

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC
Petitioner

v.

CIPLA LTD.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,168,620
Issue Date: May 1, 2012
Title: COMBINATION OF AZELASTINE AND STEROIDS

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2017-00803

SECOND DECLARATION OF DR. MAUREEN D. DONOVAN, Ph.D.

Exhibit 1165

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. The Basis For My Opinion 1

III. Cipla’s asserted meaning of “suitable for nasal administration” and “nasal spray” are MEANING OF “SUITABLE FOR NASAL ADMINISTRATION” AND “NASAL SPRAY” 3

IV. A POSA would not be dissuaded by the non-aqueous “liquid formulations” identified by Smyth because the cited references actually encourage a POSA..... 5

V. Azelastine would be understood as compatible with MCC and CMC..... 8

VI. Cramer’s Example III, while not the focus of a POSA’s understanding, supports a POSA’s reasonable expectation of successfully combining azelastine hydrochloride and fluticasone propionate into an aqueous nasal spray..... 13

 A. Dr. Govindarajan’s recreations each showed physical stability, and Dr. Govindarajan’s tested recreation provided a nasal spray..... 14

 B. Dr. Herpin did not make and test any of Dr. Govindarajan’s examples because Dr. Herpin used a different HPMC..... 17

 C. Dr. Herpin’s flawed attempt at Dr. Govindarajan’s example produced a pH within the pH range stated by the ’620 for a nasal spray “suitable for nasal administration,” a fact acknowledged by Dr. Smyth during his deposition. 18

 D. Each of the Cramer Example III recreations falls within accepted osmolality values for nasal sprays according to the art submitted by both Petitioner and Patent Owner – including art specifically relied upon by Dr. Smyth 19

 E. Cipla’s “recreations” of Cramer Example III are not representative of the routine work of a POSA 20

VII. Patent Owner has relied on views in opposition to Dr. Smyth’s when obtaining other patents claiming priority to the ’620 patent. 22

VIII. The prior art expressly provides for Dymista’s preservative combination 24

IX. Glycerine is a widely used excipient with known advantageous solubilizing properties as well as tonicity effects..... 28

X. Meda’s efforts were not that of a POSA and therefore do not show “failure by

others,” especially when one of the two trials appears successful 31

I, Maureen Donovan, do declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I am over the age of eighteen (18) and otherwise competent to make this declaration.

2. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC for a *inter partes* review (IPR) for U.S. Patent No. 8,168,620 (Ex. 1001). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate, which is \$400 per hour for any consulting and \$600 per hour for any deposition appearances. I understand that my declaration accompanies a petition for *inter partes* review involving the above-mentioned U.S. Patent.

II. The Basis For My Opinion

3. In formulating my opinion, the documents I considered include Patent Owner's Response (Paper 21; "POR"), Dr. Smyth's Second Declaration (CIP2150), his deposition transcript (Ex. 1143), Dr. D'Addio's Second Declaration (CIP2148) and his deposition transcript (Ex. 1141), Dr. Herpin's Declaration (CIP2029), the documents cited in each of these, as well as other documents provided by Cipla and submitted as part of the Petitioner's Reply.

4. I understand that an obviousness analysis involves comparing a claim to the prior art to determine whether the claimed invention would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art (POSA) in view of the prior art, and in light of the general knowledge in the art. I also understand that when a POSA would have reached the claimed invention through routine experimentation, the invention may be deemed obvious. I understand that a finding of obviousness for a specific range or ratio in a patent can be overcome if the claimed range or ratio is proven to be critical to the performance or use of the claimed invention.

5. I also understand that obviousness can be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to achieve the claimed invention. It is also my understanding that where there is a reason to modify or combine the prior art to achieve the claimed invention, there must also be a reasonable expectation of success in so doing. I understand that the reason to combine prior art references can come from a variety of sources, not just the prior art itself or the specific problem the patentee was trying to solve. And I understand that the references themselves need not provide a specific hint or suggestion of the alteration needed to arrive at the claimed invention; the analysis may include recourse to logic, judgment, and common sense available to a person of ordinary skill that does not necessarily require explication in any reference.

6. I understand that when considering the obviousness of an invention, one should also consider whether there are any secondary considerations that support the

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.