

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICRO LABS LIMITED AND MICRO LABS USA INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SANTEN PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD. AND
ASAHI GLASS CO., LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01434
U.S. Patent No. 5,886,035

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF
TIMOTHY L. MACDONALD, PH.D.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. AN INITIAL INCREASE IN IOP WAS A SERIOUS
FLAW FOR A POTENTIAL IOP-LOWERING DRUG..... 2

III. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS 4

 A. Commercial Success/Copying..... 4

 B. Unexpected Results 13

 C. Long-Felt but Unmet Need 16

 D. Failure of Others..... 16

I, Timothy L. Macdonald, Ph.D., declare and state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am Professor of Chemistry, and former Chair of Chemistry, at the University of Virginia ("UVA"). I also hold a secondary appointment as Professor of Pharmacology at UVA.

2. I have been retained on behalf of Patent Owners Santen Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. and Asahi Glass Co., Ltd. (together, "Patent Owner") as an independent expert consultant in the above-referenced *inter partes* review ("IPR") proceeding, to provide information and opinions on the teachings of the prior art and the state of the art, as relevant to the issued claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,886,035 ("the '035 Patent"). Ex.1001.

3. I previously submitted a written declaration on these topics, which was filed as Ex.2001. I hereby incorporate my previous declaration into this declaration.

4. For purposes of this declaration, I have been asked to explain, as of December 26, 1996, how a POSITA developing prostaglandin analogs for IOP-lowering would have viewed an initial increase in IOP caused by a candidate compound.

5. I have also been asked to consider whether objective secondary considerations of nonobviousness (for example, commercial success, copying,

unexpected results, long-felt but unmet need, and failure of others) support the nonobviousness of the claims of the '035 Patent.

6. My opinions in this Declaration are based on documents I have reviewed in connection with this proceeding, and are further informed by my knowledge and experience, including my decades of experience in medicinal chemistry and molecular pharmacology. I have also relied on the Supplemental Declaration of Robert D. Fechtner, M.D. (Ex.2029), which I understand is also being submitted in this proceeding. An updated list of the documents and materials that I considered in connection with the development of my opinions set forth in this (and my previous) declaration is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

II. AN INITIAL INCREASE IN IOP WAS A SERIOUS FLAW FOR A POTENTIAL IOP-LOWERING DRUG

7. As of December 26, 1996, a POSITA would have recognized that an initial increase in IOP, as was reported for Compound C of Klimko, was a serious deficiency in the context of a potential IOP-lowering drug. A POSITA at the time would also have understood that the initial increase in IOP could not be easily overcome, for example, by reducing the dose. Rather, a POSITA would have expected that decreasing the administered dose of Compound C would have the effect of decreasing the overall efficacy of the drug. This is because the initial increase in IOP is part of a biphasic response to Compound C; the first phase is a

hypertensive phase where IOP is increased, and the second phase is a hypotensive phase where IOP is reduced. *See, e.g., Camras et al., "Reduction of intraocular pressure by prostaglandins applied topically to the eyes of conscious rabbits," Invest. Ophthalmol. Vis. Sci. 16:1125-1134 (1977) ("Camras 1977") (Ex.2003), 2.* Given that Klimko does not provide dose-response curves for Compound C, a POSITA would have expected similar dose-response curves for both phases of the response to Compound C. While the unacceptable initial increase in IOP could potentially have been reduced by a low enough dose, a POSITA would have expected that the later IOP reduction would have been reduced as well. For example, in Camras 1977 (Ex.2003), 4, PGF_{2α} was shown to exhibit an initial IOP increase after administration. Although the initial IOP increase was mitigated by drastically lowering the dose of PGF_{2α}, the IOP-lowering activity was compromised at those lower doses. *Id.* At a 200 μg dose, PGF_{2α} provided IOP-lowering activity for at least about a full day, but there was a significant initial increase in IOP after administration. *Id.* At 50 μg PGF_{2α}, the initial increase in IOP was not reduced. *Id.* At 5 μg PGF_{2α}, the initial increase in IOP was reduced, but the area under the curve of the IOP-lowering was dramatically reduced, and the duration of efficacy was limited to 15 hours or less (rather than at least about a full day at 50 μg and 200 μg). *Id.* In my experience, a POSITA always favored development of compounds that do not increase IOP over compounds that do

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.