

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SLAYBACK PHARMA LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

EYE THERAPIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-00142
U.S. Patent No. 8,293,742

DECLARATION OF ROBERT J. NOECKER, MD, MBA

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Introduction.....	4
II. Qualifications and Professional Experience.....	4
III. Information Considered.....	8
IV. Summary of Opinions.....	9
V. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	11
VI. Technical Background.....	13
A. Anatomy of the Eye.....	13
B. Adrenergic Receptors.....	17
C. Ocular Conditions.....	20
1. Eye redness	20
2. Glaucoma	23
D. State-of-the-art redness relievers: “an α_1 mediated effect”.....	24
E. Not all α -adrenergic agonists characterized as “vasoconstrictors” work similarly.....	27
1. Vasoconstriction (α_1 effect) versus vasodilation (α_2 effect)	27
2. Adrenergic receptor location and effect of agonist selectivity on reduction of eye redness	28
F. Brimonidine—a highly selective α_2 agonist.....	30
1. Brimonidine’s known adverse side effects	30

2.	The prior art established that brimonidine’s blanching effects were concentration dependent, rapidly diminishing as the concentration decreased.....	34
3.	A POSA would not have chosen brimonidine as an α_2 agonist redness reliever absent hindsight knowledge.....	37
VII.	The ’742 Patent.....	40
VIII.	Claim Construction.....	48
A.	Relevant Legal Principles.....	48
B.	“ocular condition”	48
C.	“about 0.025%”	52
1.	“about 0.025%” does not include 0.03%	52
2.	Responses to Dr. Laskar’s Opinions.....	56
IX.	The ’742 patented methods would not have been obvious	59
A.	Relevant Legal Principles.....	60
B.	Discussion of References Relied on by Dr. Sher.....	61
1.	Alphagan [®] Label 1998 and Alphagan [®] NDA.....	61
2.	Federal Register 1988	66
3.	U.S. Patent No. 6,294,553.....	67
4.	Walters 1991	75
5.	Norden 2002.....	77
6.	U.S. Patent No. 6,242,442.....	81
7.	Scruggs 2000.....	84
8.	U.S. Patent No. 6,562,873.....	85
C.	Response to the Petitioner’s Grounds of Purported Invalidity	85

1.	Ground No. 1 – The '553 patent does not expressly or inherently anticipate claims 1 and 2	85
2.	Ground No. 2 – Walters 1991 does not expressly or inherently anticipate claims 1 and 2	89
3.	Ground No. 3 – Claims 1-6 are not obvious	91
D.	Objective, real-world evidence of nonobviousness	118
1.	Lumify® Product	119
2.	Unexpected superiority of the '742 patent's invention over prior art ophthalmic redness reducers	121
3.	Lumify®—the commercial embodiment of the patented invention—enjoyed significant industry praise	141

I. Introduction

1. I, Robert J. Noecker, submit this declaration to state my opinion on the matters described below.

2. I have been retained by Eye Therapies, LLC, as an independent expert in this proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

3. I understand that this proceeding involves U.S. Patent No. 8,293,742 (“the ’742 patent”), and that I have been asked to provide my opinions of whether the subject matter of the claims of the ’742 patent is patentable.

4. This declaration sets forth my opinions from the perspective of a person ordinarily skilled person in the art, which I have formed in this proceeding based on my education, training, clinical research, knowledge, personal and professional experience, my understanding as an expert in the field, and my study of the evidence.

5. I am being compensated for my time at the rate of \$750 per hour. This compensation is not contingent upon the nature of my findings, the presentation of my findings in testimony, or the outcome of this proceeding.

II. Qualifications and Professional Experience

6. My curriculum vitae is submitted with this declaration as Appendix A. I have summarized my educational and professional background below.

7. I received a Bachelor of Science in Biology from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1985. I also received a Bachelor of Science in Materials

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.