

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS
Deposition of GUNTHER HOCHHAUS, held at the
offices of:

Arent Fox
1717 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Taken pursuant to notice before Tina M.
Alfaro, a Notary Public within and for the District
of Columbia.

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS
APPEARANCES:
ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:
ARENT FOX

BY: RICHARD BERMAN, ESQ.
BRADFORD FRESE, ESQ.
YELEE KIM, ESQ.
1717 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY
BY: JESSAMYN BERNIKER, ESQ.
KEVIN HOAGLAND-HANSON, ESQ.
725 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

and
GREEN GRIFFITH
BY: JESSICA TYRUS MacKAY, ESQ.
676 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

1	GUNTHER HOCHHAUS	
2	INDEX	
3	EXAMINATION	
4	WITNESS	PAGE
5	GUNTHER HOCHHAUS	
6	By Ms. Berniker	6
7	By Mr. Berman	334
8	EXHIBITS	
9	PATENT OWNER EXHIBITS	PAGE
10	Exhibit 2059	40
11	"Concepts in Clinical Pharmacokinetics"	
12	Exhibit 2060	67
13	Chapter co-authored with Dr. Derendorf	
14	Exhibit 2061	77
15	Paper: "Current concepts in pharmacokinetics and their implications for clinical medicine"	
16	Exhibit 2062	103
17	Diagram of concentration time profile	
18	PREVIOUSLY MARKED EXHIBITS	
19	EXHIBITS	PAGE
20	Exhibit 1007	201
21	Wyse patent	
22	Exhibit 1013	183
23	Kushwaha paper	
24	Exhibit 1032	213
25	Presentation	
	Exhibit 1035	134
	2008 Kerr paper	

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS
PREVIOUSLY MARKED EXHIBITS
(cont'd)

3	EXHIBITS	PAGE
4	Exhibit 1036	295
5	2009 Kerr paper	
6	Exhibit 1040	280
7	2010 Merlin paper	
8	Exhibit 1044	21
9	PDR	
10	Exhibit 1049	24
11	2012 FDA meeting transcript	
12	Exhibit 1051	286
13	Sabzghabae paper	

NOTE: Exhibit 2059 not tendered
for inclusion with transcript

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

(Witness sworn.)

WHEREUPON:

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS,

called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

BY MS. BERNIKER:

Q. Good morning, Doctor. My name is Jessamyn Berniker, and I represent the Patent Owner in this case. Nice to meet you.

A. Hello.

Q. I understand that you've been deposed before?

A. A few times, yes.

Q. And you understand that you're under oath today?

A. Yes.

Q. And you understand that you're testifying under penalty of perjury; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you have to provide the most complete and truthful answers; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. They need to be both truthful and complete;

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

do you understand that?

A. I understand.

Q. I thought you might say that. You understand that the testimony that you provided by way of declaration, which you have in front of you, to the Patent Office was also under penalty of perjury, right?

A. Yes.

Q. And that you also had an obligation to provide complete and truthful answers there; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you understood that when you signed it?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you review your declaration carefully to confirm that you believed that everything you said in there was complete and truthful?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Well, I'd like to direct your attention -- I'm going to work off of the '747 Patent, Case No. IPR 2019-0688 version of your declaration for today. So you're welcome to reference the other ones if you want, but that's the

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

one that I'm going to be referring to when we talk about paragraph numbers.

MS. BERNIKER: Counsel, did you want a copy?

MR. BERMAN: I'll take one, please.

BY MS. BERNIKER:

Q. Okay. Can I refer you, please, to paragraph 64 -- I'm sorry -- yes, paragraph 64 of your declaration in that case. Did you draft the declaration, sir?

A. We did it together. So I found my opinion and then I got, of course, help.

Q. Is it your view the words in here are your own?

A. Yeah.

Q. You stand by them?

A. Yeah.

Q. You stand by the choices of what you cited and what you didn't cite?

A. Yeah.

Q. And you stand by what you reviewed in preparing these opinions?

A. Yeah. I tried my best, yes.

Q. Do you believe that you reviewed any

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

materials that would have been -- a reasonable person would have reviewed in preparing the opinions that you submitted here?

A. I believe so.

Q. Did you go out of your way to try to make sure that you reviewed everything that you think would have been relevant to your opinions?

A. Yeah. I mean, I did quite a bit of Google searches. I did some literature searches by myself.

Q. You did independent research beyond what the attorneys provided to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So I want to direct your attention to paragraph 64 and something that you say in paragraph 64, and you said -- in 64 you're talking about your position that "In emergency situations in general and in naloxone therapy" --

A. Where are you?

Q. Paragraph 64. You say "As I mentioned above" --

A. Yes.

Q. -- "in emergency situations in general, and in naloxone therapy in particular, rapid onset of action and high drug exposure are desired to get the

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

overdose victim breathing normally as quickly as possible"; do you see that?

A. I see that.

Q. And when you talk about overdose victim, you're talking about opioid overdose victims, right?

A. Let me just read through the sentence again. You're pretty fast.

Q. Sorry.

(Witness reviewing document.)

A. That sentence says that "In emergency situations in general" --

Q. Yes.

A. -- "and in naloxone therapy in particular, rapid onset of action and high drug exposure" --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

A. It says that "In emergency situations in general" -- so it's not totally focused alone on the therapy -- "and naloxone therapy in particular, rapid onset of action and high drug exposure are desired to get the overdose victim breathing normally as quickly as possible."

Q. And with respect to naloxone, the overdose victim has overdosed on what?

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

A. In this case opioids.

Q. Okay. You're talking about people who have overdosed on opioids, right?

A. That would include people with opioid overdose.

Q. With respect to naloxone, the drug is being used to treat people who have opioid overdose, not some other kind of overdose, right, sir?

A. The overdose would be included, yes.

Q. Right. I'm asking now a separate question from your sentence. When we're talking about the use of naloxone to reverse overdose, that is about reversing opioid overdose, right?

A. If you only say overdose, that would include -- that would not specify it. If you say that naloxone is being used for a very, very specific situation, then it would include the very, very specific situation.

Q. Is naloxone used to treat different kinds of overdose apart from opioid overdose?

A. I would have to think about it.

Q. Sitting here today, you're not aware of that right, sir?

A. I would have to think about it.

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

Q. I'm asking are you aware today about whether naloxone -- how about this. Is naloxone indicated for the use of reversing any kind of overdose aside from opioid overdose?

A. I would have to look into the label directly.

Q. You haven't considered that question in forming your opinions today?

A. Not yet. I would -- I would have -- right now I would need to look at the label.

Q. Okay. Well, here's my question for you. In the 65 or so pages of your expert report were they based on the premise that naloxone is being used to treat opioid overdose?

A. That would include it, yes.

Q. Were they based on the premise that naloxone was being used for some other purpose?

A. Can you slow down?

Q. Sure. Were they based on the premise that naloxone was being used for some other purpose?

A. I would need to clearly read very, very much through my declaration and see whether there was something else in it.

Q. When's the last time you read your

GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

declaration?

A. Fully? A long time ago.

Q. You did not read your declaration fully before coming for a deposition about your declaration that is all of 65 pages, sir?

MR. BERMAN: Objection to form.

MS. BERNIKER: In preparing for coming here to testify today, is it your testimony that you didn't bother to read your 65-page declaration?

MR. BERMAN: Objection to form.

MS. BERNIKER: You can answer.

A. Huh?

Q. You can answer even though he objects.

A. I certainly read significant portions of it.

Q. Okay.

A. But it's 65 pages. It's a lot. So -- and I'm getting older. So I would need to go through it and clearly see whether other things were included or not.

Q. I assume that you're not suggesting that your age prevents you from being able to digest the information in your 65-page declaration, right?

MR. BERMAN: Objection to form.

1 GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

2 A. No.

3 Q. Okay. You have the mental capacity to
4 understand what you said here?

5 A. Absolutely.

6 Q. And you plan to defend it today, right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Okay. So my question to you, sir, is is
9 your declaration about what a person of skill in the
10 art would have done in connection with using
11 naloxone to treat opioid overdose, or is it in
12 connection with something else?

13 A. It includes opioid overdose.

14 Q. Okay. Is there any other type of overdose
15 that you intended to include by your declaration?

16 A. It certainly includes the overdose,
17 absolutely.

18 Q. You're not answering my question. Is there
19 another kind of overdose that you intended to
20 include in terms of what the person of skill in the
21 art would have been focused on in connection with
22 your declaration?

23 A. To just be on the safe side I would need to
24 see the label.

25 Q. Okay. I'm not sure we have the label. We

1 GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

2 have the PDR. Let's hold on that question. We'll
3 come back to it.

4 A. Okay.

5 Q. In selecting -- in the comments that you
6 make about the appropriate dose of intranasal
7 naloxone, sir, was there some particular clinical
8 effect that you thought the person of skill in the
9 art would be trying to achieve?

10 A. I don't understand what you mean. Can you
11 rephrase?

12 Q. Okay. You have a bunch of opinions in here
13 about the dose of intranasal naloxone that a person
14 of skill in the art would have considered; is that
15 fair?

16 A. Yeah. Can you direct me to those?

17 Q. It's your entire report, isn't it?

18 MR. BERMAN: Objection to form.

19 A. You are asking me a very specific question,
20 and I would like to know what section of my report
21 you are referring to.

22 Q. Okay. Let's try another question. What
23 are the opinions in your report about generally?

24 A. About the things that are in here. Let's
25 go through them. It's the table of contents. So it

1 GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

2 covers the background and qualifications, it talks
3 about certain legal standards, it describes the
4 state-of-the-art. I then discuss the motivation to
5 design a nasal formulation having high
6 bioavailability with a reasonable expectation of
7 success, and it goes through --

8 Q. Is your expert -- is your declaration about
9 what a person of skill in the art as of March of
10 2015 would be thinking in connection with the
11 development of an intranasal naloxone product?

12 A. Certainly not in the entirety. I mean,
13 that probably would not be able to be captured in 65
14 pages.

15 Q. It wouldn't, would it?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Okay. Well, which aspects of that were you
18 intending to capture in your 65 pages?

19 A. As I said, I talk about the motivation to
20 design a naloxone nasal formulation having high
21 bioavailability with a reasonable expectation of
22 success. I talk about claim construction, I talk
23 about some other things, but the main portion
24 certainly deals with the prior art patent
25 application disclosure. It talks about the known

1 GUNTHER HOCHHAUS

2 physico-chemical and biopharmaceutical and
3 pharmacological properties of naloxone --

4 Q. Okay. I don't need you to read the entire
5 table of contents into the record.

6 A. You were asking me what my declaration is
7 about.

8 Q. What would a person of skill in the art be
9 trying to achieve in 2015?

10 A. That's a very, very -- I can't really --
11 you need to be more specific.

12 Q. Okay. It's your testimony that the person
13 of skill in the art would be trying to achieve
14 something in doing whatever it is that you say that
15 they need to do, right?

16 MR. BERMAN: Objection to form.

17 A. You need to be -- a person -- a POSA --
18 there are lots of POSA's. So you need to be more
19 specific.

20 Q. Is it your view that there are different
21 POSA's for the same obviousness analysis so that you
22 could have one POSA doing one thing and another POSA
23 doing something else and another POSA doing
24 something else?

25 A. Well, as I -- as I stated in my

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.