Court and myself
11 to this chart.

12 A. Yeah. This looks at year four post launch,
13 which is the only complete year that we have for
14 Combigan, and what it shows is the cumulative marketing
15 spend for all of these drugs alphabetically is the ones
16 that are brands that have been launched in the last 15
17 years.

18 And what you can see in the first column is
19 the cumulative amount of money they spent on marketing.

20 What you can see in year four is how much of
21 the market they've gained, they've garnered through that
22 marketing spending.

23 And in the last column, what you can see is
24 how effective their marketing is in converting people to
25 buy their product. So it shows how many millions of

1 dollars each of these products had to spend to get
2 1 percent of the market share.

3 So what you can see is that Combigan is by far
4 the worst of any of these products. They had to spend
5 \$24 million for each 1 percent share of the market,
6 whereas you look at the one right above them, Alphagan
7 P, they only had to spend \$3.4 million for each 1
8 percent share of the market.

9 Cosopt, the one right below them, they only
10 had to spend \$4.8 million for each 1 percent share of
11 the market.

12 So -- and all of the rest of them had to spend
13 a lot less than Combigan did for each 1 percent share of
14 the market.

15 Q. And so based on this analysis, Professor, does
16 Combigan's 24.02 million per share point tell you
17 anything about the nexus with the claims of the
18 patent-in-suit?

19 A. It tells me that they're -- that what's
20 driving sales here is marketing. They can't convert
21 people to -- to buy this product, except by spending an
22 inordinate amount of money on marketing and promotion.

23 Q. Doctor, I want to turn to profit now.

24 Did you hear Mr. LeCause say this morning that
25 Combigan was profitable?

1 A. Yeah -- well, he said it had a positive net
2 income.

3 Q. Do you have an opinion about whether Combigan
4 has a positive net income?

5 A. Yeah. I don't think it does.

6 Q. Why not?

7 A. For several reasons. But in particular, I --
8 I looked at the same document that Mr. LeCause looked
9 at. That was the only one I had.

10 MR. MCTIGUE: Could we bring up PTX136,
11 please?

12 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Dr. Hay, do you have any
13 particular concerns with PTX136 that you'd like to share
14 with the Court?

15 A. Yeah. I think I have a lot of concerns with
16 this document. I think, if we look at very last
17 column -- or we can look at this one right here. We can
18 stay right where we are -- they're claiming that they're
19 selling a lot of Combigan in '07 through 2010, and yet
20 there's no distribution or freight charges.

21 They're getting to distribute this for free?
22 I don't know how you distribute a drug for free. And
23 yet every year the distribution cost is zero. So that's
24 a big problem.

25 Q. Is that just one example?

1 A. That's one example of many.

2 In addition to that, where do they get the
3 marketing numbers in this chart, the marketing costs in
4 this -- they just roll a ratio of Allergan's entire eye
5 care market, 19.4 percent. That seems to be pulled out
6 of a hat. It's not based on any rigorous auditable
7 estimate of the cost of marketing Combigan.

8 G&A, that's just rolled out at 2 percent of
9 sales, which makes no sense. And if you look at the
10 last column, everything is zero for 10 years, 1996
11 through 2006, except what they call R&D.

12 Now, this morning it was unclear to me, based
13 on Mr. LeCause's testimony, what is thrown into R&D. He
14 seemed to say, well, all that's marketing back in '06.
15 That's part of R&D, which doesn't make any sense.

16 Legal, back in '06 through 1996, that's all
17 part of R&D which, again, I find a little perplexing.

18 Q. Doctor -- Doctor, if expenses are tied to a
19 percentage of sales --

20 A. Uh-huh.

21 Q. -- and Combigan hasn't been launched yet,
22 would this chart show any expenses for sales?

23 A. No, not if there's simple percentage of sales.
24 That's why I find it perplexing. I don't think it's a
25 realistic assessment of the actual marketing costs,

1 certainly prior to launch of the product.

2 And then another big problem with this P&L
3 sheet is, if you look at net income before taxes --

4 Q. Where is that, Doctor?

5 A. That's down there at the bottom. That's one
6 of the things that Mr. LeCause talked a lot about, the
7 last --

8 Q. Then I'll let the record reflect that's 70,065
9 or 70 million, correct?

10 A. Yes. Over the cumulative time period, that's
11 7 -- \$70 million, a little bit more than that. And what
12 you see is that before income tax, the numbers identical
13 to after income tax.

14 So they're claiming it's a profitable product,
15 and yet they're not paying any income tax on it. They
16 must have strange ways of doing their tax filing.

17 Q. Did you prepare any analysis of those lines
18 from Allergan's profit and loss statement, Professor
19 Hay?

20 A. Yes, I did.

21 MR. MCTIGUE: Please bring up Hay 7 now.

22 No. Hay 7.

23 VIDEO TECH: Hay 7?

24 MR. MCTIGUE: Table 4 of his report.

25 THE WITNESS: Probably the next page.

1 MR. MCTIGUE: There we go. Sorry about
2 that.

3 Q. (By Mr. McTigue) Now, Professor, the net
4 income after taxes that's the top line, is that your
5 line, or is that Allergan's?

6 A. That's taken right out of the P&L chart that
7 we were just looking at. Every -- all of those numbers
8 are right out of that chart.

9 Q. Okay. And the source here is the P&L chart,
10 correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. But the bottom line, is that out of Allergan's
13 chart, or have you done some analysis on that?

14 A. No. What I did was adjust the numbers in the
15 top line for the fact that you have to deal with the
16 cost of capital.

17 Q. What is cost of the capital?

18 A. Well, it's time discounting that -- that any
19 finance person does, any economist does. And what it
20 basically says is that a dollar in the future -- a risky
21 dollar in the future is not worth as much as a certain
22 dollar today.

23 And so you have to adjust for that using a
24 discount factor, which is standard in the industry as
25 weighted average cost of capital.

1 Q. Doctor, the profit and loss statement had a
2 51-million-dollar charge for clinical trials, and it was
3 in a bucket from 1996 to 2006. How did you account for
4 that \$51 million?

5 A. Well, clearly, not all \$51 million in the R&D
6 costs, if that's what they were, occurred in 2006.
7 We've already heard testimony that they were doing
8 clinical trials, you know, in 2000, probably in the
9 1900s as well. And so some of that 51 million is -- in
10 fact, I would guess probably most of it goes back much
11 earlier.

12 So I simply averaged it over the prior 10
13 years in that column and then did a simple time discount
14 adjustment, and instead of 51 million, it's actually
15 \$170.761 million.

16 Q. And not going into your WACC analysis, but,
17 Professor, ultimately, what did you come to as the net
18 income adjusted by WACC for 2011?

19 A. If you just do that simple WACC adjustment,
20 the 53-million-dollar net income that Mr. LeCause
21 presented is, in fact, a 52-million-dollar net loss.

22 Q. If there was a 52-million-dollar net loss or
23 maybe a carryforward loss, Allergan wouldn't be paying
24 any income taxes on it, correct?

25 A. That would be one explanation for why they're

1 not paying taxes.

2 MR. MCTIGUE: I pass the witness, Your
3 Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Cross-examination.

5 MR. SHEAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 My name is Chad Shear, and I'm an
7 attorney with Fish & Richardson representing the
8 Plaintiff.

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. SHEAR:

11 Q. Dr. Hay, good afternoon.

12 A. Good afternoon.

13 Q. I'd like to start where you began with the
14 demonstrative that you put up where you added the
15 additional lines to the -- to the demonstrative that
16 Mr. LeCause had this morning.

17 Do you remember that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And the first four years on that
20 demonstrative, that was actual data, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Thank you very much.

23 A. It was data from the P&L statement.

24 Q. Sure. Okay.

25 And -- and the numbers that you have for 2011,

1 those are your -- those are estimated numbers, right?

2 A. Taken from the 2011 Q1 data annualized.

3 Q. Okay. And you estimated that at the end of
4 2011, the sales would be 140 million for Combigan?

5 A. I believe so, yeah. The gross sales?

6 Q. Yes.

7 A. Something like that.

8 Q. And did you -- did you hear -- you were in the
9 courtroom today when Mr. LeCause testified; is that
10 right?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And did you hear Mr. LeCause say that
13 internally within Allergan, they're projecting the sales
14 for 2011 to be 155 million?

15 A. I don't specifically recall that, no.

16 Q. But if Mr. LeCause is right, and those numbers
17 are correct, then your graph is wrong; is that right?

18 A. Well, it depends on what the discounts are to
19 get to the hundred. Maybe they're discounting even more
20 than they did in the first quarter.

21 Q. But you'd agree 155 million is higher than the
22 140 that you estimated here.

23 A. Right. And the discounts could be even
24 higher.

25 Q. Okay. Now, Dr. Hay, I think -- I think I

1 heard you testify that you had some trouble
2 understanding Allergan's P&L; is that right?

3 A. There were a lot of perplexing entries in that
4 table, yes.

5 Q. Okay. And -- and in light of the fact that
6 you had some troubles understanding Allergan's P&L, you
7 still feel comfortable offering the opinion today in
8 Court that Combigan was not a commercial success?

9 A. Well, in the totality of everything I've
10 looked at, that was just one set of information I looked
11 at. I looked at a number of other things and --

12 THE COURT: Why don't we answer the
13 question he asked you. He didn't ask you what else you
14 looked at. I'm not going to put up with it, Dr. Hay.
15 You've testified too many times in too many courts, and
16 you answer the question on cross that he asked you, and
17 don't start giving me a lecture.

18 We got that clear?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

20 THE COURT: Good.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. (By Mr. Shear) Now, Dr. Hay, I'd like to talk
23 about your experience a minute, if you don't mind. And
24 I want to make sure I get it right. I think you said
25 that your title -- you're the professor of

1 pharmaceutical economics and policy; is that correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And -- and so I -- is it fair, then, that --
4 that you -- is it -- start over. Let me see if we can
5 get this comprehensible.

6 You've spent a lot of years studying the
7 pharmaceutical industry, right?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And -- and from that work and your work in the
10 Hatch-Waxman cases that you've been involved with, you
11 understand that drug development is an expensive
12 process, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. There's a lot of costs associated with
15 developing a product.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. There's research and development expenses,
18 right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. There's the cost of Phase 1 clinical trials.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. There's the cost of Phase 2 clinical trials.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. There's the cost of Phase 3 clinical trials.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And then there's the expense of FDA approval.

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And -- and it's all a risky proposition.

4 You're not guaranteed it's going to work, right?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. And the reward for an innovator like Allergan

7 is, in the end, they might get a patent out of it,

8 right?

9 A. That's the business model, yes.

10 Q. Okay. And that patent gives them a -- a

11 period of exclusivity in which they can try to recoup

12 everything they have just spent bringing that drug to

13 market, right?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And, Dr. Hay, you would agree with me, that

16 it's our patent system that has allowed the creation of

17 more new drugs and more new biomedical innovations in

18 this country than any other country in the history of

19 the world.

20 A. Yes, that's true.

21 Q. Now, Dr. Hay, I don't remember. Were you in

22 the courtroom for opening statements?

23 A. No, I wasn't.

24 Q. Okay. So you didn't hear -- counsel for the

25 Defendants said that -- that Combigan was the worst

1 performing brand name glaucoma medication launched in
2 the last 15 years.

3 A. No, I didn't.

4 Q. Well, Dr. Hay, you are aware, though, that
5 represented over here next to me are four of the largest
6 generic drug companies in the world, right?

7 A. I don't know that specifically.

8 Q. But you are aware they're all here.

9 A. I don't -- I don't keep track of generic
10 companies, to be honest. I don't know which ones are
11 big and which ones aren't. Sorry.

12 Q. That's -- that's fair enough. But you would
13 agree with me that there are four generic drug companies
14 represented over here vying for the right to sell a copy
15 of a drug which you say is a commercial failure.

16 A. That's correct.

17 MR. SHEAR: No further questions, Your
18 Honor.

19 THE COURT: Redirect?

20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. McTIGUE:

22 Q. Quickly, Dr. Hay.

23 Counsel mentioned the cost of FDA approval can
24 be high, right?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. Was there anything in Allergan's profit and
2 loss statement that reflected regulatory costs for FDA
3 approval?

4 A. Not that I can see.

5 Q. And there are four generics. Is the model for
6 generics different than the business model for a branded
7 pharmaceutical company?

8 A. Absolutely not. Just because a product is or
9 is not profitable for a brand name company has nothing
10 to do with whether or not it's profitable for generics.
11 They -- they're different business models. As we said,
12 the brand name companies engage in certain kinds of
13 clinical trials and certain kinds of other marketing
14 activity that generics don't have to do.

15 For example, generics have mandatory
16 substitution laws in the United States, so they don't
17 have to do marketing.

18 So the fact that a product is commercially
19 successful or is not commercially successful for a brand
20 product says nothing about whether it could be
21 commercially successful for generic companies.

22 Q. Thank you.

23 MR. MCTIGUE: No further questions.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MR. SHEAR: No questions.

1 THE COURT: You may step down, Dr. Hay.

2 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 MR. RUZICH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

4 We call -- Defense calls Dr. Laskar.

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 MR. RUZICH: And good afternoon, Your
7 Honor. Rich Ruzich again for Sandoz and the rest of the
8 Defendants.

9 THE COURT: He's still under oath. You
10 might put that on the record.

11 Doctor, you understand you're still under
12 oath.

13 THE WITNESS: I do.

14 THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed.

15 MR. RUZICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 PAUL A. LASKAR, Ph.D., DEFENDANTS' WITNESS,

17 PREVIOUSLY SWORN

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. RUZICH:

20 Q. Dr. Laskar, you heard Dr. Noecker admit that
21 he is not a formulator, correct?

22 A. Yes, I heard that.

23 Q. And are Dr. Noecker's opinions in keeping with
24 his admission that he is not a formulator?

25 A. Yes, I believe that to be the case.

1 Q. Dr. Laskar, how many expert formulators have
2 testified during this trial?

3 A. I've been present throughout the week, and to
4 my -- up until now, only myself.

5 Q. And have you ever testified in court before?

6 A. No, I have not.

7 Q. Okay. Dr. Laskar, Dr. Noecker testified that
8 he was surprised that you, as an expert formulator of
9 more than 30 years, would believe that Brimonidine would
10 be your sole choice as the alpha-2 agonist in
11 formulating a fixed combination glaucoma product
12 containing an alpha-2 agonist as of 2002.

13 Do you recall Dr. Noecker's statement to that
14 effect?

15 A. Yes, I do.

16 Q. And what's your reaction?

17 A. I'm surprised that he would make that
18 observation.

19 MR. RUZICH: Can we pull up AGX112,
20 please?

21 Q. (By Mr. Ruzich) Now, Dr. Noecker repeated that
22 DeSantis disclosed hundreds of thousands, as a matter of
23 fact, millions of different possible combinations of a
24 glaucoma containing an Alpha-2 agonist.

25 Do you recall that right here (indicates)?

1 A. Yes, I certainly do.

2 Q. Now, Dr. Laskar, would a person of ordinary
3 skill in the art, in formulating a fixed combination
4 glaucoma drug with an Alpha-2 agonist, be reading
5 DeSantis as disclosing so many combinations?

6 A. A person of skill in the art would -- upon
7 reading DeSantis, immediately would envision that that
8 list is truncated to a very narrow list of both
9 alpha-agonists and certainly beta-blockers.

10 Q. Okay. And so this whole analogy about this
11 needle in a haystack really comes down to a strand -- a
12 single strand of straw in the eyes of a person of
13 ordinary skill in the art?

14 A. Absolutely, with a big flag on it.

15 Q. Let's turn now to beta-blockers and DeSantis.
16 Dr. Noecker testified that DeSantis disclosed more than
17 50 beta-blockers, correct?

18 A. Yes. According to this, 56.

19 Q. Okay. Now, Dr. Laskar, would a person of
20 ordinary skill in the art, in formulating a fixed combo
21 of glaucoma drug -- of a glaucoma drug with an alpha-2
22 agonist, have any hesitation whatsoever with choosing
23 Timolol as its beta-blocker, along with Brimonidine,
24 after reading DeSantis?

25 A. Absolutely not. Even if one, as sometimes

1 people do, skips the title and goes to the body of
2 the -- of the patent, even reading the list of those --
3 that 56 beta-blockers, there's only a small set that
4 have any history of use in the eye for the control of
5 ocular hypertension.

6 And if they would then merely look at the
7 title, then that small number becomes one, Timolol.
8 They read the claim, it becomes one, Timolol.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. And by virtue of the fact that Timolol, as
11 being most prevalently prescribed, would identify
12 Timolol Maleate as a form of Timolol to be used in
13 formation -- formulation -- excuse me -- of a fixed
14 combination of an alpha-2 agonist and Timolol.

15 Q. To wrap up, Dr. Laskar, did anything that Dr.
16 Noecker testified about, as well as Mr. LeCause
17 testified about, have any way or any impact as to your
18 opinion that the '463 and the '258 patents are rendered
19 invalid and obvious?

20 A. No, not at all. I maintain everything that I
21 testified to yesterday.

22 Q. And any impact on your opinion that the '258
23 and '463 patents are invalid as anticipated?

24 A. No. My opinions stand as discussed yesterday.

25 Q. Thank you, Dr. Laskar.

1 MR. RUZICH: I pass the witness, Your
2 Honor.

3 THE COURT: Cross?

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 BY MS. BROOKS:

6 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Laskar.

7 A. Good afternoon, Ms. Brooks.

8 Q. I just have a few questions for you.

9 Disclosed for you today, although Counsel
10 didn't use it, was a piece -- or a page from
11 Remington's. You're familiar with Remington's, are you
12 not?

13 A. Yes, absolutely.

14 Q. Certainly as a formulator, you are; is that
15 right, sir?

16 A. Yes. Yes.

17 MS. BROOKS: And if we could pull up,
18 please, DTX -- let's see if I can find the exhibit
19 number on it -- you know, fortunately, my copy of
20 Remington's does not have the exhibit number, so I'm
21 just going to put this on the ELMO.

22 Q. (By Ms. Brooks) Attached to your exhibit
23 report as Exhibit A, Dr. Laskar, was this page from
24 Remington's regarding salt formation; is that right?

25 A. Yes, it was. I recognize Table 2, yes.

1 Q. And, in fact, you only had two exhibits
2 attached to your reply expert report that was in
3 response to Dr. Noecker's report, correct?

4 A. I believe my reply report was both to
5 Dr. Noecker and Dr. Stella.

6 Q. Dr. Stella, that's right. And one of the
7 things in one of the two exhibits attached was this page
8 from Remington's talking about salt formation; is that
9 right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And you've agreed that Brimonidine is
12 Brimonidine Tartrate, correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Timolol is Timolol Maleate; is that correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And those are two different salts, are they
17 not?

18 A. Yes, absolutely.

19 Q. And you agree, would you not, with the
20 statement in Remington's that salt-forming agents are
21 often chosen empirically by the pharmaceutical chemist
22 primarily on the basis of the cost of raw materials, the
23 ease of recrystallization, and the percentage yield?

24 Would you agree with that statement?

25 A. I believe that statement is somewhat dated

1 in -- in light of current medicinal chemistry practices.

2 Q. Would you agree with the next sentence,
3 however? Unfortunately, there is no reliable way of
4 predicting the influence of a particular salt species on
5 the behavior of the parent compound in dosage forms.

6 A. I would agree with that, yes.

7 Q. And that still applies to this day; is that
8 correct?

9 A. Yes. I'm not qualifying that statement
10 whatsoever.

11 Q. And you would agree that when you make a
12 combination product where you put them together in one
13 bottle, in this particular case, you would then be
14 putting together two different salts into an aqueous
15 solution, correct?

16 A. If the salt forms were, in fact, different,
17 then yes.

18 Q. And you would also agree, would you not, that
19 when one combines certain salt forms in an aqueous
20 solution -- strike that -- two salt forms in an aqueous
21 solution, there can be what's called a salt exchange,
22 correct?

23 A. Yes, strictly speaking. I -- I would modify
24 that by saying, so long as those two salts remain
25 soluble, then they basically exist as separate ions that

1 each float as a cloud with the negative ions surrounding
2 the positive, or vice versa.

3 Q. You can't predict how that -- what's going to
4 happen when you put those two salts together in an
5 aqueous solution until you actually do so, correct?

6 A. For the most part, you're correct, yes.

7 Q. And now Combigan, there's Brimonidine in
8 Combigan, correct?

9 A. Yes, there is.

10 Q. And the Brimonidine, there are nitrogen atoms
11 which are secondary amines in the Brimonidine; is that
12 right?

13 A. Yes, as there is in Timolol.

14 Q. And you would agree that they could act as
15 what are called nucleophiles capable of attacking
16 electron-poor or electrophilic sites, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And now the Timolol has carbon nitrogen double
19 bonds, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And these carbon nitrogen double bonds could
22 be susceptible to nucleophilic addition, couldn't they?

23 A. Yes, they could be.

24 Q. And, therefore, they could react with the
25 nucleophilic amine group of Brimonidine, correct?

1 A. Yes, they could.

2 Q. And, of course, that wouldn't happen if they
3 were kept in two separate bottles; is that right?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Now, if we go back to DeSantis -- I don't want
6 to reinvent the wheel, but the last time you were on the
7 stand, you agreed that the only formulation that is
8 listed in DeSantis at Column 6, the example, is a
9 formulation for containing Betaxolol; is that right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And you are aware, are you not, sir, that
12 there have been studies on the effect of Betaxolol as it
13 relates to the lowering of intraocular pressure?

14 A. I'm aware of it as a beta-blocker used in the
15 amelioration of glaucoma and ocular hypertension, yes.

16 Q. And now, Betaxolol is a different mechanism
17 than Timolol, correct?

18 A. It is a somewhat more selective beta --
19 beta-blocker, yes.

20 Q. Exactly. In fact, it's a cardioselective
21 beta-blocker, preferentially inhibiting the beta-1
22 adrenoreceptors, correct?

23 A. I don't have that text in front of me, but I
24 would believe that you're reading correctly.

25 Q. Whereas Timolol is not a selective

1 beta-blocker, is it?

2 A. That is correct, yes.

3 Q. And one of skill in the art would know that
4 Timolol could cause brachycardia, arrhythmia, and even
5 congestive heart failure by blocking beta-1
6 adrenoreceptors of the heart, correct?

7 A. Yes. That is known about Timolol.

8 Q. And the Timolol is contraindicated in patients
9 with pulmonary disease as inhibition of beta-2 receptors
10 in the bronchi and bronchials results in contraction of
11 smooth muscle of the bronchial tree from unopposed
12 parasympathetic activity leading to bronchospasm in
13 respiratory obstruction, correct?

14 A. I don't know from what you're reading and --
15 but, yes, as a non-selective beta-blocker and
16 understanding the impact of a beta -- beta-antagonist on
17 the respiratory tree, that sounds correct.

18 Q. And, in fact, Timolol also crosses the blood
19 brain barrier and blocks serotonin receptors in the
20 central nervous system and may cause depression,
21 weakness, fatigue, memory loss, decreased libido, and
22 impotence, correct?

23 A. If you're -- I trust that the reference that
24 you're reading from is a reliable one.

25 Q. And, in fact, because Timolol is a

1 non-selected beta-blocker, it should be used with
2 caution in patients with diabetes mellitus, correct?

3 A. Yes, if that's what the text says.

4 Q. And, in fact, there have been several reports
5 demonstrating that the use of these non-selected
6 beta-blockers, like Timolol, may negatively impact the
7 patient's quality of life by causing exercise
8 intolerance, sexual dysfunction, and respiratory
9 difficulty, correct?

10 A. I trust that the -- the reference you're
11 reading.

12 Q. Whereas Betaxolol, the only beta-blocker
13 disclosed in a formulation in DeSantis, doesn't suffer
14 from these problems, does it?

15 A. That I -- I'm not a pharmacologist. I'm not a
16 physician. And so I would -- I would not position
17 myself to make a judgment about that.

18 Q. So you would have difficulty opining as one of
19 the skill in the art whether one of skill in the art
20 would look at DeSantis and knowing that Betaxolol
21 doesn't have these same negative characteristics as
22 Timolol would choose Betaxolol in their formulation.
23 You're not able to tell us that one way or another; is
24 that right, Dr. Laskar?

25 A. What I can say is that the DeSantis patent

1 explicitly identifies Timolol in the title, explicitly
2 identifies Timolol in the claim. And for that reason,
3 it leads one skilled in the art to identify Timolol as a
4 first candidate in the formulation of a fixed
5 combination of an Alpha-2 agonist and a beta-blocker.

6 Q. I'm sorry. Are you finished with your answer.
7 I didn't want to cut you off.

8 A. I'm done. Thank you.

9 Q. My question, sir, was you aren't able to tell
10 us whether one of skill in the art would look at
11 DeSantis and go immediately to Betaxolol rather than
12 Timolol, because Betaxolol doesn't have the negative
13 side effects that Timolol does.

14 You're not able to tell us that one way or
15 another; is that correct sir?

16 A. No. As I understand the question that you
17 asked, no.

18 Q. You -- the answer is, no, you're not able to
19 tell us that? Is that correct, sir?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. But even in DeSantis, we're warned away from
22 Timolol, aren't we?

23 A. Again, I don't have the text of that patent in
24 front of me at the moment to be able to -- and I can
25 assure you I have not memorized any of the

1 patents-in-suit nor DeSantis.

2 MS. BROOKS: Well, then let's pull up
3 DeSantis, DTX123, and specifically, Mr. Exline, at the
4 bottom of Column 1.

5 Q. (By Ms. Brooks) DeSantis teaches one of -- one
6 of skill in the art at the very bottom of Column 1, at
7 least one beta-blocker, Timolol, has increasingly become
8 associated with serious pulmonary side effects
9 attributable to its effect on beta-2 receptors in
10 pulmonary tissue.

11 Is that correct, Dr. Laskar?

12 A. Yes, I'm reading that. Thank you.

13 Q. And that is the only negative comment about
14 any beta-blocker that you can find in DeSantis; is that
15 correct?

16 A. In the absence of reading to the next column,
17 I'll trust that -- you have reviewed it more carefully,
18 more recently than I.

19 Q. Thank you, sir.

20 MS. BROOKS: Pass the witness, Your
21 Honor.

22 THE COURT: Redirect?

23 MR. RUZICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 Can we pull up DTX145 and 6. Again,
25 DTX145 to Figure 1.

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. RUZICH:

3 Q. Do you see Brimonidine and Apraclonidine in
4 this figure, Dr. Laskar?

5 A. Yes, I do.

6 Q. And can you locate the secondary amine that
7 counsel suggested would be attacked by Timolol?

8 A. I see that there are what can be considered
9 secondary amine in the five-member hexacycle.

10 Q. Okay. Does Apraclonidine have this exact same
11 secondary amine?

12 A. Absolutely. That entire -- that substructure
13 is common in Clonidine, Apraclonidine as well as
14 Brimonidine.

15 Q. Does DeSantis claim Apraclonidine with
16 Timolol?

17 A. It does.

18 Q. What would a person expect about the ability
19 to combine Brimonidine and Timolol in light of DeSantis?

20 A. In light of DeSantis, those are identified. I
21 would mention that as a formulator, it is part of the
22 normal routine, normal testing in evaluating a
23 formulation to place those two materials together, and
24 to experimentally verify any predispositions or -- or
25 suggested interactions that other literature might --

1 might propose could happen, might happen, may happen.
2 And it is uncertain about the certainty -- redundant.
3 One is not certain that that reaction will, in fact,
4 occur until one puts those materials together.

5 Q. Great. Does that complete your answer?

6 A. But you have to start somewhere.

7 Q. Thank you, Dr. Laskar.

8 MR. RUZICH: No further questions, Your
9 Honor.

10 MS. BROOKS: No further questions, Your
11 Honor.

12 THE COURT: All right. You may step
13 down.

14 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

15 THE COURT: Any other witness?

16 MR. BENSON: Defendants call Dr. Tanna.

17 THE COURT: Dr. Tanna, you understand
18 you're still under oath.

19 Okay. Let's proceed.

20 MR. LEE: May I approach, Your Honor?

21 MR. BENSON: May I approach the witness,
22 Your Honor?

23 THE COURT: Yes. The Court has a
24 commitment. We're going to quit today precisely at
25 5:00 o'clock.

1 MR. BENSON: The binder looks worse than
2 it is.

3 THE COURT: I don't know what it means.
4 I'm just telling you.

5 MR. BENSON: Okay. Thank you.
6 May I proceed?

7 THE COURT: Please do.

8 ANGELO P. TANNA, M.D., DEFENDANTS' WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY

9 SWORN

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. BENSON:

12 Q. Welcome back, Dr. Tanna.

13 A. Thank you, Mr. Benson.

14 Q. Dr. Tanna, do you understand as part of an
15 obviousness analysis, you are required to consider
16 secondary considerations that may have been raised by
17 Plaintiff?

18 A. Yes, I'm aware of that.

19 Q. Okay. And do you understand -- first, were
20 you present in the courtroom when Dr. Noecker testified
21 earlier today?

22 A. Yes, for all but two minutes.

23 Q. Okay. And do you understand Dr. Noecker
24 testified about unexpected results and long-felt needs,
25 which are secondary considerations?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Now, in view of Dr. Noecker's testimony, has
3 your opinion about the validity of the claims of the
4 '149 and '976 patent changed?

5 A. No, it has not.

6 Q. Okay. I'd like to start with the unexpected
7 results.

8 Could you give me the legal standard you
9 applied in analyzing unexpected results?

10 A. I compared the claimed inventions with the
11 closest prior art.

12 Q. Okay. Did Dr. Noecker, in your opinion,
13 provide a definition of the closest prior art?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Did -- in your opinion, did Dr. Noecker
16 provide any analysis about the closest prior art?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Now, in your opinion, did Dr. Noecker compare
19 the fixed combination products, which is an embodiment
20 of the patents, to the closest prior art?

21 A. No.

22 Q. All right. What is your opinion as to what is
23 the closest prior art with respect to these claims?

24 A. I believe DeSantis discloses the closest prior
25 art, and I believe the closest prior art is effectively

1 the claimed invention itself.

2 Q. So in the event the Court finds that the
3 DeSantis reference does not anticipate the claims at
4 issue, do you have an opinion as to what the closest
5 prior art would then be?

6 A. Yes. In that case, my opinion would be that
7 the closest prior art is the concomitant serial
8 administration of Brimonidine twice a day at 0.2% and
9 Timolol twice a day at a concentration of 0.5%.

10 Q. Why do you believe that that is the closest
11 prior art with respect to the claims of this invention?

12 A. Because the number of differences between the
13 claimed invention and what I just described as the
14 closest prior art is the smallest. That comparator,
15 what I just described as the closest prior art, BID/BID
16 concomitant administration, possesses the smallest
17 number of differences compared to the claimed invention.

18 Q. And why is it important that it possesses the
19 smallest number of difference, if one is interested in
20 examining certain properties of the composition?

21 A. Because as you add more and more differences
22 between the claimed invention and your comparator, it
23 becomes increasingly likely the differences that might
24 be observed could be attributable to those additional
25 changes in your comparator.

1 Q. Okay. Now, what did Dr. Noecker compare the
2 fixed combination to in his analysis?

3 A. I heard three comparisons. I heard a
4 comparison of the fixed combination twice a day to
5 Brimonidine administered serially with Timolol
6 concomitantly with the Brimonidine being administered
7 three times a day, and Timolol being administered two
8 times a day. That was one.

9 Another comparator was Brimonidine monotherapy
10 three times a day at the 0.2% concentration.

11 And the third comparison I heard was only with
12 respect to one side effect, which was ocular allergy.
13 And that was with Brimonidine dosed twice-per-day
14 monotherapy.

15 Q. Now, were any of those comparisons to the
16 closest prior art as you've identified it?

17 A. No.

18 Q. And just for clarity for the remainder of your
19 direct, if I'm referring to the closest prior art, I'm
20 referring to the BID/BID concomitant administration you
21 described, okay?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. All right. Now, Dr. Tanna, did you compare
24 the fixed combination to the closest prior art as you
25 have defined it?

1 A. Yes, I have.

2 Q. I'll direct you to DTX217, please. Please let
3 me know when you get there.

4 MR. BENSON: Savi, if I could have
5 Page -- I believe it's Page 5, which is a little more
6 clear to see what -- what this particular reference is.

7 THE WITNESS: Well, I'm afraid I don't
8 have 217.

9 MR. BENSON: You know, it might be hiding
10 under your 216 tab.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes, I found it.

12 MR. BENSON: I had the same problem.

13 Q. (By Mr. Benson) Could you please identify this
14 document for me?

15 A. Yes. This is the clinical study report of the
16 507T study conducted by Allergan.

17 Q. And what is being compared in the -- in this
18 particular study?

19 A. It's a clinical trial that compares the BID
20 administration of the fixed combination with what we've
21 just defined as the closest prior art, the BID/BID
22 administration concomitantly.

23 Q. Okay. Let's go to Page 14 and, again, as we
24 did yesterday, I'm using the numbers on the bottom
25 left-hand corner.

1 A. Yes.

2 MR. BENSON: And if I could get the table
3 blown up.

4 Q. (By Mr. Benson) Can you describe for me what
5 we're looking at?

6 A. Yes. We're looking at a table that describes
7 the incidents of the side effects that were observed in
8 the clinical trial. These weren't absolutely all of the
9 side effects, but these were the ones that occurred with
10 an incidence of greater than 1%.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. And it's broken into two groups. The
13 incidents in the combination group, the fixed
14 combination, that is, and the incidents in the BID/BID
15 concomitant therapy group.

16 Q. So the combination is the fixed combination
17 and the adjunctive, is that the closest prior art as
18 you've defined it?

19 A. Yes, BID/BID concomitant administration.

20 Q. Okay. I'm going to identify those second --
21 or those side effects Dr. Noecker suggests are relevant
22 to unexpected results.

23 And those would be oral dryness, somnolence --
24 or somnolence, allergic conjunctivitis, conjunctival
25 folliculosis, and foreign body sensation.

1 Now, with respect to these side effects, could
2 you please describe for me the differences between the
3 fixed combination and the closest prior art?

4 A. Yes. There are some numerical differences,
5 but there are no statistically significant differences.
6 And in most cases, when there is a numerical difference,
7 the incidence of side effects was actually a little bit
8 higher with the fixed combination.

9 Q. Okay. Now, with respect to allergic
10 conjunctivitis, what specifically does the 19T study
11 show us?

12 A. The 19T study shows us -- and that was a
13 comparison between the fixed combination and Brimonidine
14 administered three times a day and Timolol administered
15 twice a day.

16 Q. I'm sorry. I think I made a mistake. I
17 meant this study which is --

18 THE COURT: 19T, I promise you.

19 Q. (By Mr. Benson) The 507T study, the study
20 that's in front of you in this particular study --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- could you please tell me specifically with
23 respect to allergic conjunctivitis?

24 A. Could you just repeat the question in its
25 entirety, please?

1 Q. I don't know if I even remember the question,
2 but I will try.

3 I just wanted to identify allergic
4 conjunctivitis. And could you just let me know what the
5 differences were between the fixed combination and the
6 closest prior art?

7 A. There is no statistically significant
8 difference, which is what really counts in a study like
9 this.

10 Q. Thank you.

11 With respect to these other side effects that
12 haven't been identified, are there any other -- relevant
13 differences between the two treatment groups?

14 A. There is no statistically significant
15 difference in any of these side effects in this table.

16 Q. Okay. Now, Dr. Noecker showed us a number
17 of -- of clinical research reports during his unexpected
18 results analysis.

19 Did he identify this particular study?

20 A. No, I don't believe so.

21 Q. Now, Dr. Noecker testified about systemic side
22 effects.

23 How do systemic side effects come about with a
24 topical eyedrop?

25 A. When you apply an eyedrop on the surface of

1 the eye, some proportion of that medicine gets into the
2 tear drainage system. And the tear drainage system
3 carries the medicine into the nose and into the mouth.
4 And along the way, those structures are surrounded by
5 capillaries so the molecules of the medication can enter
6 the bloodstream. And, in fact, the levels can get
7 pretty high, because the medicine doesn't go through the
8 liver first as it would if you were to take it as a
9 pill, for example.

10 Q. Now, have you seen any evidence about the --
11 well, let me ask you a different question first.

12 What would a person of ordinary skill in the
13 art expect the blood plasma concentration of Brimonidine
14 to be in a TID-dose monotherapy as compared to a
15 BID-dose monotherapy?

16 A. With Brimonidine monotherapy, BID versus TID,
17 one would just naturally expect that the blood
18 concentration of the serum or the plasma concentration
19 would be higher with the three-times-a-day dosing.
20 Because you're applying more drug to the surface of the
21 eye, there is more opportunity for the medicine to get
22 into the bloodstream. So you'd expect a higher
23 concentration in the blood.

24 Q. Have you seen any evidence in Allergan's
25 clinical research studies to support this idea that the

1 blood plasma concentration is higher in the TID-dose
2 than the BID-dose Brimonidine?

3 A. I have. In the 12T and 13T clinical trials,
4 pharmacokinetic studies were done in which the blood
5 plasma levels were actually measured. And in those
6 studies, there were three groups.

7 One group of patients received the fixed
8 combination twice a day, and another group received the
9 monotherapy of Brimonidine three times a day. So in
10 comparing those two, as expected, there was a higher
11 concentration in the subjects who were getting the
12 Brimonidine three times a day. And it was about 25
13 percent higher.

14 MR. BENSON: Savi, if you could pull up
15 DTX211 at 8.

16 Q. (By Mr. Benson) And rather than having you
17 thumb through the expensive document --

18 A. Thank you.

19 Q. -- we'll just go there.

20 MR. BENSON: And if you could, please,
21 blow up the pharmacokinetics portion.

22 Q. (By Mr. Benson) Is this the information you
23 were referring to?

24 A. Yes, it is.

25 In the second paragraph, it specifically says

1 Brimonidine concentrations were 24 percent lower in the
2 combination group than in the monotherapy group at week
3 2.

4 And here they're referring specifically to the
5 Brimonidine three-times-a-day monotherapy group. And
6 that difference is statistically significant.

7 And then it goes on to say that at some other
8 timepoint, it wasn't statistically significant, and at
9 one other, it was. So it kind of goes back and forth.

10 Q. And is the disclosure in the 13T study
11 similar?

12 A. It is very similar.

13 Q. And just for the record, that would be DTX212
14 at 8.

15 Have you confirmed that?

16 A. I have. I have looked at that.

17 Q. Okay. Would a person of ordinary skill in the
18 art expect the incidents -- the incidents of systemic
19 side effects to be greater with the TID Brimonidine
20 monotherapy as compared to the BID monotherapy in view
21 of the higher blood plasma concentrations?

22 A. Yes, but, again, now you just mentioned the
23 BID monotherapy. So that would be a logical step away
24 from 12T and 13T, which looked at BID fixed combination
25 therapy.

1 Q. I'm sorry. I must have misspoke. I meant --
2 I meant the fixed combination product.

3 So same question, but would a person of
4 ordinary skill in the art, in view of the blood plasma
5 concentration information you reviewed, expect higher
6 incidences of side effects with the TID monotherapy as
7 compared to the fixed combination BID treatment?

8 A. Yes. That would naturally follow, given what
9 we know about the dosing all by itself. And it would
10 also naturally follow, given now what we know about the
11 blood plasma concentrations.

12 Q. So did you ever see -- did Dr. Noecker ever
13 compare the fixed combination to a Brimonidine treatment
14 regime, either monotherapy or concomitant, wherein the
15 Brimonidine was dosed twice a day?

16 A. Not with respect to systemic side effects,
17 but, yes, with respect to local allergic conjunctivitis.

18 Q. Okay. So just with respect to that one side
19 effect, correct?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. Okay. Now, would a person of ordinary skill
22 in the art also expect the concentration of the drug to
23 affect ocular side effects?

24 A. Yes. The more drug you deliver to the surface
25 of the eye, the more likely you would observe ocular

1 local side effects.

2 Q. Now, with respect to all ocular side effects
3 Dr. Noecker testified about, with the exception of
4 allergic conjunctivitis, did he ever compare the fixed
5 combination to a Brimonidine treatment regime wherein
6 the Brimonidine was being administered twice a day?

7 A. No, he did not.

8 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not
9 the ocular side effects -- and, again, we'll put aside
10 for the allergic conjunctivitis for a moment -- but the
11 other ocular side effects Dr. Noecker testified about,
12 do you think the results, comparing the fixed
13 combination to the -- to the various treatment regimes
14 he compared, were surprising?

15 A. No, they were not surprising.

16 Q. Okay. So let's return to the -- the allergy.
17 And can I direct you to PTX91 in your binder,
18 please.

19 I hope it's in your binder. Actually, it is
20 not in your binder. I have it here, though.

21 MR. BENSON: Your Honor, may I approach
22 the witness?

23 THE COURT: Yes.

24 Q. (By Mr. Benson) Dr. Tanna, do you recall
25 Dr. Noecker testifying about this -- this publication?

1 A. Yes, I do.

2 Q. Can you tell me a little bit about this
3 publication?

4 A. It is a -- the result was a retrospective
5 chart review that was conducted that compared the
6 allergy rates among patients who were receiving
7 twice-a-day Brimonidine 0.2% monotherapy versus patients
8 who were receiving twice-a-day Combigan.

9 Q. Now, yesterday when you were testifying, you
10 testified about DTX144, which was a retrospective chart
11 review done by first author, Stewart.

12 Do you recall that?

13 A. Yes, I do.

14 Q. And do you recall Dr. Noecker testifying about
15 that document today?

16 A. Yes, I do.

17 Q. And what did Dr. Noecker say about the
18 retrospective study conducted in DTX144?

19 A. He correctly stated that the results of the
20 study like that are less reliable, because the
21 methodology is not as strong as, for example, a
22 prospectively conducted clinical trial.

23 Q. And was that your opinion as well?

24 A. Yes, it was.

25 Q. Were you using DTX144 for the purpose of

1 examining the results of that study?

2 A. No.

3 Q. And what were you using it for?

4 A. Just to demonstrate that in that chart review,
5 BID -- excuse me -- BID Brimonidine use was being done
6 in the real world in combination with beta-blockers.

7 Q. Okay. So with respect to PTX91 that you have
8 in front of you, do you -- do you agree with Dr. Noecker
9 that the type of study done in this -- in this reference
10 is also unreliable?

11 A. I agree it's weaker evidence.

12 Q. Okay. Well, be that as it may, why don't we
13 go to Page -- third page, so Page 3. And at this time,
14 the PTX numbers are on the lower right.

15 MR. BENSON: And I'd like to highlight
16 the chart at the very top.

17 Q. (By Mr. Benson) And do you recall Dr. Noecker
18 testifying about this?

19 A. Yes, I do.

20 Q. Now, if a person of ordinary skill in the art
21 or any skilled practitioner were to compare two
22 different treatment regimes, wherein each regime
23 contained Brimonidine, approximately how long would it
24 take before a difference in allergic side effects could
25 be detected between those two drugs?

1 A. My opinion is that about three months the
2 difference would be apparent, and if you had a large
3 enough study, which I considered the 507T to be a large
4 clinical trial, by the way, that you would be able to
5 detect the difference at that point.

6 That doesn't mean that everybody who is going
7 to develop an allergy will have declared themselves by
8 then, but at that point, I would expect enough of a
9 difference that someone would be able to make such a
10 determination.

11 Q. So what does the reference Dr. Noecker was
12 relying on indicate with respect to the two treatment
13 regimes here at the three-month time period?

14 A. It indicates that the incidence of allergy is
15 significantly higher by 18 months in the Brimonidine BID
16 monotherapy group compared to Combigan BID.

17 Q. Now, again, with respect to the 507T study you
18 told us earlier that when you compared Brimonidine or
19 the fixed combination to the closest prior art, at three
20 months, there was no statistically significant
21 difference in allergic conjunctivitis, correct?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not
24 any masking ability of Timolol to kind of improve the
25 allergic conjunctivitis rate was already present in the

1 prior art BID/BID concomitant therapy regime?

2 A. Yes, I think it was already present in the
3 closest prior art, BID/BID concomitant therapy. And I
4 think that you know that, because, first of all, in the
5 507T study, the allergy incidence was similar.

6 And not only that, but when you compare 507T
7 with other studies, you see that the allergy incidents
8 in both groups was lower than had been seen in other
9 well-done studies.

10 Q. Let's -- all right. Let's -- let's talk about
11 the IOP-lowering ability of the fixed combination as
12 compared to the closest prior art.

13 Was the IOP-lowering ability of the fixed
14 combination in comparison to the -- made in the 507T
15 study with respect to the closest prior art?

16 A. Yes, it was.

17 Q. And what was the result?

18 A. The result was that there was no significant
19 difference in pressure-lowering efficacy between fixed
20 combination BID and concomitant BID/BID therapy.

21 Q. Now, were the results of those studies ever
22 published?

23 A. Yes, they were published in 2005 in an article
24 that was written by Goni, G-O-N-I.

25 Q. And I'll direct you to DTX023.

1 And, Dr. Tanna, just to be clear, because
2 you're not representing that this reference is prior
3 art, correct?

4 A. This is not prior art.

5 Q. Okay. And is -- this is the study that --
6 that compares the fixed combination to the closest prior
7 art, correct?

8 A. Right. It's the peer-reviewed publication
9 that arises from the 507T Allergan clinical trial.

10 Q. Now, did Dr. Noecker refer to this -- this --
11 well, let me set up some foundation.

12 Did you review Dr. Noecker's expert report
13 that was submitted in this litigation?

14 A. I did.

15 Q. And that -- was that report of Dr. Noecker
16 submitted in response to your own invalidity opinions?

17 A. Yes, it was.

18 Q. And did Dr. Noecker cite the Goni article?

19 A. I don't believe so.

20 Q. Did Dr. -- or did Dr. Noecker cite the 507T
21 study --

22 A. No, he did not.

23 Q. -- in that report?

24 And did Dr. Noecker talk about either the 507T
25 study or the Goni reference in giving his testimony

1 today?

2 A. I don't believe he did.

3 Q. Do you believe that Dr. Noecker was aware of
4 the Goni reference when he submitted his expert report?

5 A. He must have been. I know he has cited this
6 in some of his own papers.

7 Q. I'll direct you to DTX282.

8 All right. If I could -- is this the
9 reference that you are referring to?

10 A. I'm still getting to it.

11 It is, yes.

12 Q. Now, can I direct you to Page 8, and there is
13 a paragraph on the right-hand column called
14 Brimonidine/Timolol fixed combination. And I'll take
15 you to the very last sentence in this -- in this
16 reference.

17 And what does Dr. Noecker say here about the
18 fixed combination as compared to the closest prior art?

19 A. Both treatments were well-tolerated with no
20 difference in adverse events between groups.

21 Q. Do you recall Dr. Noecker talking about the
22 afternoon trough associated with BID Brimonidine
23 monotherapy?

24 A. Yes, I do.

25 Q. I'd like to direct you to -- do you recall

1 testifying about the 19T study yesterday?

2 A. I do.

3 Q. Okay. I'll direct you to that, which is
4 DTX213, and in particular Page 6.

5 MR. BENSON: And I want the very last
6 paragraph on the bottom of this inserted table.

7 Q. (By Mr. Benson) And you can -- can you tell me
8 what's being described here?

9 A. It's basically a disclosure that at the 28-day
10 mark, there was no statistically significant difference
11 in mean IOP value between the combination and the
12 concurrent groups at all timepoints, except hour 8 where
13 the concurrent group had a lower mean IOP than the
14 combination group.

15 And what they mean there is that concomitant
16 therapy, TID/BID, resulted in better pressure lowering
17 than the fixed combination at the hour 8 afternoon
18 timepoint. That's the key timepoint where you see a
19 difference between Brimonidine monotherapy TID and
20 Brimonidine monotherapy TID.

21 So this is where you would go to, to look for
22 a difference, if you were going to compare the fixed
23 combination to TID/BID monotherapy. It's the key
24 comparator.

25 Q. Okay. And is this the basis of your opinion

1 that the fixed combination is not as effective as
2 TID/BID concomitant therapy?

3 A. Yes, it is.

4 Q. And is this the very same trough coming up
5 again that Dr. Noecker was talking about?

6 A. It's the same timepoint, same trough, yes.

7 Q. Okay. And this is with respect to the fixed
8 combination, correct?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. And is this what a person of ordinary skill in
11 the art in early 2002 could have reasonably expected?

12 A. I think one could reasonably expect this, yes.

13 Q. Now, do you recall Dr. Noecker testifying
14 about PTX77?

15 MR. BENSON: I'm going to have to put
16 this on the ELMO, because I don't have a copy, unless we
17 can get Mr. Exline to put that up.

18 That's fine. We can do it this way.

19 Q. (By Mr. Benson) This is PTX77, and Dr. Noecker
20 testified about this today.

21 MR. BENSON: And I can't seem to figure
22 out what I'm doing here. Sooner or later, I will figure
23 it out or not.

24 All right. I just can't get it on there.

25 Q. (By Mr. Benson) Okay. Now, can you describe

1 for me what we're seeing here?

2 A. I would -- I think this is the Sherwood paper;
3 is that correct?

4 Q. That's correct.

5 A. Okay. So the Sherwood paper compares the
6 fixed combination -- you'll have to remind me of the
7 comparison here.

8 It's the fixed combination twice a day versus
9 Brimonidine monotherapy three times a day and Timolol
10 monotherapy twice per day.

11 Q. Now, do you recall Dr. Noecker testifying
12 about the unexpected nature of these results?

13 A. I do.

14 Q. Do you agree with that?

15 A. I don't think it's unexpected. I think it's
16 pretty much exactly what you would expect, based on
17 previous experience with BID/TID comparisons of
18 Brimonidine monotherapy, based on what one of ordinary
19 skill would know about Timolol.

20 Q. When you say -- when you say reasonably
21 expect, do you mean that the person would expect those
22 exact numbers?

23 A. No, that's not at all what I mean.

24 Whenever you make any kind of a comparison
25 to -- to anticipate or to determine what you would

1 expect the results to be -- for example, the claimed
2 invention -- basically, the previous experience just
3 gets you into the ballpark. You don't expect to nail
4 it.

5 For example, I heard some use of the Cosopt
6 experience to try to make a determination of what would
7 happen with the fixed combination Combigan. And I think
8 that you're doing an apples-to-oranges comparison, so
9 you'd expect to get into the right ballpark, but that's
10 about it.

11 Q. Okay. Dr. Noecker also testified about
12 long-felt need. Do you feel Combigan satisfied a
13 long-felt need?

14 A. I don't think so, no.

15 Q. Why not?

16 A. Well, I think there is a place for fixed
17 combination agents. There's no question about that.

18 But when you have the possibility of serial
19 administration of the fixed combinations, that, I think,
20 eliminates the strong phrase, long-felt need.

21 I think that also, since we have other fixed
22 combination agents available and we had them prior to
23 the claimed invention, that also diminished the need for
24 another fixed combination.

25 So, for example, if at the time of the claimed

1 invention, a patient was on, let's say, Cosopt, which
2 was readily available in the United States and
3 elsewhere, or Xalacom, which was available in Europe and
4 elsewhere, those patients would not be able to
5 potentially benefit from Combigan, because they're
6 already on Timolol in their fixed combination agent that
7 they're on.

8 So there's no room for helping that patient
9 with this new claimed invention.

10 Q. Now, considering your own opinions that you've
11 expressed in Court and all of the evidence that you've
12 heard throughout this proceeding and also all the
13 evidence that you've read and in particular Dr.
14 Noecker's testimony about unexpected results and
15 long-felt need, what is your opinion regarding the
16 obviousness of claims of the '149 and the '976 patent?

17 A. My opinion stands, that they are obvious in
18 view of the prior art.

19 MR. BENSON: I'll pass the witness, Your
20 Honor.

21 THE COURT: Court's in recess until
22 9:00 a.m.

23 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

24 (Court adjourned.)
25

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

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability.

/s/ _____
SUSAN SIMMONS, CSR
Official Court Reporter
State of Texas No.: 267
Expiration Date: 12/31/12

Date

/s/ _____
SHELLY HOLMES
Deputy Official Court Reporter
State of Texas No.: 7804
Expiration Date: 12/31/12

Date