

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APOTEX, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

UCB BIOPHARMA S.A.
Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,633,194 to Fanara *et al.*
Case No.: IPR2019-00400

DECLARATION OF DR. PAUL A. LASKAR, PH.D.

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	MY EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	2
III.	LIST OF MATERIALS CONSIDERED.....	9
IV.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	11
	A. Obviousness.....	11
V.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (“POSA”).....	14
VI.	THE ’194 PATENT.....	16
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	18
VIII.	SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART.....	19
	B. Levocetirizine Was a Known Prior Art Compound and was Suitable for Liquid Preparations.....	19
	C. Methylparaben and Propylparaben Are Widely Used Preservatives.....	23
	1. WO ’094 (EX1007).....	25
	2. EP ’203 (EX1004).....	26
	3. Handbook (EX1006).....	27
	4. US ’558 (EX1015).....	30
IX.	INVALIDITY OF THE ’194 PATENT.....	31
	B. Ground 1: Claims 1-11 Would Have Been Obvious over WO ’094 in view of the Handbook.....	32
	1. Claim 1.....	32
	a) “A liquid pharmaceutical composition comprising (i) levocetirizine or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt of levocetirizine”.....	34
	b) “a preservative mixture consisting essentially of a mixture of methyl parahydroxybenzoate and propyl	

Declaration of Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D.

parahydroxybenzoate in a ratio of 9/1 expressed in weight”.....35

(1) There is no Teaching Away in the Handbook37

c) “said [paraben] mixture being present in an amount of more than 0 and up to 0.75 mg/ml of the composition”.....39

d) “wherein said composition is substantially free of bacteria”.....43

5. Dependent Claim 244

6. Dependent Claim 345

7. Dependent Claim 445

8. Dependent Claims 5 and 10.....45

9. Dependent Claim 646

a) “wherein the hydrochloride salt of levocetirizine is present in amount of 0.5 mg/ml”46

b) “the mixture of methyl p-hydroxybenzoate and propyl p-hydroxybenzoate is present in amount of 0.75 mg/ml.”48

10. Dependent Claim 749

11. Dependent Claim 850

12. Dependent Claim 950

13. Dependent Claim 11.....51

a) “the composition is in the form of an oral solution comprising 0.50 mg/ml levocetirizine dihydrochloride”.....51

b) “0.675 mg/ml methyl p-hydroxybenzoate, and 0.075 mg/ml propyl p-hydroxybenzoate”52

C. Ground 2: Claims 1-11 Are Obvious over EP '203 in View of US '558 and the Handbook.....53

2. Claim 154

Declaration of Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D.

a)	“A liquid pharmaceutical composition comprising (i) levocetirizine or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt of levocetirizine”	57
b)	“a preservative mixture consisting essentially of a mixture of methyl parahydroxybenzoate and propyl parahydroxybenzoate in a ratio of 9/1 expressed in weight”	58
c)	“said [paraben] mixture being present in an amount of more than 0 and up to 0.75 mg/ml of the composition”	60
d)	“wherein said composition is substantially free of bacteria”	62
3.	Dependent Claim 2	63
4.	Dependent Claim 3	64
5.	Dependent Claim 4	64
6.	Dependent Claims 5 and 10.....	64
7.	Dependent Claim 6	65
a)	“wherein the hydrochloride salt of levocetirizine is present in amount of 0.5 mg/ml”	65
b)	“the mixture of methyl p-hydroxybenzoate and propyl p-hydroxybenzoate is present in amount of 0.75 mg/ml”	67
8.	Dependent Claim 7	67
9.	Dependent Claim 8	68
10.	Dependent Claim 9	69
11.	Dependent Claim 11.....	69
a)	“the composition is in the form of an oral solution comprising 0.50 mg/ml levocetirizine dihydrochloride”	70
b)	“0.675 mg/ml methyl p-hydroxybenzoate, and 0.075 mg/ml propyl p-hydroxybenzoate”	73
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS.....	74

I, Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D., do hereby declare and state as follows:

1. I have been asked to provide testimony as to what one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood with respect to the patent at issue and various prior art discussed herein. I provide this testimony below:

I. INTRODUCTION

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

3. I have been retained on behalf of Petitioner for the above-captioned *inter partes* review (“IPRs”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate, which is \$300 per hour for consulting; \$375 per hour for deposition and testimony, including preparation; \$125 per hour for non-working travel time. My compensation does not depend in any way on the outcome of any of the IPRs.

4. It is my understanding that the Petitions for *Inter Partes* Review in this matter involves U.S. Patent No. 8,633,194 (“the ’194 patent”) (EX1001).

5. The ’194 patent names Domenico Fanara, Jean Scouvert, Claire Poulain, and Michel Deleers as the purported inventors.

6. It is also my understanding that Patent Owner contends the priority date of the ’194 patent is July 14, 2004—the filing date of EP Application No. 04016519.

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.