

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

NALOX-1 PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

ADAPT PHARMA OPERATIONS LIMITED, and  
OPIANT PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Patent Owners.

---

Case IPR2019-00685  
U.S. Patent No. 9,211,253

---

**DECLARATION OF STUART A. JONES, PH.D.**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....i

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.....6

III. THE ADAPT PATENTS.....13

IV. LEGAL PRINCIPLES OF OBVIOUSNESS.....16

V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....19

VI. CONSTRUCTION OF CLAIMS .....23

VII. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL BACKGROUND.....23

    A. Formulation Basics.....23

    B. Pharmacokinetic Basics.....25

    C. Best Practices in Drug Development .....28

VIII. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS.....29

    A. The POSA’s Goals Would Not Have Led To The Claimed Invention.....29

    B. Wyse Leads Away From, Not Towards, The Claimed Invention.....33

    C. The Claimed Use Of A Preservative, And Specifically BZK And EDTA, Was Not Obvious.....37

        1. Wyse Taught Away From The Use Of BZK, Or BZK And EDTA, In A Naloxone Formulation. ....37

        2. Other Prior Art Also Taught Away From The Use Of BZK, BZK And EDTA, And Preservatives Generally.....66

**DECLARATION OF STUART A. JONES**

3. The Prior Art Provided Many Other Options For Preservatives And Excipients. ....79

4. The POSA Would Not Have Had Reasonable Expectation That A Formulation With BZK Or BZK And EDTA Would Be Stable.....84

5. Dr. Donovan Has Not Demonstrated That The POSA Would Have Used Any Preservative Other Than BZK At The Claimed Concentration Ranges. ....85

D. The Claimed Dose Of 4 Milligrams Was Not Obvious. ....93

1. The Prior Art Practice Was To Administer A Low Initial Dose Of Naloxone And Increase That Dose Slowly Over Time Only if Needed. ....93

2. The Prior Art Taught That An Initial Intranasal Dose Of 2 Milligrams Or Less Was Effective And Discouraged Higher Doses.....96

3. Wyse Taught A Dose Of 2 Milligrams And Taught Away From A Product That Delivered Higher Amounts Of Naloxone Faster. ....102

4. Neither Of Nalox-1’s Experts Identified Anything About Wyse’s Final Formulation That The POSA Would Have Wanted To Change.....120

5. The POSA Would Not Have Wanted To Increase The Dose To Match The Pharmacokinetic Exposure Of An Injection Dose Of More Than 0.4 Milligrams. ....124

6. Davies and Wang Did Not Teach A Dose Of 4 Milligrams And Would Not Have Provided A Reasonable Expectation of Success With Such A Dose.....141

E. Administering Intranasal Naloxone In A Single Spray In One Nostril Was Not Obvious. ....145

F. The Claimed Device Limitations Would Not Have Been Obvious. ....146

**DECLARATION OF STUART A. JONES**

G. The Claimed Combination Would Not Have Been Obvious..... 148

IX. OBJECTIVE INDICIA DEMONSTRATE THE NON-OBVIOUSNESS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS..... 151

A. The Unexpected Properties. .... 151

1. The Claimed Invention Displays Unexpected Stability Compared To Wyse. .... 151

2. The Claimed Invention Displays Superior Pharmacokinetics Compared To Wyse..... 154

B. The Failure Of Others To Arrive At A Dose Of More Than 2 Milligrams, Or To Arrive At The Entire Claimed Invention, Demonstrates Nonobviousness. .... 158

1. AntiOp/Indivior Failed To Secure FDA Approval For Their 1.8 Milligram Nasal Naloxone Product. .... 159

2. Amphastar Failed To Secure FDA Approval For A 2 Milligram Nasal Naloxone Product. .... 160

3. Mundipharma Developed A 2 Milligram Nasal Naloxone Product But Did Not Seek FDA Approval. .... 161

C. Others Copying The Claimed Dose Demonstrates Nonobviousness..... 161

D. There Is A Nexus Between The Challenged Claims And Objective Indicia Of Nonobviousness. .... 162

E. Narcan® Nasal Spray Embodies The Claimed Invention. .... 165

1. Limitation-by-Limitation Analysis ..... 165

2. Narcan® Nasal Spray Embodies The Claims Of The '253, '747, And '965 Patents ..... 167

Table of Exhibits..... 173

Appendix A: Dependent Claim Embodiment Analysis.....Appendix 1

***DECLARATION OF STUART A. JONES***

I, Stuart A. Jones, Ph.D., declare as follows:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. I am an expert in the field of drug development, which includes the fields of drug formulation, drug delivery, dosage form design, dose selection, formulation, manufacturing, and pharmacokinetics, including as applied to the development of intranasal and inhalation products. I am currently a Reader, an academic position equivalent to a U.S. professorship, in Pharmaceutics at King's College London. I have held this position since 2019. I was previously a Senior Lecturer from 2010 and a Lecturer from 2005. Since 2009, I have been the Director of two Masters of Science programs, in Drug Development Science and Clinical Pharmacology. My complete curriculum vitae is found at Exhibit 2200.

2. On behalf of Patent Owners Adapt Pharma Operations Limited and Opiant Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (collectively, "Adapt"), I have been asked to provide my opinion as to whether the claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,211,253 ("the '253 patent"), 9,468,747 ("the '747 patent"), and 9,629,965 ("the '965 patent") (collectively, "the Adapt patents" or "the challenged patents"), would have been obvious to the hypothetical person of ordinary skill ("POSA") in the art as of March 16, 2015. I have also been asked to respond to opinions and testimony offered by Dr. Maureen Donovan and Dr. Günther Hochhaus concerning the validity of the Adapt patents, both in their declarations and at their depositions.

# 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.