UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SLAYBACK PHARMA LLC

Petitioner
v.
EYE THERAPIES, LLC

Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,293,742

Case No. IPR2021-Unassigned

DECLARATION OF PAUL A. LASKAR, PH.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND 4
A. Education and Experience 4
B. Materials Considered 6
C. Scope of Work, Compensation 7
D. Testimony as Expert in Last Four Years 7
II. LEGAL STANDARDS 8
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (POSA) 10
IV. BACKGROUND TO THE '742 PATENT 11
A. The Use of Vasoconstrictor Eye Drops to Reduce Eye Redness Was a Well Established Field 11
B. 2-Imidazoline Derivatives Were Known as Vasoconstrictors for Reducing Eye Redness 12
C. Brimonidine Was Known to Be a Potent Vasoconstrictor With Favorable Properties for an Eye Redness Reducer 13
D. Brimonidine Was Approved in 1996 for Use in Eye Drops 14
E. Prior Art Discloses "Low Concentrations" of Brimonidine 16
F. The Prior Art Disclosed Brimonidine Eye Drops With a pH of 6.3 to 6.5 17
V. U.S. PATENT 8,293,742 18
A. Excerpts from the Specification of the '742 Patent 18
1. Summary of the Present Invention 18
2. Background of the Invention 18

3. "Brimonidine" Is Defined Broadly 19
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 20
A. "0.03%" Is Included in "about 0.025%" 20
VII. OPINIONS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF A FORMULATOR.....26
A. Certain Publications Relied on by Dr. Sher 26
1. The '553 Patent 26
2. Walters 1991 28
3. Pasquali 2013 33
4. Alphagan® Label 1998 33
5. Scruggs 2000 33
6. Federal Register 1988 34
7. Derick 1997 34
B. A POSA Was Motivated to Formulate at a pH between about 5.5 and about 6.5 35
C. It Was Routine for a POSA to Formulate Brimonidine Ocular Drops at Any Concentration Between 0.001% and 0.05% and at Any pH between about 5.5 and about 6.5 36
D. Dose Ranging 37
E. A Proper Comparison to the Prior Art Would Be to the "0.03%" Brimonidine in Example 1 of the '553 Patent or to the 0.02% Brimonidine in Walters 1991 38

1. I, Paul A. Laskar, Ph.D., have been retained by counsel for Petitioner Slayback Pharma LLC (Petitioner or Slayback). I understand that Petitioner seeks *inter partes* review ("IPR") of U.S. Patent 8,293,742 (EX-1001, '742 patent), assigned to Eye Therapies, LLC (Patent Owner), to request that the United States Patent and Trademark Office cancel claims 1-6 of the '742 patent as unpatentable. I submit this expert declaration in support of Petitioner's IPR Petition for the '742 patent.

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND

A. Education and Experience

2. I am currently President and Principal Consultant with Paul Laskar Associates, Inc.

3. In 1965 I received a B.A. in General Science (Chemistry, Biology) from University of Rochester.

4. In 1968 I received a B.S. in Pharmacy from University of Illinois – Medical Center.

5. In 1971 I received an M.S. in Pharmacy from University of Illinois – Medical Center.

6. In 1974 I completed my Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical Sciences at Oregon State University with a minor in Biostatistics.

7. In 1988 I received an MBA from University of California at Irvine, (General Management, International Management, Marketing).

8. Following completion of my graduate work, I taught for about nine years at two colleges of pharmacy, University of Illinois-Chicago Campuses and Creighton University. In late 1982, I joined Allergan as a formulation scientist where I advanced ultimately to Director of Product Development in Allergan's dermatology business group, Herbert Laboratories. In this capacity, I was involved in CMC (chemistry, manufacturing, and controls) activities for Allergan's beta-blocker ophthalmic as well as other ophthalmic products as well as their first topical retinoid.

9. I then joined CoCensys where I led the CMC efforts for two successful INDs, one for a parenteral and the other for an oral liquid. In 1994, I joined Santen Inc, the U.S. subsidiary of a leading Japanese specialty company, Santen LTD. There I led the pharmaceutical development department which during my tenure resulted in four successful NDAs and formulation of Santen's first prostanoid product for glaucoma.

DOCKET ALARM

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.