

Filed on behalf of: Abraxis Biosciences, LLC

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APOTEX INC. AND APOTEX CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, LLC
Patent Owner

IPR2018-00151; IPR2018-00152; IPR2018-00153
U.S. Patent Nos. 8,138,229; 7,820,788; and 7,923,536

DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER VELLTURO, Ph.D.

Filed on behalf of: Abraxis Biosciences, LLC

I, Christopher Velluro, Ph.D., hereby declare and state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I submit this declaration on behalf of Abraxis Bioscience, LLC (“Abraxis” or “Patent Owner”), Patent Owner of U.S. Pat. Nos. 7,820,788 (“the ’788 patent”), 7,923,536 (“the ’536 patent”), and 8,138,229 (“the ’229 patent”) (collectively, “the Abraxis Patents”) to provide my opinions on certain matters in connection with the petitions for *inter partes* reviews filed by Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp., (“Apotex” or “Petitioner”) in case nos. IPR2018-00151, IPR2018-00152, and IPR2018-00153 (collectively, the “Apotex IPR Petitions”).

II. BACKGROUND & QUALIFICATIONS

2. I am the founder and president of Quantitative Economic Solutions, LLC (“QES”), a microeconomic consulting firm. I received a Doctor of Philosophy degree (Ph.D.) in Economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1989. My fields of specialization include industrial organization and econometrics.

3. I have evaluated pharmaceutical patent issues in the context of commercial success and injunctive relief considerations on numerous occasions. I also have extensive experience in the valuation of intellectual property and in the assessment of economic injury/damages sustained as a result of copyright, trademark, and/or

patent infringement. Industries that I have studied in this context include: pharmaceutical products, over-the-counter medications and instruments, medical devices, consumer products, computer hardware and software, and semiconductors. I have been qualified and have testified as an expert in many Federal Courts throughout the United States as an economist generally, as an expert in statistics/surveys, and as an expert in the economics of the pharmaceutical industry specifically.

4. QES is being compensated for my time spent on this matter at an hourly rate of \$850, which is my customary rate. Payment is not contingent on the outcome of this matter. QES is also compensated for the time spent on this matter by persons working at my direction. Those rates are lower than my hourly rate.

5. A copy of my curriculum vitae, including a list of publications I have authored, is attached to this declaration as Appendix A.

III. BASIS OF OPINIONS

6. In forming my opinions, I have reviewed the Apotex IPR Petitions, portions of the Patent Owner's Preliminary Responses in IPR2017-01101; 01103; and 01104 ("Actavis IPRs"), the Institution Decisions in the Actavis IPRs, portions of the Abraxis Patents, portions of the references cited in the Petitions in the Actavis IPRs, as well as the other documents identified below.

7. The opinions expressed herein are also based on my knowledge, skill,

experience, training, and education.

IV. STATEMENTS

8. I have been asked to consider whether the Kadima reference (EX1004) would have provided economic motivation to a skilled artisan “to reduce Capxol™’s albumin-paclitaxel ratio in order to obtain a more cost-effective and commercially viable formulation.” (’229 Pet. 46; ’788 Pet. 45; ’536 Pet. 45)¹ Based on my review of Kadima, Desai (EX1006), and my knowledge in the field of economics with respect to the pharmaceutical industry as of 1998, it is my opinion that Kadima did not provide any such motivation to reduce the weight ratio based on the cost of albumin.

9. Petitioner argues that “[a]s Kadima explains, ‘[a]lbumin is a cost-limiting component for use in drug stabilization,’ because ‘[a]lbumin is an expensive ingredient.’” (’229 Pet. 46; ’788 Pet. 45; ’536 Pet. 45.) Petitioner relies on Kadima’s table, reproduced as Table 1 below, to provide “examples of cost

¹’229 Pet. refers to Apotex’s Petition for Inter Partes Review in IPR2018-00151. ’788 Pet. refers to Apotex’s Petition for Inter Partes Review in IPR2018-00152. ’536 Pet. refers to Apotex’s Petition for Inter Partes Review in IPR2018-00153.

differences for various ratios of albumin to paclitaxel—ranging from to \$10.70 for a 0.5:1 ratio to \$81.90 for a 10:1 ratio” and that “[b]ased on these significant differences, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to reduce Capxol™’s albumin-paclitaxel ratio in order to reduce the cost of producing the formulation.” (’229 Pet. 46; ’788 Pet. 46; ’536 Pet. 45-46.)

Table 1

| Molar ratio | Paclitaxel (mg) | HSA (g) | Paclitaxel Cost | HSA Cost⁽¹⁾ | Ingredients Total Cost |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1:10 | 30 | 23.4 | \$7 | \$74.90 | \$81.90 |
| 1:5 | 30 | 11.7 | \$7 | \$37.40 | \$44.40 |
| 1:2 | 30 | 4.7 | \$7 | \$15.00 | \$22.00 |
| 1:1 | 30 | 2.34 | \$7 | \$7.49 | \$14.50 |
| 1:0.5 | 30 | 1.17 | \$7 | 3.74 | \$10.70 |

(1) The fair 1999 market value of HSA is approximately \$3.20 per gram.

10. I understand that, as Patent Owner pointed out in its Preliminary Response in the Actavis IPRs, and the Board agreed, Kadima does not report weight ratios, only molar ratios. (IPR2017-01101, paper 7 at 32; IPR2017-01103, paper 7 at 31; IPR2017-01104, paper 7 at 32.) I further understand that a paclitaxel-to-albumin molar ratio of 1:10 converts to an albumin-to-paclitaxel weight ratio of 790:1, and the lowest reported molar ratio of 1:0.5 corresponds to a weight ratio of 39:1. (IPR2017-01101, paper 7 at 26; IPR2017-01103, paper 7 at 26; IPR2017-01104, paper 7 at 26.)

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.