

CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY

Alderson®

COURT REPORTING



A Trustpoint Company

Transcript of **Stuart Allen Jones**

Friday, February 21, 2020

Nalox-1 Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Adapt Pharma Operations Ltd.

Alderson Court Reporting
1-800-FOR-DEPO (367-3376)
Info@AldersonReporting.com
www.AldersonReporting.com

Alderson Reference Number: 91002

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2 BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

3 - - - - - X

4 NALOX-1 PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC :
5 Petitioner, : Case No.
6 v. : IPR2019-00685
7 ADAPT PHARMA OPERATIONS LTD., and : IPR2019-00688
8 OPIANT PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., : IPR2019-00694
9 Patent Owners. :

10 - - - - - X

11 Friday, February 21, 2020
12 Washington, DC

13 CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY

14 Deposition of STUART ALLEN JONES, a
15 witness herein, called for examination by the
16 Petitioner in the above-entitled matter, pursuant to
17 notice, the witness being duly sworn by Desirae S.
18 Jura, a Notary Public in and for the District of
19 Columbia, taken at Williams & Connolly LLP, at 9:33
20 a.m., Friday, February 21, 2020, and the proceedings
21 being taken down by stenotype by Desirae S. Jura,
22 RPR, and transcribed under her direction.

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 On behalf of the Petitioner:

4 RICHARD J. BERMAN, ESQUIRE

5 YELEE Y. KIM, ESQUIRE

6 Arent Fox LLP

7 1717 K Street, NW

8 Washington, DC 20006

9 (202) 857-6000

10 richard.berman@arentfox.com

11 yelee.kim@arentfox.com

12

13 On Behalf of Patent Owners Adapt Pharma

14 Operations Ltd., and Opiant Pharmaceuticals,

15 Inc.:

16 JESSICA TYRUS MACKAY, ESQUIRE

17 Green, Griffith & Borg-Breen, LLP

18 676 North Michigan Avenue

19 Suite 3900

20 Chicago, Illinois 60611

21 (313) 883-8000

22 jmackay@greengriffith.com

Page 3

1 APPEARANCES (Continued):

2

3 On behalf of the Patent Owner Adapt Pharma

4 Operations Limited:

5 DAVID M. KRINSKY, ESQUIRE

6 JESSAMYN S. BERNIKER, ESQUIRE

7 JESSICA PALMER RYEN, ESQUIRE

8 Williams & Connolly LLP

9 725 12th Street, NW

10 Washington, DC 20005

11 (202) 434-5338

12 dkrinsky@wc.com

13 jberniker@wc.com

14 jryen@wc.com

15

16 ALSO PRESENT:

17 JOSHUA H. HARRIS

18 Burford Capital

19 350 Madison Avenue

20 New York, New York 10017

21 (646) 849-6410

22 jharris@burfordcapital.com

Page 4

C O N T E N T S

2 WITNESS	PAGE
3 STUART ALLEN JONES	
4 BY MR. BERMAN	6
5	
6 Afternoon session - Page 83	
7	
8	
9	
E X H I B I T S	
10 EXHIBIT NO.	PAGE
11 1 - Pharmacokinetic Properties and Human	
12 Use Characteristics of an FDA-Approved	
13 Intranasal Naloxone Product for the	
14 Treatment of Opioid Overdose	58
15 2 - Pharmacokinetic Interaction between	
16 Naloxone and Naltrexone Following	
17 Intranasal Administration to Healthy	
18 Subjects	66
19 3 - Quaternary Ammonium Compounds: Simple	
20 In Structure, Complex in Application	71
21 4 - Chemical Stability of Pharmaceuticals	
22 A Handbook for Pharmacists	89

Page 5

E X H I B I T S (Continued):

2 EXHIBIT NO.	PAGE
3 5 - Bentley and Dyke: 512. The Structure	
4 of pseudoMorphine	92
5 6 - Stability of Morphine in Aqueous Solution	
6 III Kinetics of Morphine Degradation in	
7 Aqueous Solution	95
8 7 - Investigation of 4,5-epoxymorphinan	
9 degradation during analysis by HPLC	98
10 8 - Differences between opioids:	
11 Pharmacological, experimental, clinical	
12 and economical perspectives	100
13 9 - Research Article, Effect of Formulation	
14 Variables on the Nasal Permeability and	
15 Stability of Naloxone Intranasal	
16 Formulations	125
17 - - -	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

Page 6

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 Whereupon,

3 STUART ALLEN JONES

4 was called as a witness by counsel for the

5 Defendants, and having been duly sworn, was examined

6 and testified as follows:

7 EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

8 BY MR. BERMAN:

9 Q. Good morning, Dr. Jones. My name is Rich

10 Berman. I'm counsel for petitioner Nalox-1

11 Pharmaceuticals, LLC.

12 Can you recite your full name and home

13 address for the record.

14 A. Stuart Allen Jones. 42 Fairlawns Langley

15 Road, Watford, United Kingdom.

16 Q. We'll go over some ground rules. Let me

17 know if you don't hear or understand the question.

18 If you answer, we'll assume you heard and understood

19 the question. Okay?

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. Let me know if you don't know or can't

22 remember the information sought by the question. If

Page 7

1 you answer, we will assume that you know and remember

2 the information sought. Okay?

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. We have a court reporter who is making a

5 transcript, so be sure to answer in a way that the

6 court reporter can record in the transcript. And

7 you'll need to answer out loud. The court reporter

8 cannot record nodding or shaking of the head. Also,

9 please say yes rather than uh-huh. Okay?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And let me know if you want to take a

12 break for any reason. Okay?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And let me know if you realize that an

15 answer you previously gave is inaccurate or

16 incomplete. Just say that you want to correct or

17 supplement a previous answer. Okay?

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. Is there any reason why you cannot give

20 full and complete answers today?

21 A. No.

22 Q. You submitted declarations in connection

Page 8

1 with certain IPRs, correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. I'm showing you what's been previously

4 marked as Exhibit 2201 for the IPRs in the '253,

5 '747, and '965 patent matters.

6 Do you see that?

7 MR. KRINSKY: And I'd like to note for the

8 record that you've passed out copies marked

9 Protective Order Material. We can sort out

10 confidentiality designations afterwards, but at least

11 on an interim basis, let's mark the transcript

12 confidential.

13 MR. BERMAN: Sure.

14 BY MR. BERMAN:

15 Q. Do you see that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. I am going to use for questioning today

18 the '253 IPR. Okay?

19 A. Okay.

20 Q. And if any answer you give today would be

21 different for either of the other two IPRs, the '747

22 or '965, will you let me know that?

Page 9

1 MR. KRINSKY: Objection to form.

2 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question,

3 please?

4 BY MR. BERMAN:

5 Q. Sure. I'm going to use the '253 as the

6 basis of going through and asking you some questions.

7 But if, in the context of answering those questions,

8 if your answer would be different depending on which

9 of the three patents we're talking about, can you let

10 me know the difference?

11 MR. KRINSKY: If I could just state for

12 the record, I believe these are all the same exact

13 documents under the cover sheet.

14 MR. BERMAN: Right. I understand that.

15 BY MR. BERMAN:

16 Q. What I'm saying is, inartfully, if an

17 answer you're going to give would be different if we

18 were talking about the '253 patent declaration versus

19 the '747 or the '965 patent, will you let me know if

20 there's any difference in your answer?

21 MR. KRINSKY: Object to the form of the

22 question. Vague.

Page 10

1 THE WITNESS: I believe the three
2 documents are identical.
3 BY MR. BERMAN:
4 Q. Okay. Let's go to paragraph 7 of your
5 declaration. And you see, there is a summary of the
6 asserted grounds of obviousness for all three of the
7 IPRs?
8 MR. KRINSKY: Counsel, did you mean page
9 7?
10 MR. BERMAN: Paragraph 7.
11 MR. KRINSKY: Thank you.
12 THE WITNESS: In paragraph 7, it says, "I
13 understand that each proceeding Nalox-1 argues that
14 the challenged claims of the Adapt patents are
15 obvious over a combination of references, as set
16 forth in the charts below."
17 And the charts below mention asserted
18 grounds of obviousness. Yes.
19 BY MR. BERMAN:
20 Q. And you see the main reference is the Wyse
21 reference?
22 A. Can you explain what you mean by "main"?

Page 11

1 Q. Well, under the asserted grounds of
2 obviousness, it says Wyse and HPE, Wyse, Djupesland,
3 and HPE, and so on and so forth. Do you see that?
4 A. I can see there's four references
5 mentioned in those tables.
6 Q. You're familiar with the Wyse patent, are
7 you not?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. Can you turn to paragraph 22 on page 13.
10 And the last sentence there says, "The Adapt patents
11 disclose formulations, devices, and methods for nasal
12 delivery of pharmaceutical compositions comprising
13 naloxone." Do you see that?
14 A. I see those words at the bottom of the
15 page 13, yes.
16 Q. And turning onto paragraph 27, here you
17 recite three categories of claims covered by the
18 Adapt patents. Do you see that?
19 A. At the bottom of page 15, I note, "In
20 general, the claims of the Adapt patents fall into
21 three categories: (1) claims directed to
22 pharmaceutical formulations for intranasal

Page 12

1 administration of an opioid antagonist - in
2 particular, naloxone; (2) claims directed to
3 single-use, pre-primed devices adapted for nasal
4 delivery of such pharmaceutical formulations; and,
5 (3) methods of treating opioid overdose and symptoms
6 thereof by nasally administering naloxone using
7 those" -- and it continues on the next page --
8 "devices and formulations." Yes.
9 Q. And in paragraph 28, you recite what the
10 formulations in the Adapt patents generally comprise.
11 Do you see that?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. In your opinion, which of the features
14 distinguish the Adapt patents from the prior art?
15 MR. KRINSKY: Object to the form of the
16 question. Vague.
17 THE WITNESS: Can you explain what you
18 mean by the word "distinct"?
19 BY MR. BERMAN:
20 Q. What features, in your opinion, are
21 different between the Adapt patents and the prior
22 art?

Page 13

1 MR. KRINSKY: Object to the form of the
2 question. Vague.
3 THE WITNESS: Can you explain what you
4 mean by "features," please?
5 BY MR. BERMAN:
6 Q. Let's do it this way. I'm showing you
7 what's been previously marked as Exhibit Nalox 1007.
8 This is the Wyse '570 patent. Do you see that?
9 A. Yes, I see that.
10 Q. You're familiar with this reference?
11 You've seen it before?
12 A. Yes, I believe I've seen it before.
13 Q. So Wyse discloses intranasal
14 administration of a composition to reverse opioid
15 overdose, correct?
16 A. Yes. That's correct.
17 Q. And Wyse discloses an aqueous solution
18 containing naloxone hydrochloride, correct?
19 A. Yes. That's correct.
20 Q. And Wyse discloses sodium chloride as an
21 isotonicity agent, correct?
22 A. Wyse uses sodium chloride, but I can't

1 000 FOR DEFO

11 1 000 FOR DEFO

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.