June 20, 2018

WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 1 1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL Board 2 3 ----- X 4 WATSON LABORATORIES,) 5 INC.,) Case No. IRP2017-01621 Petitioner,) Patent No. 9,358,240 6 7) Case No. IRP2017-01622 vs.) Patent No. 9,339-507 8 UNITED THERAPEUTICS, 9 INC.,) 10 Patent Owner.) Pages 1-36 11 ---- X 12 TELEPHONE CONFERENCE HELD BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES 13 DAVID COTTA, TONI SCHEINER AND ERICA FRANKLIN Wednesday, June 20, 2018 14 1:11 p.m. 15 Foley & Lardner Washington Harbour 3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 600 16 Washington, D.C. 17 Sara A. Watt, RPR, RMR, CRR 18 19 20 21 22 ESQUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

June 20, 2018 2

121	
1	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:
2	Kurt Mathas, Esquire (by telephone) Winston & Strawn
3	35 West Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60601
4	(312) 558-5700 Kmathas@winston.com
5	ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:
	George E. Quillin, Esquire
6	Natasha Iyer, Esquire Stephen B. Maebius, Esquire (by telephone)
7	Foley & Lardner Washington Harbour
8	3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20007
9	(202) 672-5300
10	Gquillin@foley.com niyer@foley.com
11	smaebius@foley.com
12	Veronica Ascarrunz, Esquire (by telephone) Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati
13	1700 K Street, N.W. Fifth Floor
	Washington, D.C. 20006-3817
14	(202) 973-8800 vascarrunz@wsgr.com
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
	Source 800.211.DEPO (3376)

CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 3 PROCEEDINGS 1 2 MR. QUILLIN: This is George Quillin on 3 behalf of the Patent Owner joining the call. 4 MR. MAEBIUS: Also Steve Maebius on 5 behalf of Patent Owner. MS. IYER: Natasha Iyer on behalf of 6 7 Patent Owner. JUDGE COTTA: Is there anyone from 8 9 Petitioner on the line? MR. QUILLIN: This is George Quillin for 10 the Patent Owner. Mr. Kurt Mathas is attempting to 11 12 call in. 13 MR. MATHAS: Hi, George. I just joined. Thank you. 14 15 MR. OUILLIN: Wonderful. Okay. Is there anybody 16 JUDGE COTTA: else that's going to be attending from Petitioner 17 or do we have the complete roster of attendees? 18 19 MR. MATHAS: It's just me. Thank you. 20 JUDGE COTTA: So it sounds like we're 21 good to go? I believe so, Your Honor. 22 MR. QUILLIN: ESQUIRE ESQUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

CONFERENCE CALL
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS

1 JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Now, I understand that Patent Owner has arranged for a court reporter 2 3 to be present; is that correct? 4 MR. QUILLIN: Yes, Your Honor. This is George Quillin. We have a court reporter here on 5 location with us. 6 7 JUDGE COTTA: Okay. And could you please provide a transcript of the call to Petitioner and 8 9 file the transcript with the Board as an exhibit? 10 MR. QUILLIN: Yes, Your Honor, we will. Because the court reporter is here with 11 me, we joined the call after there were any 12 introductions by the Board. If you'd like the 13 14 court reporter to have the names of the panel, now 15 would be a good time, I suggest. JUDGE COTTA: Understood. Thank you for 16 17 the heads up. For the benefit of the court reporter, 18 19 this is Judge Cotta speaking. And with me on the 20 line are Judges Scheiner and Franklin. And this is a conference call concerning IPR2017-01621 and 21 22 IPR2017-01622.



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

12	
1	So my understanding is that Patent Owner
2	is requesting this conference call to address two
3	separate issues. The first issue relates to the
4	scheduling and location of four non-party fact
5	witnesses, all of whom are located in Germany. And
6	the second issue relates to Patent Owner's reliance
7	on its post-SAS supplemental response or reliance
8	on arguments that were presented in the preliminary
9	responses in the post-SAS supplemental response.
10	So let's start with the first issue.
11	Patent Owner, since you requested the call can you
12	please explain the nature of the problem.
13	MR. QUILLIN: Yes, Your Honor. This is
14	George Quillin.
15	This has to do with the authorship of a
16	particular paragraph, actually portions of a
17	particular paragraph of a journal article called
18	Ghofrani, which is Exhibit 1005. These four
19	declarants are listed as co-authors on the entire
20	article, but they're not, they're not all authors
21	of this particular excerpt. And these four
22	witnesses are not under the control of the Patent



Г

1	Owner.
2	The Board's rules, as you know, say the
3	cross-examination depositions should be in the U.S.
4	unless, unless the parties agree otherwise or the
5	Board orders. We have been attempting to agree
6	with the Petitioner for a location not in the U.S.,
7	and in our view the Petitioner has unreasonably
8	withheld agreement. I've got six broad points that
9	I'd like to make.
10	So the first one, the first point has to
11	do with the length and the nature of the
12	declarations. I had e-mailed the Board earlier
13	with the names of these four witnesses and their
14	exhibit numbers. I'll take the two of them in the
15	middle.
16	So Dr. Grimminger and Dr. Reichenberger,
17	each testify as to this excerpt, saying, I'm not
18	the author. I didn't write that. And so
19	Grimminger says he didn't write it and he says
20	Reichenberger did not write it.
21	Reichenberger, in his very short
22	declaration, says the same thing. I,



CONFERENCE CALL	
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS	

1 Reichenberger, didn't write it; and Grimminger didn't write it. He says Ghofrani wrote other 2 3 portions and he says Seeger and another co-author, 4 Voswinckel, wrote this excerpt. So those two witnesses say, in their very short declarations, 5 say this. 6 7 Ghofrani in his first declaration, 2026, says the same thing. I, Ghofrani, didn't write 8 9 this excerpt. I wrote something else. And to my knowledge, it's Seeger and Voswinckel that wrote 10 11 this excerpt. So those three witnesses all say the same 12 13 thing, that they didn't write this excerpt. 14 Dr. Seeger, in his excerpt, says, I, 15 Seeger, did write it, along with Voswinckel. And these other guys, they did not write it. 16 So the length of the declarations and the 17 content are very short. They go to the facts of 18 19 who authored this thing, not in any technological 20 detail. So that's the first point. In our view, in our view the case law 21 from the Board is clear to us that on those facts 22



CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 8 1 there's no case where the Board has compelled such a witness to come to the United States to be 2 3 cross-examined on such a short factual declaration. 4 But these are not --5 JUDGE COTTA: Are there cases that you want to refer us to? 6 7 MR. QUILLIN: Yes, Your Honor, there are I can address those now. 8 three cases. Three cases 9 are Instradent against Noble, IPR2015-01786. This 10 is Paper 61. The other case is Activision, Activision 11 Blizzard against Acceleration Bay. 12 That's 13 IPR2015-01951. It's Paper 17. 14 And the third one is IBM against 15 Intellectual Ventures, IPR2014-01385, Paper 19. So in our view, just on those facts, the 16 17 Board has not compelled bringing the witness all 18 the way to the United States. But as the saying 19 goes, wait, there's more. 20 So our second point has to do with the 21 identity of these witnesses. These witnesses are 22 not our witnesses. They're not our employees.



	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS9
1	They're not under our control. And they're not
2	expert witness, they're fact witnesses. These are
3	the listed co-authors of an article that Watson,
4	the Petitioner, picked out.
5	It's not as though there was a set of
6	U.S. co-authors and a different set of German
7	authors, and we picked the German authors just to
8	cause trouble. That's not what's going on. It's
9	not as though we've brought this on ourselves, Your
10	Honor. These are four fact witnesses listed in the
11	article that Watson itself has picked out and
12	relied on. And these folks are not under our
13	control. That's the second point.
14	The third point
15	JUDGE COTTA: So with respect to that
16	point, I just wanted to ask, Dr. Seeger states that
17	he's a paid consultant for UTC.
18	MR. QUILLIN: Correct, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE COTTA: Does that situate him
20	differently from the other three?
21	MR. QUILLIN: From two of them.
22	Grimminger and Reichenberger were not paid, and
	ESQUIRE BOO.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

CONFERENCE CALL	
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS	

Ghofrani in his second declaration makes clear that 1 he is a paid consultant. 2 So although these folks are paid, they're 3 4 not our employees and they're not under our control in that sense. They've got their own counsel. 5 We can't -- at the present time, we can't even 6 7 communicate directly with them. We've got to go, as you can appreciate, through their counsel. 8 9 And it's burdensome on these witnesses. 10 These are not -- these are not retirees lounging on These are active folks with their own the Riviera. 11 12 business. 13 What sort of business are they in? Well, these are not fungible guys on some production 14 15 line. These are medical professionals, these are physicians, they're clinicians with an ongoing 16 17 responsibility to patients and their colleagues and their staff and their employer. 18 They're not only not under our control, 19 20 but not, in a sense, not even under their own 21 control, putting Seeger aside for the moment. He's a little different because he's the head. 22 But



	CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 11
1	these three, Ghofrani, Grimminger, and
2	Reichenberger, are employees of their respective
3	clinics or hospitals, and they got to get you
4	know, they got to get permission from the employer.
5	They can't just up and walk away.
6	JUDGE COTTA: In connection with the paid
7	consultant, are you just to the extent you can
8	disclose it, are you are Dr. Seeger and
9	Dr. Ghofrani getting compensated only for their
10	time in connection with this deposition and their
11	declarations or
12	MR. QUILLIN: Yes, Your Honor.
13	JUDGE COTTA: Or is there a relationship
14	with UTC beyond that?
15	MR. QUILLIN: I'm not it's my
16	understanding that there is not a relationship with
17	UTC beyond that.
18	All of these witnesses work as internists
19	and professors in hospitals in a variety of
20	locations, including Bad Nauheim, Giessen/Marburg,
21	Friedberg. They treat patients directly. Many of
22	these patients, you know, they're not coming in
	ESQUIRE BOO.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS12
1	with, you know, toenail problems. These may have
2	life-threatening diseases. And at least
3	Drs. Ghofrani and Seeger are the heads and
4	directors of their divisions and clinics.
5	All, all the doctors' practices include
6	operating on patients and other invasive
7	procedures. Each clinic, as we understand it, has
8	prescheduled days for operations and other
9	procedures, which entails scheduling and staffing
10	that may be set months in advance.
11	Any travel to the United States would
12	realistically require these witnesses to be away
13	from their clinics for four to five working days.
14	That's an entire working week. Even depositions in
15	Frankfurt would pull them away from their clinical
16	responsibilities and their patients.
17	They're willing, as we understand it,
18	they're willing to appear as witnesses, but of
19	course the well-being and the life of their
20	patients is their top priority. So replacing any
21	of them, much less all of them, for required
22	planned clinics and procedures if they were to



CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 13 travel to the U.S. would be next to impossible for 1 them. 2 3 JUDGE COTTA: So you say they're willing 4 to participate as witnesses. What have you offered as an accommodation 5 to Petitioner in terms of their availability for 6 7 depositions? MR. QUILLIN: We've offered to make them 8 9 available for a deposition in Germany, going 10 through the procedures that are there. We have offered to reimburse travel expenses for Watson's 11 12 counsel. 13 And I don't want to jump too far ahead, but I'm believing, Your Honor -- I obviously can't 14 15 speak for the Petitioner, but I believe that if you say that Patent Owner is not required to bring 16 17 those four to the U.S., then the parties will be able to work out suitable locations and times and 18 19 that sort of thing that are mutually convenient. 20 We've got a relatively good working 21 relationship, I think. And as I understand it, 22 there's no reason, there's no -- there's no



CONFERENCE CALL	
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS	

1 articulated reason why the Petitioner is not willing to have the depositions in Germany. 2 3 So that has to do with the burden on the 4 witnesses, which includes, you know, the summer months and German hospitals are understaffed and 5 there's a lot of other stuff going on about they're 6 7 trying to rearrange their schedules and doing it all in advance. 8 9 And that plays into the fourth point, which has to do with the logistics of taking a 10 deposition in Germany. We have to go, as I 11 12 understand it under the rules, we have to go 13 through the consulate, which is in Frankfurt. And 14 the consulate then has to convey the request to the 15 embassy in Berlin. The embassy then communicates to the German department of -- Ministry of Justice. 16 17 So there's a long lead time. As we understand it, it could be six to eight weeks. 18 19 We raised this topic with Petitioner's

20 counsel, like, three weeks ago and haven't been 21 able to make much progress. And from our view, the 22 longer Watson waits to deal with this, the less



	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS15
1	likely we're able to get approval on time, which we
2	say falls on Watson.
3	We certainly you know, we, United
4	Therapeutics, we're not in control of the
5	consulate. There may be logistical problems with
6	things going on there. But we're confident that if
7	you tell us that we're not required to bring them
8	to the U.S., we can work through whatever the
9	situation is and both sides, you know, working
10	hard, will do their best to make them available for
11	a deposition.
12	The fifth point has to do with the case
13	law. I've already mentioned the three cases that
14	we say support us. In Instradent, the Board found
15	it was unnecessarily burdensome to make an Israeli
16	third-party witness appear in the U.S. for
17	cross-examination, and ordering the deposition
18	occur in Israel or by video.
19	In Activision, the Board found it
20	unnecessarily costly and burdensome to make an
21	Australian declarant available for a live
22	deposition in the U.S. regarding a three-page



	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS16
1	declaration, and ordering that they be made
2	available for a video deposition.
3	And in IBM, the Board permitted a
4	telephonic deposition of no more than an hour where
5	the declaration was three pages.
6	Now, there are a couple cases that Watson
7	has pointed out, but we think those are clearly
8	distinguishable.
9	One of them is HTC Corporation, that's
10	IPR2014-01198. It had to do with a French witness.
11	And, again, as I understand it, he had to do with
12	more like expert testimony, but he was he was
13	someone who was not willing to be deposed in the
14	U.S., and the Board encouraged the parties to work
15	together and come up with a solution. I think I
16	think if the Board were to tell us that we can have
17	the deposition in Europe, that the parties would be
18	able to work out a solution.
19	And there's another case that they've
20	cited which is Valve Corporation, which is
21	IPR2017-00136. But I again, those cases don't
22	control here. They're easily distinguishable from
	2 FSOLIRF 800.211.DEPO (3376)

	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS17
1	what we have here.
2	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Just to get you back
3	to your six points, I think I've got 1, 2, 4, and
4	5. Maybe I missed 3 and 6.
5	MR. QUILLIN: 3 was the burden on the
6	witnesses. So 2 was the identity of the witnesses.
7	These are third parties, not employees, not under
8	our control. 3 was the burden on the witnesses.
9	These guys are, as I say
10	JUDGE COTTA: Yeah.
11	MR. QUILLIN: 4 had to do with the
12	logistics of the deposition.
13	JUDGE COTTA: 5 is the case law.
14	MR. QUILLIN: 5 is the case law.
15	And 6 was the question you asked about
16	the status of negotiations so far. We're working
17	back and forth and we've I think have been
18	negotiating in good faith. But the sticking point
19	seems to be the Petitioner's, in our view,
20	unreasonable unwillingness.
21	JUDGE COTTA: Okay.
22	MR. QUILLIN: So the final thing has to
	ESQUIRE BOD.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS18
1	do with the ask. What do we want from the Board?
2	All we're looking for really, Your Honor,
3	is an order saying that the depositions are not
4	required in the U.S. We'll do our best, working
5	with the witnesses, over whom we don't have any
6	control, and with Petitioner to come up with a
7	mutually satisfactory location for the deposition
8	in Europe.
9	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Can I hear from the
10	Petitioner, please?
11	MR. MATHAS: Yes, Your Honor. This is
12	Kurt Mathas for Petitioner. Let me respond to a
13	few things that Mr. Quillin just said.
14	As the Board noted in the questioning,
15	two of these witnesses are paid consultants for
16	United Therapeutics. At least Dr. Seeger has a
17	long history with United Therapeutics, consulting
18	relationships going back into the early 2000s.
19	Over the course of that history and as
20	recently as a couple years ago Dr. Seeger has been
21	in the United States for meetings in connection
22	with United Therapeutics business. And so we



CONFERENCE CALL	
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS	

1 certainly think that that is relevant to the claims of burden and the alleged unavailability of these 2 3 folks to be able to travel to the U.S. 4 By the same token, there was a point made about that this is all really about one paragraph 5 and three guys who said, "I didn't write it," and 6 7 one guy who said, "I did write it." I would respectfully suggest that that is underselling the 8 9 evidence and the importance of the evidence here, Your Honor. 10 As the actual declarations go, the Seeger 11 declaration, there's two of them. One is six 12 13 pages, one is ten pages. The Ghofrani declaration, again there's two of them, one is four pages, one 14 15 is six pages. Grimminger and Reichenberger do in fact have shorter depositions and are not paid 16 17 consultants of UTC at this point. One other point about the importance of 18 19 these declarations, Your Honor, is this issue was 20 at the center of the pre-institution fight. And, in fact, four of the six declarations were 21 submitted in connection with the Patent Owner's 22



1 preliminary response. And as Your Honors may recall, there was this dispute about the authorship 2 3 of Ghofrani and the inventorship of the claims at 4 issue. Four of these declarations were submitted with the Patent Owner's preliminary response. 5 Watson sought leave and was granted 6 7 permission to put in a reply to Patent Owner's 8 preliminary response to raise questions as to some 9 of the statements made in the declarations with respect to other evidence of record that called 10 into question some of the statements in the 11 12 declarations. 13 We submitted that reply brief and Your Honors, in your institution decision, found that 14 15 this issue of what the inventors said in their declarations versus some of this other evidence of 16 17 record raised a general issue of material fact as to the contribution of the non-inventors to the 18 19 references in question.

And so we think that that piece of this, Your Honors, distinguishes our case and the importance of these individual witnesses where



1 their credibility has already been called into question and will be critical in these depositions 2 3 from the cases relied upon by Patent Owner that he 4 cited to you in his remarks. And in each of those, the depositions were -- or the declarations were 5 limited and on limited issues. Here, at least two 6 7 of the declarations span ten pages cumulatively, or more, and all of them go to a critical issue as 8 9 between the parties.

With respect to the case law, counsel for Patent Owner cited two of the cases that we would rely on, but we would also note two things about those cases and their analysis of the rules that require depositions within the United States unless otherwise directed.

With respect to the HTC case, the panel there notes that in fact the default of position established by the rules is that the party proffering a declarant's testimony shall make that declarant available for cross-examination within the United States.

22

The Valve Corp. case, which was also



mentioned, also has a discussion of the reason 1 behind the rules and what it means when you submit 2 a declaration. And there the panel noted that 3 4 Patent Owner chose to submit a declaration from Mr. Rubinger. That choice came with certain 5 foreseeable consequences. Specifically, it was 6 7 foreseeable that the witness would be subject to cross-examination and that the burden and expense 8 of producing that witness would fall on Patent 9 10 Owner. A third case that we cited to Patent 11 Owner which wasn't mentioned in the previous 12 13 comments is Square, Inc., versus REM Holding 3, LLC. That's IPR2014-312, at Paper 37. 14 15 And there, Your Honors, there was a declarant who was an author of one of the prior art 16 17 references, and he had put in a declaration about the subject matter of the prior art references. 18 19 And he happened to be located in Hong Kong and he 20 didn't want to come to the U.S. to be deposed. 21 The Board, in Paper 37 in Square, Inc., 22 v. REM Holdings 3, ordered that the witness, quote, ESQUIRE

	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS23
1	must be made available in the United States for
2	cross-examination or Patent Owner may request to
3	withdraw his declaration from consideration in this
4	proceeding.
5	So, Your Honors, we do think that there
6	is case law that goes in our favor. We think the
7	cases which Patent Owner has cited are themselves
8	distinguishable, given the issues at play here.
9	In addition, Your Honor
10	JUDGE COTTA: Let me interrupt you for a
11	second, just to get the paper number for
12	IPR2017-00136, just to save some trouble.
13	MR. MATHAS: Yes. That is Paper 29, Your
14	Honor. And the quote that I read is at page 30.
15	JUDGE COTTA: Okay.
16	MR. MATHAS: And in 2014-1198, the quote
17	that I read is also at page 30.
18	Two more points I think, Your Honor, is
19	that one of the things I think that here is that
20	there is an overstatement, perhaps, of the burden
21	on the doctors involved in this case.
22	I recognize that being deposed is not
	2 ESOUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376)

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SOLUTIONS

CONFERENCE CALL
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS

1 probably high on many people's list. However, based on the fact, especially with Dr. Seeger who 2 has come to the U.S. multiple occasions on behalf 3 4 of UTC business, and the fact that these folks can come during different periods within the discovery 5 period, and that these folks are presumably out of 6 7 the office from time to time on personal or other business matters, it seems to me that the burden, 8 9 respectfully, may be overstated in that they are 10 unable to get away and come to the United States. 11 And then the last thing I guess I would say is -- well, maybe two more things. 12 One is that 13 it is -- I think Patent Owner's position is ignoring the burden that they are attempting to 14 15 place on Petitioner here. We are under a tight timeframe, Your 16 17 Honor, with respect to our discovery period, because of the subsequent institution decision and 18 19 the way the schedule played out after that. We 20 have approximately seven weeks to take discovery 21 from when we will get Patent Owner's supplemental 22 response before our reply is due.



1 During that period of time, as it currently stands, we are going to be required to 2 3 take at least ten depositions of declarants that 4 have put in declarations so far. There may be additional declarations. So with that kind of 5 truncated discovery period, in light of the way the 6 7 schedule shook out, we have to not only take these depositions, we have to prepare our reply brief and 8 9 apparently also go to Germany for a week or however 10 long it takes to get these depositions done. And, apparently, I learned this morning 11 that, as counsel indicated, this is not a simple 12 13 process of going to a court, a conference room in Germany, but instead we apparently have to go 14 15 through these formal processes. And I was, I guess, under the misimpression that Patent Owner 16 17 was offering to make those arrangements. As of this morning, that additional burden was going to 18 19 fall on us to get the depositions of their 20 declarants.

21 With respect to the negotiations between 22 the parties, we have had them, as counsel said.



CONFERENCE CALL	
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS	

1	One of the compromises we proposed was that Patent
2	Owner bring their two paid consultants to the
3	United States, Dr. Ghofrani and Dr. Seeger, and
4	that we would go to Germany for the other two,
5	Dr. Reichenberger and Grimminger. In part because,
6	as Your Honor noted, there does seem to be a
7	distinction between paid and unpaid consultants,
8	and we thought that is a reasonable compromise in
9	order to bring some resolution to this, rather than
10	demanding that all four of the declarants be
11	brought to the United States.
12	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. So just to
13	summarize, it seems to me like the principal
14	objection that Petitioner has to taking the
15	depositions in Germany is just the logistics and
16	the tight timeframe that Petitioner is under in
17	terms of responding to the Patent Owner's
18	supplemental response and the Patent Owner's
19	response and squeezing in ten depositions in seven
20	weeks?
21	MR. MATHAS: That's right, Your Honor,
22	the burden and inconvenience of doing that work.



	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS27
1	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Can I ask Patent
2	Owner just a quick question?
3	Have you checked to see whether any of
4	the witnesses have plans to be in the United
5	States, independent of this, during the relevant
6	time period?
7	MR. QUILLIN: We've checked to the extent
8	we can, Your Honor. As I say, they're not under
9	our control, we got to go through their counsel.
10	We have checked publicly available
11	schedules and it appears that they're not
12	participating in conferences in the U.S., for
13	example. So to our knowledge, to our knowledge
14	they are not otherwise coming to the U.S. during
15	this time period.
16	JUDGE COTTA: Okay.
17	MR. QUILLIN: And it's not it's not
18	our position, Your Honor, that these guys are
19	somehow chained to their desks or in a cage or
20	something and can't get out. That's not the point.
21	It had to do with the or that they've never been
22	to the U.S. That's not our point. You know,



CONFERENCE CALL	June 20
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS	

1 Seeger came, evidently, a couple years ago on something that was evidently in a capacity opposed 2 3 to UTC. 4 Our point is to do with the lead time and the scheduling. It's -- as I say, aside from 5 Seeger, these are not folks who are even under full 6 7 control of their own schedule. They've got employers from whom they must get permission. And 8 9 on the case law, there's no case that we're aware of, no case that requires three witnesses, four 10 11 witnesses to come. If we're going to have, as Petitioner has 12 offered, a pair of depositions in Germany, we say 13 that Ghofrani is in that same, ought to be in that 14 15 same group. If we're going to have two or three of them in Germany, what's the point of bringing 16 17 Seeger here? There's no need, there's no marginal need to have him further disrupt what's going on 18 19 there. They all four, in our view, can be made 20 available, we will trust, in Europe. 21 And that's all we're asking for. If the 22 Board says we don't need to bring them to the U.S.,



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 29 1 we will work our very best to make them available 2 in Europe. 3 JUDGE COTTA: Okay. I think we 4 understand the issue. Is there anything else that either party 5 wants to add before we take the issue under 6 advisement? 7 MR. QUILLIN: Not from Patent Owner, Your 8 9 Honor. MR. MATHAS: Nothing from Petitioner, 10 Your Honor. 11 JUDGE COTTA: Okay. And in timing, I 12 13 assume you're looking for a decision as soon as possible so that you can move forward to resolving 14 this? 15 MR. QUILLIN: Please, Your Honor, yes. 16 17 JUDGE COTTA: Is there any hard-and-fast deadline that you have, other than as soon as 18 19 possible? 20 MR. OUILLIN: As we understand it from 21 the website on the U.S. consulate, it's going to 22 take, like, six to eight weeks, which is why we 🖉 ESQUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376)

> **UNITED THERAPEUTICS EX. 2210** WATSON LABORATORIES V. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01622 Page 29

EsquireSolutions.com

	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS30
1	tried to reach out to Petitioner three weeks ago.
2	Beyond that, I'm not aware, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Let me ask you I
4	guess before I take it under advisement, I'm going
5	to put you guys on mute and confer with the panel,
6	see if they please hold.
7	MR. QUILLIN: Yes.
8	MR. MATHAS: Yes, Your Honor.
9	(Pause in the proceedings at 1:44 p.m.)
10	(Proceedings resumed at 1:48 p.m.)
11	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Is everybody still
12	here?
13	MR. QUILLIN: Patent Owner is here, Your
14	Honor.
15	MR. MATHAS: Yes for Petitioner, Your
16	Honor.
17	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. I just wanted to
18	follow up on one question and that's to ask whether
19	the parties have considered taking the deposition
20	by video or phone or and/or elsewhere in Europe
21	more proximate to Germany to solve the logistical
22	concerns raised by the Petitioner.

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SOLUTIONS

	CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 31
1	MR. QUILLIN: Patent Owner is willing to
2	do that, Your Honor. And in terms of have we
3	discussed it, it's been broached.
4	JUDGE COTTA: So I guess my understanding
5	is, at least from Patent Owner's perspective, if we
6	were to order the depositions to occur outside the
7	United States, you'd find a way to amicably resolve
8	it?
9	MR. QUILLIN: Yes, Your Honor, we will
10	certainly do our best. Again, these are not our
11	guys, we're not in control of them, but we will
12	certainly work, do our level best to accommodate
13	both the witnesses and Petitioner.
14	MR. MATHAS: Your Honor, from Patent
15	Owner's [sic.] perspective, we have discussed
16	elsewhere in Europe as a potential for resolving
17	the issues that would be upon us by the German
18	proceedings. We still maintain that they should
19	proceed in the U.S., but under the idea that they
20	are going to be or that they would take place in
21	Europe, that one way that we might be able to avoid
22	some of the logistical issues would be by exploring



Г

1	other venues.
2	With respect to a video deposition, I
3	think two things about that. One is if it takes
4	place in Germany, I don't think that I don't
5	I think it would have to be in person, in that the
6	witness would be made available at the consulate's
7	office. And at any rate, we intend to question the
8	witnesses in person in light of the credibility
9	issues that I spoke of before.
10	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Okay. We will take
11	the issue under advisement.
12	And I guess move on to the second issue,
13	which I guess was a question relating to the Patent
14	Owner's reliance on its preliminary response and
15	its post-SAS supplemental response.
16	MR. QUILLIN: Right, Your Honor. This is
17	George Quillin.
18	JUDGE COTTA: Can you tell me what the
19	issue is there?
20	MR. QUILLIN: Well, it may be a
21	non-issue. We discussed with Petitioner and we
22	think we think Petitioner is not going to
	ESQUIRE B00.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

1	oppose.
2	But the notion is that there are
3	arguments that have been made in our Patent Owner
4	response that need to be reflected in our
5	supplemental response. So if they were all in one
6	paper and we were on page 30, we would say,
7	"Regarding this issue, see what we wrote on page
8	10."
9	That's the sort of thing we're talking
10	about doing here. All we want to do is refer back
11	to arguments that have previously been made. You
12	know, for example, Voswinckel and Ghofrani were
13	relied on for ground 1; Voswinckel's relied on for
14	grounds 2 and 3. The sort of thing we want to say
15	is that "See what we wrote before." I don't
16	imagine that you need to read it all again.
17	JUDGE COTTA: Are these referring back to
18	the preliminary response or the Patent Owner
19	response?
20	MR. QUILLIN: Our Patent Owner response.
21	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. So I think that one
22	I can resolve or we can resolve here, if you'd just
	2 FSOLURE 800.211.DEPO (3370

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SOLUTIONS

CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 34 1 let me put you on mute and confer with the panel to make sure. 2 3 (Pause in the proceedings at 1:52 p.m.) 4 (Proceedings resumed at 1:53 p.m.) 5 JUDGE COTTA: Okay. So the panel has conferred and in response to your question we are 6 7 fine with your referring back to the Patent Owner's 8 response in the supplemental response. 9 MR. QUILLIN: Very well, Your Honor. 10 Thank you very much. Is there anything further 11 JUDGE COTTA: that we should address while we're convened here? 12 13 MR. QUILLIN: Not on behalf of the Patent Owner, Your Honor. 14 15 MR. MATHAS: Nothing for Petitioner, Your Honor. 16 17 JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Well, I thank you both for your time. We will take the deposition 18 19 matter under advisement and issue an order in due 20 course, hopefully sooner rather than later. 21 MR. QUILLIN: We'd be very grateful. 22 JUDGE COTTA: To the extent you can make ESQUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376)

> **UNITED THERAPEUTICS EX. 2210** WATSON LABORATORIES V. UNITED THERAPEUTICS, IPR2017-01622 Page 34

EsquireSolutions.com

	CONFERENCE CALLJune 20, 2018WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS35
1	the transcript available sooner rather than later,
2	that would facilitate that.
3	MR. QUILLIN: Very well, Your Honor.
4	We'll press ahead on that and get it to you as soon
5	as we can.
6	JUDGE COTTA: Okay. Thank you. This
7	call is adjourned.
8	MR. QUILLIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	
10	(Proceedings concluded at 1:54 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
I	ESQUIRE BOO.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS 36 CERTIFICATE 1 I, Sara A. Watt, Registered Professional 2 3 Reporter, the officer before whom these proceedings 4 were taken, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the proceedings were by me 5 reduced to Stenotypy, afterwards transcribed upon a 6 7 computer; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings so given as 8 9 aforesaid; that these proceedings were taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption specified, 10 and were completed without adjournment; and that I 11 am not a relative, council or attorney of any 12 13 party, or otherwise interested in the event of this action. 14 15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office this 20th day of 16 17 June, 2018. SareAWatt 18 19 2018 2 Sara A. Watt, Notary Public 20 OF COL ♥ in and for the District of Columbia. 21 22 My Commission expires July 14, 2018. ESQUIRE 800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

CONFERENCE CALL	
WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS	

June 20, 2018 Index: 1..Blizzard

ATSON LAB	ORATORIES vs UN	NITED THERAPE	UTICS	Index: 1Blizza
		13:5	and/or	22:16
1	3	active	30:20	authored
		10:11	apparently	7:19
L	3	Activision	25:9,11,	authors
17:3	17:4,5,8	8:11	14	5:20 9:7
33:13	22:13,22	15:19	appears	
LO	33:14		27:11	authorship
33:8	30	actual		5:15 20:
	23:14,17	19:11	approval	availabili
1005	33:6	add	15:1	У
5:18		29:6	approximate	13:6
L7	37	addition	NFERENCE CALL	avoid
8:13	22:14,21	23:9	24:20	31:21
19			arguments	
8:15	4	additional	5:8 33:3,	aware
		25:5,18	11	28:9 30:2
20.0	4	address		
30:9	17:3,11	5:2 8:8	arranged 4:2	в
L:48 p.m	-	34:12	4:2	
30:10		adjourned	arrangement	back
L:52	5	35:7	S	17:2,17
34:3			25:17	18:18
	5	advance	art	33:10,17
1:53 p.m	17:4,13,	12:10	22:16,18	34:7
34:4	14	14:8	article	800.21 Eleg (CT)
L:54		advisement	5:17,20	11:20
35:10	6	29:7 30:4	9:3,11	
	_	32:11		based
2	6	34:19	articulated	24:2
4	17:4,15	agree	14:1	Bay
		6:4,5	assume	8:12
2	61		29:13	behalf
17:3,6 33:14	8:10	agreement 6:8	attempting	3:3,5,6
			3:11 6:5	24:3
2000s	A	ahead	24:14	34:13
18:18		13:13		
2014-1198	Acceleratio	35:4	attendees	believing
23:16	n	alleged	3:18	13:14
	8:12	19:2	attending	benefit
2026		amidahlur	3:17	4:18
7:7	accommodate	amicably 31:7	Australian	Berlin
29	31:12		15:21	14:15
23:13	accommodati	analysis	12:21	14:10
	on	21:13	author	Blizzard
			6:18	8:12



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS

June 20, 2018 Index: Board..Cotta

WATSON LABO	RATORIES vs UN	NILED THERAPE	01105	Index: BoardCotta
Board		cited	compromise	consultants
4:9,13	С	16:20	26:8	18:15
6:5,12		21:4,11	aompromiaca	19:17
7:22 8:1,		22:11	compromises 26:1	26:2,7
17 15:14,	cage	23:7	26:1	
19 16:3,	27:19		concerns	consulting
14,16	call	claims	30:22	18:17
18:1,14	3:3,12	19:1 20:3		content
22:21	4:8,12,21	clear	concluded	7:18
28:22	5:2,11	7:22 10:1	35:10	
	35:7		confer	contributio
Board's		clinic	30:5 34:1	n
6:2	called	12:7 🗰	NFERENCE CALL TSON LABORATORIES VS UNITED THERAPEUTICS	June 20, 27:10:18
bring	5:17	clinical	conference	control
13:16	20:10	12:15	4:21 5:2	5:22 9:1,
15:7	21:1		25:13	13 10:4,
26:2,9	capacity	clinicians	conferences	19,21
28:22	28:2	10:16	27:12	15:4
	20.2	clinics		16:22
bringing	case	11:3	conferred	17:8 18:6
8:17	7:21 8:1,	12:4,13,	34:6	27:9 28:7
28:16	11 15:12	22	confident	31:11
broached	16:19		15:6	51:11
	17:13,14	co-author		convened
31:3	20:21	7:3	connection	34:12
broad	21:10,16,	co-authors	11:6,10	convenient
6:8	22 22:11	5:19 9:3,	18:21	
brought	23:6,21	6	19:22	800.211.DEPO (178)3:19 EsquireSolutions.com
9:9 26:11	28:9,10	-	consequence	convey
9:9 20:11		colleagues	s	14:14
burden	cases	10:17	22:6	Corp
14:3	8:5,8	comments		21:22
17:5,8	15:13	22:13	considerati	21:22
19:2 22:8	16:6,21	22.13	on	Corporation
23:20	21:3,11,	communicate	23:3	16:9,20
24:8,14	13 23:7	10:7	considered	correct
25:18	center	communicate	30:19	4:3 9:18
26:22	19:20	s		4:2 3:10
		5 14:15	consulate	costly
burdensome	chained	14:10	14:13,14	15:20
10:9	27:19	compelled	15:5	Cotta
15:15,20	checked	8:1,17	29:21	
business	27:3,7,10	compensated	consulate's	3:8,16,20
10:12,13		11:9	32:6	4:1,7,16,
18:22	choice	11.9	52.0	19 8:5
24:4,8	22:5	complete	consultant	9:15,19
	chose	3:18	9:17 10:2	11:6,13
	22:4		11:7	13:3



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

June 20, 2018

17:2,10,	cumulativel	default	10:7	
13,21	У	21:17	11:21	E
18:9	21:7	demanding	directors	
23:10,15		26:10	12:4	e-mailed
26:12	D	• • • •		6:12
27:1,16		department	disclose	
29:3,12,		14:16	11:8	earlier
17 30:3,	days	deposed	discovery	6:12
11,17	12:8,13	16:13	24:5,17,	early
31:4	deadline	22:20	20 25:6	18:18
32:10,18	29:18	23:22		
33:17,21	a		discussed	easily
34:5,11,	deal			16:22
17,22	14:22	11:10	32:21	embassy
35:6	decision	13:9	discussion	14:15
ounsel	20:14	14:11	22:1	
10:5,8	24:18	15:11,17,		employees
13:12	29:13	22 16:2,	diseases	8:22 10:4
14:20	1	4,17	12:2	11:2 17:7
21:10	declarant	17:12	dispute	employer
25:12,22	15:21	18:7	20:2	10:18
27:9	21:20	30:19	diamont	11:4
21.9	22:16	32:2	disrupt	
ouple	declarant's	34:18	28:18	employers
16:6	21:19	depositions	distinction	28:8
18:20		6:3 12:14	26:7	encouraged
28:1	declarants	13:7 14:2	distinguish	800.211.DEPO (37865:14
ourt	5:19	18:3	able	entails
4:2,5,11,	25:3,20	19:16	16:8,22	12:9
14,18	26:10	21:2,5,14	23:8	12:9
25:13	declaration	25:3,8,	23:0	entire
	6:22 7:7	10,19	distinguish	5:19
redibility	8:3 10:1	26:15,19	es	12:14
21:1 32:8	16:1,5	28:13	20:21	established
ritical	19:12,13	31:6	divisions	21:18
21:2,8	22:3,4,17		12:4	21.10
	23:3	desks		Europe
ross-	dealerstie	27:19	doctors	16:17
examination	declaration	detail	23:21	18:8
6:3 15:17	S	7:20	doctors'	28:20
21:20	6:12 7:5,		12:5	29:2
22:8 23:2	17 11:11	differently	12.0	30:20
ross-	19:11,19,	9:20	Drs	31:16,21
	21 20:4,	directed	12:3	evidence
xamined	0 12 1 <i>6</i>			evidence
examined 8.3	9,12,16	21:15	due	10.0
8:3	21:5,7 25:4,5	21:15 directly	due 24:22	19:9 20:10,16



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

evidently	fall	Franklin	11:20	hard
28:1,2	22:9	4:20	and	15:10
	25:19	Enongh	good	hand and
excerpt	falls	French 16:10	3:21 4:15	hard-and- fast
5:21 6:17	15:2	16:10	13:20 17:18	29:17
7:4,9,11,	15:2	Friedberg	17:10	29:17
13,14	favor	11:21	granted	head
exhibit	23:6	full	20:6	10:22
4:9 5:18	fight	28:6	grateful	heads
6:14	19:20		34:21	4:17 12:3
expense		fungible		_
22:8	file	10:14	Grimminger	hear June 20, 2018 18:9
	4:9		NFERENCE CALL	18:9
expenses	final	G	7:1 9:22	high
13:11	17:22		11:1	24:1
expert	find.		19:15	history
9:2 16:12	find 31:7	general 20:17	26:5	history
arml aim	31:7	20:17	ground	18:17,19
explain 5:12	fine	George	33:13	hold
5:12	34:7	3:2,10,13	a mou m d a	30:6
exploring	folks	4:5 5:14	grounds 33:14	Holding
31:22	9:12	32:17	33:14	22:13
extent	10:3,11	German	group	
11:7 27:7	19:3	9:6,7	28:15	Holdings
34:22	24:4,6	14:5,16	guess	22:22
51.66	28:6	31:17		Hong
			25:16	222:19
F	follow	Germany	30:4 31:4	
	30:18	5:5 13:9	32:12,13	Honor
facilitate	foreseeable	14:2,11		3:22 4:4
35:2	22:6,7	25:9,14	guy	10 5:13
E	formal	26:4,15	19:7	8:7 9:10, 18 11:12
fact		28:13,16	guys	
5:4 9:2,	25:15	30:21	7:16	13:14
10 19:16,	forward	32:4	10:14	18:2,11
21 20:17	29:14	Ghofrani	17:9 19:6	19:10,19
21:17	found	5:18 7:2,	27:18	23:9,14,
24:2,4	15:14,19	7,8 10:1	30:5	18 24:17
facts	20:14	11:1,9	31:11	26:6,21
7:18,22		12:3		27:8,18 29:9,11,
8:16	fourth	19:13		
factual	14:9	20:3 26:3	н	16 30:2, 8 14 16
8:3	Frankfurt	28:14		8,14,16
	12:15	33:12	happened	31:2,9,14 32:16
faith	14:13	Giessen/	22:19	32:16 34:9,14,
17:18		Glessen/ marburg		16 35:3,8



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

June 20, 2018 Index: Honors..LLC

independent	IPR2015-	joining	Kurt
27:5	01786	3:3	3:11
individual	8:9	iournal	18:12
	TDD2015	-	
			-
institution		Judge	L
20:14	0.13	3:8,16,20	
24:18	IPR2017-	4:1,7,16,	law
Instradent	00136	19 8:5	7:21
	16:21	9:15,19	15:13
	23:12	11:6,13	17:13,14
	TPR2017- 00	13:3	21June 20, 2018
_	01621	17:2,10,	23:6 28:9
8:15		13,21	lead
intend		18:9	14:17
	IPR2017-	23:10,15	28:4
	01622	26:12	2014
internists	4:22	27:1,16	learned
11:18	Israe]	29:3,12,	25:11
interrupt		17 30:3,	leave
-		11,17	20:6
		31:4	20.0
introductio	15:15	32:10,18	length
ns	issue	33:17,21	6:11 7:17
4:13		34:5,11,	level
invasive		17,22	31:12
12:6		35:6	800.211.DEPO (3376) Esquire Solutions.com
		Tudana	
		-	12:19
20:15		4:20	life-
inventorshi		jump	threatening
q		13:13	12:2
20:3	54.19	Tueties	
	issues		light
	5:3 21:6	14:16	25:6 32:8
23:21	23:8		limited
IPR2014-	31:17,22	ĸ	21:6
01198	32:9		_
16:10	Iver	kind	list
	-		24:1
	5.0	20:5	listed
		knowledge	5:19 9:3,
8:12	J	7:10	10
IPR2014-312		27:13	
22:14	ioined	Kong	live
	3:13 4:12	22:19	15:21
		//•IM	
	27:5 individual 20:22 institution 20:14 24:18 Instradent 8:9 15:14 Intellectua 1 8:15 intend 32:7 internists 11:18 interrupt 23:10 introductio ns 4:13 invasive 12:6 inventors 20:15 inventorshi P 20:3 involved 23:21 IPR2014-01198 16:10 IPR2014-312	27:5 01786 individual 8:9 20:22 IPR2015- institution 01951 20:14 8:13 24:18 IPR2017- Instradent 00136 8:9 16:21 23:12 Intellectua 1 01621 8:15 4:21 intend IPR2017- 32:7 01622 internists 4:22 11:18 Israel interrupt 15:18 23:10 Israeli introductio 15:15 ns issue 4:13 5:3,6,10 invasive 19:19 12:6 20:4,15, inventors 17:21:8 20:15 32:11,12, inventorshi 19:33:7 P 34:19 20:3 issues involved 5:3:21:6 23:21 23:8 IPR2014- 31:17,22 01198 32:9 16:10 Iyer	27:5 01786 3:3 individual 8:9 journal 20:22 IPR2015- 5:17 institution 8:13 Judge 20:14 3:8,16,20 24:18 IPR2017- 4:1,7,16, Instradent 00136 19.85 8:9 15:14 23:12 11:6,13 Intellectua IPR2017- 13:3 1 01621 13:21 intend IPR2017- 23:10,15 32:7 01622 26:12 internists 4:22 27:1,16 11:18 Israel 29:3,12, interrupt 15:15 32:10,15 issue 33:17,21 4:13 5:3,6,10 34:5,11, invasive 19:19 17,22 12:6 20:4,15, 35:6 inventors 17.21:8 Judges 20:15 29:4,6 4:20 32:21 23:8 Justice involved 5:3 21:6 14:16 23:21 23:8 Justice



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

June 20, 2018 Index: located..Owner

WATSON LABO	RATORIES vs U	NITED THERAPE	UTICS	Index: locatedOwner
22:14	make	misimpressi	Noble	ongoing
located	6:9 13:8	on	8:9	10:16
5:5 22:19	14:21	25:16	non-	operating
5:5 22:19	15:10,15,	missed	inventors	12:6
location	20 21:19	17:4	20:18	12:0
4:6 5:4	25:17	1/:4	20:18	operations
6:6 18:7	29:1	moment	non-issue	12:8
locations	34:2,22	10:21	32:21	oppose
11:20	makes	months	non-party	
13:18	10:1	12:10	5:4	
		14:5	5.1	opposed
logistical	marginal		note	28:2 June 20, 2018
15:5	28:17	-	NFERENCE CALL ISON LABORATORIES VI UNITED THERAPE	order
30:21	material	25:11,18	noted	18:3 26:9
31:22	20:17	move	18:14	31:6
logistics		29:14	22:3 26	
14:10	Mathas	32:12		
17:12	3:11,13,		notes	ordered
26:15	19 18:11,	multiple	21:17	22:22
	12 23:13,	24:3	notion	ordering
long	16 26:21	mute	33:2	15:17
14:17	29:10	30:5 34:1	-	16:1
18:17	30:8,15		number	
25:10	31:14	mutually	23:11	orders
longer	34:15	13:19	numbers	6:5
14:22	matter	18:7	6:14	overstated
	22:18			800.211.DEPO (1964:9
lot	34:19	N		
14:6			0	overstateme
lounging	matters			nt
10:10	24:8	names	objection	23:20
	means	4:14 6:13	26:14	Owner
	22:2	Natasha	occasions	3:3,5,7,
м		3:6	24:3	11 4:2
	medical	naturo	24:3	5:1,11
made	10:15	nature	occur	6:1 13:16
16:1 19:4	meetings	5:12 6:11	15:18	21:3,11
20:9 23:1	18:21	Nauheim	31:6	22:4,10,
28:19		11:20	offered	12 23:2,7
32:6	mentioned	negotiating	13:5,8,	25.16
33:3,11	15:13	17:18	28:13	26:2 27:2
	22:1,12			29:8
Maebius	middle	negotiation	offering	30:13
3:4	6:15	S	25:17	31:1
maintain		17:16	office	33:3,18,
31:18	Ministry	25:21	24:7 32	00 04 14
	14:16		2x., J2	• •
-				



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

June 20, 2018

WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS Index: Owner's..procedures

Owner's	participate	period	piece	potential
5:6 19:22	13:4	24:6,17	20:20	31:16
20:5,7	participati	25:1,6	place	practices
24:13,21	ng	27:6,15	24:15	12:5
26:17,18	27:12	periods	31:20	
31:5,15		24:5	32:4	pre-
32:14	parties			institution
34:7	6:4 13:17	permission	planned	19:20
	16:14,17	11:4 20:7	12:22	preliminary
P	17:7 21:9	28:8	plans	5:8 20:1,
	25:22	permitted	27:4	5,8 32:14
	30:19	16:3 👷		June 20. 3183:18
p.m.	party	person	23:8	proparo
30:9 34:3	21:18	32:5,8	23.0	prepare 25:8
35:10	29:5	52.5,0	played	23:0
pages	Patent	personal	24:19	preschedule
16:5	3:3,5,7,	24:7	plays	đ
19:13,14,	11 4:2	perspective	14:9	12:8
15 21:7	5:1,6,11,	31:5,15		present
paid	22 13:16		point	4:3 10:6
9:17,22	19:22	Petitioner	6:10 7:20	
10:2,3	20:5,7	3:9,17	8:20	presented
11:6	21:3,11	4:8 6:6,7	9:13,14,	5:8
18:15	22:4,9,11	9:4 13:6,	16 14:9	press
19:16	23:2,7	15 14:1	15:12	35:4
26:2,7	24:13,21	18:6,10,	17:18	100 21 50 BOOMENT OF L
	25:16	12 24:15	19:4,17,	22:12
pair	26:1,17,	26:14,16	18 27:20,	22:12
28:13	18 27:1	28:12	22 28:4,	previously
panel	29:8	29:10	16	33:11
4:14	30:13	30:1,15,	pointed	principal
21:16	31:1,5,14	22 31:13	16:7	26:13
22:3 30:5	32:13	32:21,22		20:15
34:1,5	33:3,18,	34:15	points 6:8 17:3	prior
	20 34:7,	Petitioner'		22:16,18
paper	13	s	23:18	priority
8:10,13,		14:19	portions	12:20
15 22:14,	patients	17:19	5:16 7:3	
21 23:11,	10:17		position	problem
13 33:6	11:21,22	phone 30:20	21:17	5:12
paragraph	12:6,16,	50:20	24:13	problems
5:16,17	20	physicians	27:18	12:1 15:5
19:5	pause	10:16		
nart	30:9 34:3	picked	post-sas	procedures
part		9:4,7,11	5:7,9	12:7,9,22
26:5	people's	J. I. / / I. I.	32:15	13:10
	24:1			



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

June 20, 2018

34:1		referring	12:20
putting	R	33:17	reply
		34:7	20:7,13
10.21	raise	reflected	24:22
			25:8
Q			
		•	reporter
question			4:2,5,11,
17:15			14,18
20:11,19	30:22		request
21:2 27:2	rate		14:14
30:18	32:7	L9:15 CONFERENCE CALL WATSON LABORATORIES VILUTIED THERAPEUTICS	June 20. 2713:2
32:7,13	reach	20:5	requested
34:6		reimburse	5:11
mentioning	30:1	13:11	2.11
	read	relator	requesting
10:14	23:14,17		5:2
questions	33:16	5:5,6	require
20:8	realistical	relating	12:12
mick	_	32:13	21:14
-	-	relationshi	
	12.12		required
	rearrange	-	12:21
	14:7		13:16
-	reason		15:7 18:4
	13:22		25:2
	14:1 22:1	Pa	Requires
		18:18	28:10
		relevant	
	26:8	19:1 27:5	resolution
	recall		26:9
	20:2		resolve
	magant l		31:7
	-	32:14	33:22
	10:20	relied	recoluing
	recognize	9:12 21:3	resolving
	23:22	33:13	29:14 31:16
	record	mol 1.	21:10
		-	respect
		21:12	9:15
21 35:3,8	refer	REM	20:10
quote	8:6 33:10	22:13,22	21:10,16
22:22	references	remarks	24:17
23:14,16			25:21
·····			32:2
	,_0	replacing	
	<pre>putting 10:21 Q question 17:15 20:11,19 21:2 27:2 30:18 32:7,13 34:6 questioning 18:14 questions 20:8 quick 27:2 Quillin 3:2,10, 15,22 4:4,5,10 5:13,14 8:7 9:18, 21 11:12, 15 13:8 17:5,11, 14,22 18:13 27:7,17 29:8,16, 20 30:7, 13 31:1,9 32:16,17, 20 33:20 34:9,13, 21 35:3,8 quote 22:22</pre>	putting R 10:21 raise Q raised Q raised question 14:19 17:15 30:22 20:11,19 21:2 27:2 30:18 32:7 32:7,13 reach 34:6 30:1 questioning read 18:14 23:14,17 questioning read 20:8 realistical quick ly 27:2 12:12 Quillin rearrange 3:2,10, 14:7 15,22 reason 4:4,5,10 13:22 14:1 22:1 Preason 3:2,10, 14:7 15,22 reason 4:4,5,10 13:22 13:2 reason 3:2,10, 14:7 15,22 reason 13:22 12:12 Quillin reasonable 15:13:14 14:1 22:1 14:2 <t< td=""><td>putting R 33:17 10:21 raise reflected Q raised Reichenberg question 14:19 er 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:11,19 9:22 21:27:2 7 31:16 7 questions 30:1 20:8 realistical quick 1y 21:12 relationshi 3:2,10, 14:7 13:21 reason 3:2,10, 14:7 13:21 relationshi 3:2,10, 14:7 <t< td=""></t<></td></t<>	putting R 33:17 10:21 raise reflected Q raised Reichenberg question 14:19 er 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:17 6:16,20, 20:11,19 9:22 21:27:2 7 31:16 7 questions 30:1 20:8 realistical quick 1y 21:12 relationshi 3:2,10, 14:7 13:21 reason 3:2,10, 14:7 13:21 relationshi 3:2,10, 14:7 <t< td=""></t<>



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS

June 20, 2018

6:2 14:12 21:13,18	short	spoke	20:4,13
21:13,18			
	6:21 7:5,	32:9	subsequent
22:2	18 8:3	Gauaro	24:18
	shorter	-	24.10
0			suggest
5		squeezing	4:15 19:8
		26:19	suitable
satisfactor	31:15	staff	13:18
У	sides	10:18	
18:7	15:9		summarize
save	- -	-	26:13
23:12	-	L2:9	summer
	25:12	stands	14:4
	situate	25:2	supplementa
	9:19	start	l
25:/ 28:7	gituation		1 5:7,9
schedules		5:10	24:21
14:7		statements	26:18
27:11		20:9,11	32:15
scheduling	16:15,18	states	33:5 34:8
-	solve		55:5 54:0
			support
			15:14
4:20			т
Seeger	35:1	23.1	
-	sort	24:10	900.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com
	10:13	26:3,11	takes
9:16	13:19	27:5 31:7	25:10
10:21	33:9,14		32:3
11:8 12:3	coucht		taking
	-	17:10	14:10
19:11	20:0	Steve	26:14
24:2 26:3	sounds	3:4	30:19
28:1,6,17	3:20	sticking	talking
	span	-	
	-		33:9
10:5,20		stuff	technologic
separate	speak	14:6	al
5:3	13:15	subject	7:19
set	speaking	-	telephonic
	4:19		16:4
	Coocifical 1		
	-	22:2,4	ten
	-	submitted	19:13
25:7	22:0	19:22	21:7 25:3
	S satisfactor y 18:7 save 23:12 schedule 24:19 25:7 28:7 schedules 14:7 27:11 schedules 14:7 27:11 scheduling 5:4 12:9 28:5 Scheiner 4:20 Seeger 7:3,10, 14,15 9:16 10:21 11:8 12:3 18:16,20 19:11 24:2 26:3 28:1,6,17 sense 10:5,20 separate	shorter s 19:16 sic satisfactor 31:15 y sides 18:7 15:9 save simple 23:12 25:12 schedule situate 24:19 9:19 25:7 28:7 schedules 15:9 14:7 25:12 schedules 15:9 14:7 25:12 schedules 15:9 14:7 25:12 schedules 15:9 14:7 30:10 5:4 12:9 28:5 30:21 Scheiner sooner 4:20 34:20 35:1 31:19 10:21 31:19 10:21 31:19 10:21 31:19 10:21 3:20 sense span 10:5,20 21:7 seeparate speak 5:3 13:15 <	shorter 22:13,21 S 19:16 squeezing sic 26:19 satisfactor 31:15 staff y sides 10:18 18:7 15:9 staffing save simple 12:9 23:12 25:12 staffing schedule situate 25:2 schedules situation 5:10 14:7 solution 20:9,11 scheduling 16:15,18 states 5:4 12:9 solution 28:5 30:21 9:16 Scheiner sooner 12:11 4:20 34:20 21:14,21 Seeger 35:1 23:1 7:3,10, sort 24:10 14,15 10:13 26:3,11 9:16 13:19 27:5 31:7 10:21 33:9,14 status 18:16,20 20:6 3:4 28:1,6,17 3:20 sticking



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS

June 20, 2018

ATSON LABO	RATORIES vs UN	NITED THERAPE	UTICS	ndex: termswee
26:19	15:1 24:7	13:1,17	27:4 31:7	view
+	25:1	15:8,16,		6:7 7:21
terms	27:6,15	22 16:14	unnecessari	8:16
13:6	28:4	18:4 19:3	ly	14:21
26:17	34:18	22:20	15:15,20	17:19
31:2		24:3	unpaid	28:19
testify	timeframe	27:12,14,	26:7	
6:17	24:16	22 28:22		Voswinckel
	26:16	22 28:22	unreasonabl	7:4,10,15
testimony	times		e	33:12
16:12	13:18	31:19	17:20	Voswinckel'
21:19	13:10	unable	unreasonabl	
Themeneutic	timing	24:10 🗱	NFERENCE CALL TSON LABORATORIES VS UNITED THERAPEUTICS	S June 20, 2018
Therapeutic	29:12		4	33:13
5		unavailabil	6:7	
15:4	toenail	ity	unwillingne	W
18:16,17,	12:1	19:2	SS	
22	token	undersellin	17:20	
thing	19:4			wait
6:22 7:8,	19.4	9 19:8	UTC	8:19
13,19	top	19:8	9:17	waits
-	12:20	understaffe	11:14,17	
13:19	tonia	đ	19:17	14:22
17:22	topic	14:5	24:4 28:3	walk
24:11	14:19			11:5
33:9,14	transcript	understand		
things	4:8,9	4:1 12:7,	v	wanted
15:6	35:1	17 13:21		9:16
18:13	_	14:12,17	Valve	800.211.DEPO (3976) EsquireSolutions.gen0:17
21:12	travel	16:11	16:20	Watson
	12:11	29:4,20	21:22	9:3,11
23:19	13:1,11		21:22	
24:12	19:3	understandi	variety	14:22
32:3	++	ng	11:19	15:2 16:6
third-party	treat	5:1 11:16		20:6
15:16	11:21	31:4	Ventures	Watson's
	trouble	Understood	8:15	13:11
thought	9:8 23:12	4:16	venues	
26:8		4:10	32:1	website
three name	truncated	United	52.1	29:21
three-page	25:6	8:2,18	versus	week
15:22	trust	12:11	20:16	
tight	28:20	15:3	22:13	12:14
24:16	20:20	18:16,17,	video	25:9
26:16		21,22		weeks
	υ	21,22 21:14,21	15:18	14:18,20
			16:2	24:20
time		23:1	30:20	
4:15 10:6			50.20	26.20
time 4:15 10:6 11:10	U.S. 6:3,6 9:6	24:10 26:3,11	32:2	26:20 29:22



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

CONFERENCE	CALL
CONFERENCE	UALL

June 20, 2018 Index: well-being..years

30:1	16 19:6,7	
well-being	wrote	
12:19	7:2,4,9,	
th draw	10 33:7,	
withdraw	15	
23:3		
withheld	Y	
6:8	-	
witnesses	Vearg	
5:5,22	years 18:20	
6:13 7:5,	28:1	CONFERENCE CALL. June 20, 2018
12 8:21,	28:1	CONFERENCE CALL June 20, 2018 WATSON LABORATORIES vs UNITED THERAPEUTICS
22 9:2,10		
10:9		
11:18		
12:12,18		
13:4 14:4		
17:6,8		
18:5,15		
20:22		
27:4		
28:10,11		
31:13		
32:8		
Wonderful		
3:15		604.211.DEIPO (X376) ElequireSolutions.com
work		
11:18		
13:18		
15:8		
16:14,18		
26:22 29:1		
31:12		
working		
12:13,14		
13:20		
15:9		
17:16		
18:4		
write		
6:18,19,		
20 7:1,2,		
8,13,15,		

