```
Page 1
 1
           UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
 2
             BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
 3
 4
     ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC, ) Case IPR2017-01053
 5
                                      ) Patent 8,268,299
                Petitioner,
 6
          v.
 7
     ALCON RESEARCH, LTD.,
 8
                Patent Owner,
 9
10
11
12
                          Tuesday, May 8, 2018
13
14
          Deposition of JOHN C. STAINES, JR., PH.D.,
15
16
     taken at the offices of Foley & Lardner,
17
     3000 K St NW, Suite 600, Washington, D.C.,
     beginning at 9:12 a.m., before Nancy J. Martin, a
18
19
     Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Shorthand
20
     Reporter.
21
22
23
24
25
                                                        ALCON 2|168
                                    Argentum Pharm. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd.
```



	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	
	Representing the Patent Owner
4	WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY, LLP
	725 Twelfth Street N.W.
5	Washington, D.C. 20005
	(202) 434-5208
6	BY: ALEXANDER S. ZOLAN, ESQ.
	azolan@wc.com
7	
8	
9	Representing the Petitioner
	FOLEY & LARDNER, LLP
10	Washington Harbour
	3000 K Street, N.W.
11	Suite 600
	Washington, D.C. 20007
12	(202) 945-6009
	BY: ANDREW R. CHESLOCK, ESQ.
13	acheslock@foley.com
L 4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	



		Pag	је 3
1		INDEX	
2			PAGE
3	BY MR. ZOLAN		4
4			-
•		EXHIBITS PREVIOUSLY MARKED	
5		IMILDITO INIVIOUDII PHIMID	
3	NUMBER	Description	Page
6	HOMBER	Description	rage
J	Exhibit 1001	U.S. Patent 8,268,299, 19 pages	47
7	DANIEDIC 1001	0.5. racent 0,200,255, 15 pages	
,	Exhibit 1059	Statista, Percentage of the	38
8	EXHIDIC 1059	Glaucoma Prescription Market in	30
0		_	
9		the U.S. as of 2015 by Product	
10	Exhibit 1060	Type, 5 pages	41
10	EXHIBIT 1060	Independent Research Update,	41
11		Nicox, 20 pages	
тт	B	T-1 0016 G	41
10	Exhibit 1061	July 2016 Corporate	41
12	T 1:1:1 1004	Presentation, 21 pages	4.4
13	Exhibit 1094	Declaration of John C. Staines,	11
		Jr. in Support of Petitioner's	
14		Reply to Patient Owner's	
		Response, 90 pages	
15			
	Exhibit 2046	Travatan Z and Other	88
16		Prostaglandin Analog Drugs Share	
		of New Prescriptions, 1 page	
17			
	Exhibit 2051	Travatan Z and Other	80
18		Prostaglandin Analog Drugs Share	
		of Voice Excluding Retail Value	
19		of Samples, 1 page	
20	Exhibit 2052	Travatan Z and Other	80
		Prostaglandin Analog Drugs Share	
21		of Voice Including Retail Value	
		of Samples, 1 page	
22			
23			
24			
25			



	Page 4
1	WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, MAY 8, 2018; 9:12 A.M.
2	
3	
4	JOHN C. STAINES, JR.,
5	having been first duly sworn,
6	was examined and testified as follows:
7	
8	EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. ZOLAN:
10	Q. Good morning, Dr. Staines.
11	A. Good morning.
12	Q. Can you excuse me. "Mr. Staines."
13	A. Thank you.
14	Q. Good morning, Mr. Staines.
15	A. Good morning.
16	Q. Could you state your name and spell it for
17	the record, please.
18	A. Sure. John Christopher Staines, Jr. Staines
19	is S-t-a-i-ne-s.
20	Q. Have you ever concluded that a product was
21	a pharmaceutical product was commercially successful?
22	A. So concluded I've concluded it. Not as an
23	expert, but I have concluded that they have been, yes.
24	Q. So in the Hatch-Waxman context, have you ever
25	written an expert report that concluded that a



1 | pharmaceutical product was commercial and successful?

- A. No. I haven't written that many expert reports, so that -- right. So the ones I've written have not concluded that.
- Q. How many expert reports have you written in the Hatch-Waxman context?
 - A. Four.

Q. Did you -- in any of those reports, did you conclude that the product was not commercially successful because it lacked a nexus?

MR. CHESLOCK: Objection to form.

THE WITNESS: Let me preface this. One of them was a -- it was Hatch-Waxman, but it was in the context of a preliminary injunction, and so that didn't come up. So the three other ones -- so one of them, I think it was both nexus and commercial success. I didn't find it was commercial success, No. 1.

- No. 2, even if it were a commercial success, that there wasn't a nexus to the patents. I think I found that in the second one as well. And I can't recall the third one.
- Q. You've written other declarations in the IPR context; right?
 - A. Yes, two others.



DOCKET

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.

