

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HIKMA PHARMACEUTICALS USA INC.,
HIKMA PHARMACEUTICALS PLC,
Petitioner,

v.

AMARIN PHARMACEUTICALS IRELAND LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2021-00215
Patent 8,642,077 B2
Issued: February 4, 2014

Title: STABLE PHARMACEUTICAL
COMPOSITION AND METHODS OF USING SAME

DECLARATION OF EDWARD A. FISHER, M.D., Ph.D., M.P.H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF CITED EXHIBITS	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	7
II. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.....	8
III. LEGAL STANDARDS USED IN MY ANALYSIS	13
A. Prior art.....	14
B. Person of ordinary skill in the art.....	14
C. Anticipation	16
D. Obviousness.....	17
IV. THE '077 PATENT.....	20
A. The challenged claims	20
B. The specification	21
V. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND	23
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	26
VII. PRIOR-ART REFERENCES	31
A. Yokoyama I	31
B. Mori	34
C. Yokoyama II.....	35
D. Satoh.....	37
E. Grimsgaard	40
VIII. OPINIONS OF UNPATENTABILITY	41
A. Grounds based on Yokoyama I.....	42
1. <u>Ground A.1: Yokoyama I anticipates claims 1, 8, and 19.....</u>	42
a. Independent claim 1.....	42
b. Dependent claim 8.....	52
c. Dependent claim 19	56
2. <u>Ground A.2: Dependent claim 8 would have been obvious over Yokoyama I in view of Satoh.</u>	56
3. <u>Ground A.3: Dependent claims 14–18 would have been obvious over Yokoyama I in view of Grimsgaard.</u>	60

a.	Dependent claims 14, 16, 17	60
b.	Dependent claims 15 and 18.....	63
B.	Grounds based on Mori and Yokoyama II.....	63
1.	<u>Ground B.1</u> : Claims 1, 8, and 19 would have been obvious over Mori in view of Yokoyama II.	64
a.	Independent claim 1.....	64
b.	Dependent claim 8.....	71
c.	Dependent claim 19	72
2.	<u>Ground B.2</u> : Dependent claim 8 would have been obvious over Mori in view of Yokoyama II and Satoh.	73
3.	<u>Ground B.3</u> : Dependent claims 14–18 would have been obvious over Mori in view of Yokoyama II and Grimsgaard.	74
a.	Dependent claims 14, 16, 17	74
b.	Dependent claims 15 and 18.....	76
C.	There are no secondary considerations of nonobviousness.	77
1.	The claimed method does not produce unexpected results.	77
2.	Patent Owner’s Vascepa lacks a nexus to the claims.	86
3.	Any alleged secondary considerations would be discounted by the blocking effect of existing and expected patents.	87
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	90

LIST OF CITED EXHIBITS

No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,642,077 B2 to Manku et al. (the “’077 patent”)
1002	Expert Declaration of Edward A. Fisher, M.D., Ph.D., M.P.H.
1003	WO 2007/142118 to Yokoyama et al. (2007) (certified English translation) (“Yokoyama I”)
1004	Trevor A. Mori et al., <i>Purified Eicosapentaenoic and Docosahexaenoic Acids Have Differential Effects on Serum Lipids and Lipoproteins, LDL Particle Size, Glucose, and Insulin in Mildly Hyperlipidemic Men</i> , 71 AM. J. CLINICAL NUTRI. 1085 (2000) (“Mori”)
1005	Mitsuhiro Yokoyama et al., <i>Effects of Eicosapentaenoic Acid on Major Coronary Events in Hypercholesterolaemic Patients (JELIS): a Randomized Open- Label, Blinded Endpoint Analysis</i> , 369 LANCET 1090 (2007) (“Yokoyama II”)
1006	Noriko Satoh et al., <i>Purified Eicosapentaenoic Acid Reduces Small Dense LDL, Remnant Lipoprotein Particles, and C-Reactive Protein in Metabolic Syndrome</i> , 30 DIABETES CARE 144 (2007) (“Satoh”)
1007	Sameline Grimsgaard et al., <i>Highly Purified Eicosapentaenoic Acid and Docosahexaenoic Acid in Humans Have Similar Triacylglycerol-Lowering Effects but Divergent Effects on Serum Fatty Acids</i> , 66 AM. J. CLINICAL NUTRI. 649 (1997) (“Grimsgaard”)
1008	<i>Third Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III) Final Report</i> , 106 CIRCULATION 3143 (2002) (“ATP-III”)
1009	Plaintiffs’ Corrected Post-Trial Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (Feb. 27, 2020) from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc.</i> , No. 16-2525, D.I. 377, ¶ 510 (D. Nev.) (“Amarin FFCL”)
1010	Day 2 (Jan. 14, 2020) Trial Transcript from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc.</i> , No. 16-2525 (D. Nev.) (Testimony of Dr. Budoff) (“Budoff Tr.”)
1011	Margaret Carroll, et al., <i>Serum Lipids of Adults 20–74 Years: United States, 1976–80</i> , Nat’l Ctr for Health Statistics, Vital & Health Statistics, 11(242) (1993) (“Nat’l Health Survey”)

No.	Description
1012	Hartmut H-J Schmidt et al., <i>Lipid Evaluation in HIV-1-Positive Patients Treated with Protease Inhibitors</i> , 4 ANTIVIRAL THER. 163 (1999) (“Schmidt”)
1014	Lovaza®, PHYSICIANS’ DESK REFERENCE 2699 (62d ed. 2007) (“Lovaza PDR”)
1015	Shuichi Nozaki et al., <i>Effects of Purified Eicosapentaenoic Acid Ethyl Ester on Plasma Lipoproteins in Primary Hypercholesterolemia</i> , 62 INT’L J. VITAMIN & NUTR. RES. 256(1992) (“Nozaki”)
1016	Koji Shinozaki et al., <i>The Long-Term Effect of Eicosapentaenoic Acid on Serum Levels of Lipoprotein (a) and Lipids in Patients with Vascular Disease</i> , 2(2) J. ATHEROSCL. THROMB. 107 (1996) (“Shinozaki”)
1018	Day 7 (Jan. 28, 2020) Trial Transcript from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc.</i> , No. 16-2525 (D. Nev.) (Testimony of Dr. Toth) (“Toth Tr.”)
1019	Plaintiffs’ Validity Contentions from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc.</i> , No. 16-2525 (D. Nev.)
1020	Plaintiffs’ Infringement Contentions from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. et al. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc. et al.</i> , C.A. No. 20-1630 (D. Del.)
1021	Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Motion to Dismiss from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. et al. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc. et al.</i> , C.A. No. 20-1630 (D. Del.)
1022	Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. et al. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc. et al.</i> , C.A. No. 20-1630, D.I. 17 (D. Del.) (“Complaint”)
1023	Exhibit U to Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. et al. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc. et al.</i> , C.A. No. 20-1630, D.I. 17-22 (D. Del.) (Christie Ballantyne et al., <i>Efficacy and Safety of Eicosapentaenoic Acid Ethyl Ester (AMR101) Therapy in Statin-Treated Patients with Persistent High Triglycerides</i> , AM. J. CARDIOL. 1 (2012)) (“Ballantyne”)
1024	Exhibit V to Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint from <i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. et al. v. Hikma Pharm. USA Inc. et al.</i> , C.A. No. 20-1630, D.I. 17-23 (D. Del.) (Deepak L. Bhatt et al., <i>Cardiovascular Risk Reduction with Icosapent Ethyl for Hypertriglyceridemia</i> , 380 N. ENGL. J. MED. 11 (2018)) (“Bhatt”)

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.