

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

HOPEWELL PHARMA VENTURES, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

MERCK SERONO S.A.  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2023-00481  
U.S. Patent No. 8,377,903

---

**DECLARATION OF AARON E. MILLER, 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.	My Background and Qualifications.....	2
III.	Summary of Opinions.....	5
IV.	List of documents I considered in formulating my opinions.....	10
V.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (“POSA”).....	13
VI.	State of the Art Prior to December 22, 2004 .....	14
	A. Multiple sclerosis is a chronic disease with no known cure .....	14
	B. Immunosuppression was a common therapeutic strategy to treat multiple sclerosis before December 2004 .....	22
	C. Cladribine, a known immunosuppressant, was used to treat multiple sclerosis before December 2004 .....	26
	1. Clinical studies assessing parenteral cladribine in MS patients began in the early 1990s .....	27
	2. By December 2004, oral cladribine was favored to treat MS patients .....	37
	D. MS often requires cyclical drug therapy to prevent relapses and limit progression of the disease.....	39
VII.	The ’903 Patent Specification and Claims .....	43
VIII.	Claim Construction.....	45
	B. “Total Dose of Cladribine” .....	45
	C. “Induction Period”.....	46
	D. “Maintenance Period” .....	47
IX.	Basis of my analysis with respect to obviousness.....	48
X.	My analysis with respect to claim 17 .....	50

*Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,377,903*  
*Declaration of Aaron E. Miller, M.D.*  
*(EX1002)*

A.	Bodor and Stelmasiak teach orally administering cladribine to treat multiple sclerosis, including RRMS .....	51
B.	Bodor’s and Stelmasiak’s cladribine dosing regimens include an “induction period;” Bodor’s induction period is 2 months long .....	53
C.	Bodor teaches the claimed total dose of cladribine administered in an induction period.....	55
D.	Bodor and Stelmasiak teach retreating with cladribine after a cladribine-free period .....	56
E.	Stelmasiak teaches administering a lower dose of cladribine in the retreatment period compared to the induction period; a POSA would have known how to optimize the maintenance period dose and length.....	58
F.	Stelmasiak teaches a second cladribine-free period after the maintenance period; a POSA would have known how to optimize the length of the second cladribine-free period.....	65
G.	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Bodor and Stelmasiak with a reasonable expectation of success .....	67
1.	A POSA would have been motivated to formulate an oral cladribine composition per Bodor.....	67
2.	A POSA would have been motivated to treat relapsing-remitting MS by administering Bodor’s oral cladribine composition according to Stelmasiak’s induction period/cladribine-free period/maintenance period/cladribine-free period framework.....	68
3.	A POSA would have been motivated to administer “about 1.7 mg/kg to about 3.5 mg/kg” in an induction period.....	74
4.	A POSA would have administered a lower total dose of cladribine in the maintenance period compared to the total dose in the induction period.....	75

*Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,377,903*  
*Declaration of Aaron E. Miller, M.D.*  
*(EX1002)*

5.	A POSA would have routinely optimized the prior art to arrive at the claimed total cladribine dose and length of the maintenance period .....	77
H.	A POSA would have had a reasonable expectation of success .....	78
XI.	My analysis with respect to claim 19 .....	84
XII.	My analysis with respect to claim 20 .....	85
XIII.	My analysis with respect to claims 22 and 23 .....	86
XIV.	My analysis with respect to claim 24 .....	87
XV.	My analysis with respect to claim 25 and 26 .....	88
XVI.	My analysis with respect to claim 27 .....	89
XVII.	No objective indicia of non-obviousness exist.....	90
XVIII.	Conclusion.....	90

*Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,377,903*  
*Declaration of Aaron E. Miller, M.D.*  
*(EX1002)*

I, Aaron E. Miller, M.D., hereby declare as follows.

**I. Introduction**

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

2. I have been retained as an expert witness on behalf of Petitioner Hopewell Pharma Ventures, Inc. (“Hopewell”) for the above-captioned *inter partes* review (“IPR”). I am being compensated for my time in connection with this IPR at my standard consulting rate, which is \$790/hr.

3. I understand that the petition for IPR involves U.S. Patent No. 8,377,903 (“the ’903 patent”), EX1001, which resulted from U.S. Application No. 12/766,173 (“the ’173 application”), filed on April 23, 2010, which is a continuation of U.S. Application No. 11,722,018, which is the National Phase Entry of International Patent Application No. PCT/EP2005/056954, filed on December 20, 2005, which claims the benefit of the U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/638,669, filed on December 22, 2004, and the Foreign Patent Application No. EP04106909, filed on December 22, 2004. EX1001, De Luca. The ’903 patent issued on February 19, 2013, from the ’173 application. *Id.* The ’903 patent names Giampiero De Luca, Arnaud Ythier, Alain Munafo, and Maria Lopez-Bresnahan as

# 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.