

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC

Petitioner

v.

CIPLA LIMITED

Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2017-00807

U.S. Patent No. 8,168,620

---

**SECOND DECLARATION OF WARNER CARR, M.D.**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***

Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Professional and Educational Background.....	1
III.	Basis for my opinions .....	4
IV.	Summary of Opinions.....	6
V.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	8
VI.	The '620 Patent.....	10
VII.	Claim Construction.....	11
VIII.	State of the Art.....	13
	A. Many of the treatment options available in 2002 had overlapping effects in treating AR. ....	14
	B. A POSA would have known that co-administration of antihistamines and steroids provided no meaningful benefit as compared to steroids alone. ....	18
	C. The treatment recommendations and general practices prior to the date of invention were consistent with the co-administration studies' findings, and would not have encouraged a POSA to pursue a fixed-dose combination. ....	28
IX.	The art did not motivate a POSA to combine azelastine and fluticasone into a fixed-dose combination as recited in claims 1, 4-6, 24-26, 29, and 42-44.....	39
	A. The art as a whole did not motivate a POSA to develop an inflexible fixed-dose combination.....	41
	B. The art as a whole did not motivate a POSA to develop a fixed-dose combination that would be expected to yield no clinical benefit but exhibit increased side effects. ....	41

C.	The art as a whole did not motivate a POSA to select azelastine for use in a fixed-dose combination with a steroid in order to improve compliance. ....	42
D.	A POSA would not have been motivated to select azelastine based on any anti-inflammatory activity.....	44
E.	A POSA would not have been motivated to pursue a fixed-dose combination of an antihistamine and a steroid.....	45
X.	Objective indicia of non-obviousness suggests that the challenged claims are not obvious. ....	46
A.	Dr. Schleimer was present at the trial in district court.....	46
B.	The patents-in-suit exhibit several significant, unexpected clinical results.....	47
1.	From a clinical perspective, the closest prior art comprises the studies and review articles finding no additional benefit from adding an antihistamine to a steroid.....	48
2.	Dymista <sup>®</sup> shows an unexpected improvement in efficacy when compared to the closest prior art. ....	50
3.	Dymista <sup>®</sup> exhibits an unexpectedly fast onset of action compared to the closest prior art.....	53
4.	Dymista <sup>®</sup> has unexpectedly reduced side effects as compared to either azelastine or fluticasone monotherapies. ....	56
C.	Dymista <sup>®</sup> satisfies a long-felt but unmet need in the treatment of AR. ....	59
1.	Dymista <sup>®</sup> satisfies the long-felt need for more effective AR treatment. ....	60
2.	Dymista <sup>®</sup> satisfies the long-felt need for an AR treatment with a faster onset. ....	60

3. Dymista<sup>®</sup> satisfies the long-felt need for an AR treatment  
with fewer side effects. ....62

D. FDA was skeptical of Dymista<sup>®</sup> .....64

E. Dymista<sup>®</sup> has been widely praised in the industry as the new  
gold standard for the treatment of AR.....66

F. Dymista<sup>®</sup>, Duonase, and several Indian copycat products are  
covered by the challenged claims.....67

I, Warner Carr, do declare as follows:

**I. Introduction**

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

2. Patent Owner Cipla Ltd. (“Cipla”) has retained me as an expert witness in the *inter partes* review matter referenced above concerning U.S. Patent No. 8,168,620 (“the ’620 patent”) (EX1001). I understand that this petition for *inter partes* review was filed by Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC (“Argentum”).

3. I am being compensated for my time in connection with this matter at my customary rate of \$800 per hour, and my compensation does not depend upon the ultimate outcome of this case. I will also be compensated for any reasonable expenses that arise in connection with this matter, including travel costs incurred while conducting activities associated with this *inter partes* review.

4. I have been asked by Cipla to review and respond to Argentum’s petition and the supporting declaration submitted by Dr. Robert Schleimer.

**II. Professional and Educational Background**

5. I am currently a Partner and Vice-President of Allergy and Asthma Associates of Southern California and I am the Co-Medical Director of Southern California Research. I have served in both positions since 2009 after joining the practice in 2007.

# 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.