

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APOTEX INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

UCB BIOPHARMA SPRL,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2019-00400  
Patent 8,633,194

---

**DECLARATION OF SARFARAZ K. NIAZI**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A.	Background and Qualifications .....	1
B.	Compensation .....	4
C.	Materials Considered.....	4
<b>II.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF OPINIONS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>LEGAL STANDARDS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF FORMULATION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>CONTROLLING MICROBIAL GROWTH IN PHARMACEUTICAL FORMULATIONS .....</b>	<b>13</b>
A.	Testing for Antimicrobial Effectiveness .....	14
B.	Microbial Contamination Risk in Pharmaceutical Formulations.....	16
C.	Preservatives, and Other Options to Prevent Microbial Contamination .....	17
D.	Parabens.....	20
<b>IX.</b>	<b>LEVOCETIRIZINE AND ANTIHISTAMINES .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b>THE '194 PATENT .....</b>	<b>27</b>
A.	The '194 Patent.....	27
B.	Prosecution History .....	31

C. The European Opposition Proceedings are Irrelevant to This Petition.  
.....35

**XI. PETITIONER’S REFERENCES.....37**

A. EP ’203 (EX1004) .....37  
B. WO ’094 (EX1007) .....42  
C. Handbook (EX1006) .....45  
D. US ’558 (EX1015).....53  
E. Dr. Laskar’s References Allegedly Teaching a 9:1 Ratio of Methylparaben to Propylparaben .....54

**XII. OPINION REGARDING GROUND 1: WO ’094 AND THE HANDBOOK DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE. ....57**

A. WO ’094 Does Not Direct a POSA to Use an Oral Syrup.....58  
B. A POSA Would Not Be Motivated to Use the Handbook to Determine the Amounts and Ratios of the Preservatives in the Formulation of WO ’094. ....60  
C. The Handbook Does Not Teach a POSA to Use Methylparaben and Propylparaben in a “Ratio of 9/1 by Weight” and in an Amount of “More than 0 and Up to 0.75 mg/mL.” .....61  
    1. Dr. Laskar’s “Overlapping Range” is Not Grounded in Principles of Pharmaceutical Formulation.....62  
    2. The Prior Art Does Not Teach Using a 9:1 Ratio of Methylparaben and Propylparaben in a Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulation. ....66  
    3. A POSA Would Not Be Motivated to Minimize the Amount of Preservatives in a Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulation.....68  
D. A POSA Would Have No Reasonable Expectation of Succeeding in Making the Claimed Invention. ....71  
E. The Invention of the ’194 Patent was Surprising and Unexpected.....72

..

1.	It was Unexpected that Levocetirizine Would Have Antibacterial Properties. ....	73
2.	The '194 Patent Inventors Were Unexpectedly Able to Prepare a Formulation with Low Amounts of Parabens that Was Substantially Free of Bacteria.....	74
F.	Dependent Claims.....	78
1.	Dependent Claim 2 .....	78
2.	Dependent Claim 4 .....	78
3.	Dependent Claim 6 .....	79
4.	Dependent Claim 11 .....	80

**XIII. OPINION REGARDING GROUND 2: EP '203, US '558, AND THE HANDBOOK DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE. ....81**

A.	EP '203 Does Not Direct a POSA to Example 5. ....	83
B.	Dr. Laskar Does Not Explain Why a POSA Would Be Motivated to Modify the Methylparaben and Propylparaben Amounts and Ratio in EP '203 Example 5.....	84
C.	A POSA Would Not be Motivated to Combine the Teachings of the Handbook with Example 5 of EP '203.....	85
D.	A POSA Would Have No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Making the Claimed Invention.....	86
E.	The Handbook Does Not Teach a POSA to Use Methylparaben and Propylparaben in “a Ratio of 9/1” and in “an Amount of More than 0 and up to 0.75 mg/mL.”.....	87
F.	The Invention of the '194 Patent was Surprising and Unexpected.....	88
G.	Dependent Claims.....	88

...

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. I, Sarfaraz K. Niazi, Ph.D., have been retained by Fenwick & West LLP, counsel for Patent Owner UCB Biopharma Sprl (“Patent Owner”), as an expert witness in the above-captioned *inter partes* review of United States Patent No. 8,633,194 (the “’194 patent”) (EX1001). I understand that Apotex, Inc. (“Apotex”) has petitioned for *inter partes* review of the ’194 patent and requests that the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) cancel as unpatentable claims 1-11 of the ’194 patent.

2. This declaration sets forth my analyses and opinions based on the materials I have considered thus far, as well as the bases for my opinions.

### A. Background and Qualifications

3. While a copy of my curriculum vitae is submitted as Exhibit 2009, below I provide a high-level overview of my experience with pharmaceutical formulation, beginning with my education. In 1966, I received my B.Sc. in Chemistry from Karachi University, Pakistan. I then received my B. Pharm, also from Karachi University in 1969. I went on to receive my M.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences from Washington State University in 1970, followed by my Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical Sciences from the University of Illinois in 1974.

4. From 1972 to 1988, I served full-time on the faculty of the University of Illinois College of Pharmacy, where I taught pharmacokinetics as well as

# 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.