

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS VIII, LLC**

Petitioner,

v.

**THE TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Patent Owner

---

**Case: IPR2015-01836**

**Patent No. 7,932,268**

---

**DECLARATION OF DR. S. DAVID KIMBALL, PH.D.**

PENN EX. 2025  
CEAD v. PENN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary of Opinions.....	1
II. Materials Considered.....	3
III. Qualifications.....	3
IV. The Patents-at-Issue.....	8
A. The '268 Patent .....	8
1. Overview .....	8
2. Existing Claims .....	8
3. Proposed Claim Amendment .....	10
B. The '135 Patent .....	12
1. Overview .....	12
2. Existing Claims .....	12
3. Proposed Claim Amendment .....	16
V. Legal Principles.....	19
A. Patent Validity .....	20
B. The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	20
C. Obviousness.....	22
VI. Opinions.....	23
A. Tutorial .....	23
1. The chemical structure of a drug molecule determines its biological performance. ....	24
2. MTP inhibitors are clinically efficacious compounds with significant toxicological issues.....	41
B. Obviousness.....	43
1. Dr. Mayersohn's analysis does not account for chemical structure.....	45
2. The prior art provides no credible motivation for a POSA to choose lomitapide over any other MTP inhibitor. ....	59
3. A POSA would not have a reasonable expectation of success in applying the same dosing regimen to both implitapide and lomitapide.....	66
4. Proposed Claim Amendment .....	69

VII. Conclusion .....70  
VIII. Prior Expert Testimony .....71  
IX. Compensation .....71

1. I, S. David Kimball, have been retained to testify on behalf of Patent Owner the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania (“Penn”) in this proceeding as an expert in medicinal chemistry.

## **I. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS**

2. I am aware that Petitioner Coalition for Affordable Drugs VIII, LLC (“CFAD”) has sought to challenge the validity of U.S. Patents Nos. 7,932,268 (“the ’268 patent”) and 8,618,135 (“the ’135 patent”) (collectively, the “patents-at-issue”) in separate Inter Partes Review (“IPR”) proceedings before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. I am also aware that PTAB has instituted IPR proceedings with respect to each of the patents-at-issue.

3. I am aware that although Penn is the sole assignee and owner of the patents-at-issue, the patent is currently licensed to Aegerion Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Aegerion”). I am also aware that, according to the terms of this license, Aegerion currently markets the drug compound lomitapide in the United States under the trade name JUXTAPID®.

4. I have been retained to address the assertions in the Declaration of Michael Mayersohn, Ph.D. (CFAD Ex. 1003, “Mayersohn Dec.”) and the Declaration of Randall J. Zusman, M.D. (CFAD Ex. 1002, “Zusman Dec.”)

regarding the alleged invalidity of the patents-at-issue. In my Declaration, I will provide my opinion regarding how the chemical structure of a drug compound can impact its biological performance and clinical use. It is my opinion that the patents-at-issue are not invalid for obviousness because (1) there are significant chemical differences between lomitapide, implitapide, and other contemporary MTP inhibitors; (2) there is no motivation in the prior art for a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically select lomitapide for development over other MTP inhibitors; and (3) a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have a reasonable expectation of success dosing lomitapide in the same manner as proposed for implitapide in “Bayer/PPD Implitapide Development Follows Zetia Model”, The Pink Sheet, Vol. 66, No. 7, p. 17 (2004) (CFAD Ex. 1013, “Pink Sheet 2004”) and/or Evan Stein, “Microsomal Triglyceride Transfer Protein (MTP) Inhibitor (implitapide) program”, Presentation Given at PPD’s Analyst Day (February 5, 2004) (CFAD Ex. 1014, “Stein”).

5. Additionally, I have been asked to address the non-obviousness of certain proposed claims that I understand Penn has submitted with its Motion to Amend in this proceeding to claim priority to Provisional U.S. Patent Application No. 60/550,915 (“the ’915 Provisional”). As explained in further detail below, and

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.