

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  
IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

- - -

VANDA PHARMACEUTICALS INC., ) Civil Action  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
ROXANE LABORATORIES, INC., )  
)  
Defendant. ) No. 14-757-GMS

- - -

Wilmington, Delaware  
Monday, February 29, 2016  
9:00 a.m.  
Trial Day 1

BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY M. SLEET, U.S.D.C.J.

APPEARANCES:

KAREN JACOBS, ESQ., and  
ETHAN H. TOWNSEND, ESQ.  
Morris Nichols Arsht & Tunnell LLP  
-and-  
NICHOLAS GROOMBRIDGE, ESQ.,  
ERIC ALAN STONE, ESQ.,  
KIRA A. DAVIS, ESQ.,  
JASON L. MEIZLISH, ESQ.,  
JOSEPHINE YOUNG, ESQ., and  
DANIEL KLEIN, ESQ.  
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP  
(New York, NY)

Counsel for Plaintiff

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 DAVID E. MOORE, ESQ.  
Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP

3 -and-

4 KENNETH G. SCHULER, ESQ.,  
EMILY C. MELVIN, ESQ.,  
5 DANIEL BROWN, ESQ.,  
MELISSA BRAND, ESQ.,  
6 MICHAEL R. SERINGHAUS, ESQ., and  
DAMION JURRENS, ESQ.  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
7 (Chicago, IL)

8 Counsel for Defendant

9 :03:07

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 ):14:09

24

):14:09

25

):14:09

1 molecule, which actually failed. They gave the license to  
2 Titan Pharmaceuticals, a San Francisco-based company, which  
3 in turn sought to find a partner to develop iloperidone  
4 product. That partner was Novartis, who sublicensed the  
5 product from Titan.

6 Q. And did Novartis own the rights to iloperidone in the  
7 period that's shown here from '97 to 2004?

8 A. That is correct.

9 Q. And was that during the period of time -- it was  
10 during that period of time that you worked at Novartis?

11 A. I overlapped the period of time at Novartis from '98  
12 to 2003.

13 Q. All right. And during that period of time were you  
14 personally involved in some of the work on developing  
15 iloperidone?

16 A. Yes, I was.

17 Q. Please describe for us what Novartis was doing during  
18 that period of time.

19 A. Novartis undertook an extensive clinical development  
20 program for the purpose of eventually obtaining the U.S. FDA  
21 approval in commercializing the product for the treatment of  
22 schizophrenia, so in that course, it is likely that they  
23 expended great resources of hundreds of millions of dollars,  
24 and numerous studies, both pre-clinical and clinical.

25 Q. And what happened next in terms of the ownership of

1 Fanapt?

2 A. Novartis decided around 2003 to stop the program and  
3 seek to identify a party that would outline the  
4 productivity. I had founded Vanda in 2003, and we obtained  
5 the license to iloperidone in 2004.

6 Q. And describe briefly, there's no need to get into  
7 anything confidential, the terms of that transaction by  
8 which Vanda acquired the rights to Fanapt or iloperidone  
9 from Novartis in 2004.

10 A. Yes. It was a small, up-front payment of about a  
11 half-a-million dollars, and Vanda would be responsible for  
12 all further development and commercialization, and Novartis  
13 would receive on the back end a royalty are payment of about  
14 ten percent and some milestones.

15 Q. And so then what happened in 2004 once Vanda had  
16 obtained the rights to iloperidone?

17 A. Well, using all the information available, and  
18 concluding the pharmacokinetics that were started, in  
19 discussions with the FDA, we began the next phase of the  
20 clinical development program with a large Phase 3 efficacy  
21 study which resulted in an NDA filing, and finally, NDA  
22 approval in May of 2009.

23 Q. And after FDA approval, was there a further  
24 transaction in terms of the ownership of the product?

25 A. That is correct.

- 1 Q. How did that come about?
- 2 A. At the time of approval, Vanda did not have any  
3 commercial capacity, and we sought to identify a commercial  
4 partner for the product to commercialize in the U.S.  
5 Novartis at that time showed interest in  
6 reacquiring the rights, and at this time, the publicly  
7 announced deal was with a 200 million up-front payment, and  
8 so royalties and milestones based on net revenue.
- 9 Q. And why the difference in those up front payments of  
10 500,000 in 2004 and 200 million five years later?
- 11 A. Well, at the beginning there was a compound that  
12 was going nowhere, and in 2009 it was an FDA-approved  
13 compound.
- 14 Q. Why is it that in 2004 it was going nowhere?
- 15 A. Novartis had decided to abandon the program in part,  
16 maybe in large part due to their identification of the QT  
17 prolonging effects of the molecule that they felt they may  
18 not be able to overcome for regulatory approval.
- 19 Q. And did Novartis follow in the transaction in 2009  
20 actually commercialize the molecule?
- 21 A. Yes, they did. They commercialized Fanapt in the U.S.  
22 in the beginning of 2010.
- 23 Q. And has it been on the market ever since?
- 24 A. That is correct.
- 25 Q. And please explain for us this last transaction that

# 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.