

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

-----)
SAMSUNG BIOEPIS COMPANY, LTD.,)
Petitioner,) IPR NOS.
vs.) 2023-00739
REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.) 2023-00884
Patent Owner.)
-----)

DEPOSITION OF RICHARD MANNING, Ph.D.
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 27, 2024

REPORTED BY: Tina Alfaro, RPR, CRR, RMR

<p>1 Videotaped deposition of</p> <p>2 RICHARD MANNING, Ph.D., held at the offices of:</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER, LLP</p> <p>5 601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW</p> <p>6 Washington, D.C. 20001</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 Taken pursuant to notice before Tina M.</p> <p>9 Alfaro, a Notary Public within and for the District</p> <p>10 of Columbia.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 I N D E X</p> <p>2 EXAMINATION</p> <p>3 WITNESS PAGE</p> <p>4 RICHARD MANNING, Ph.D.</p> <p>5 By Mr. Erwine 6</p> <p>6 EXHIBITS</p> <p>7 DEPOSITION EXHIBITS PAGE</p> <p>8 Exhibit 1001-A 14</p> <p>9 '572 Patent</p> <p>10 Exhibit 1001 14</p> <p>11 '601 Patent</p> <p>12 Exhibit 2027 14</p> <p>13 Declaration of Michael Stewart, M.D.</p> <p>14 regarding '601 Patent</p> <p>15 Exhibit 2043 13</p> <p>16 Declaration regarding '601 Patent</p> <p>17 Exhibit 2065 14</p> <p>18 Declaration of Michael Stewart M.D.</p> <p>19 regarding '572 Patent</p> <p>20 Exhibit 2067 13</p> <p>21 Declaration regarding '572 Patent</p> <p>22 Exhibit 2172 86</p> <p>23 DME Market Assessment Quarter 3 2017</p> <p>24 Exhibit 2224 91</p> <p>25 Wet AMD Physician ATU Q4 2017</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p>
<p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:</p> <p>3 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP</p> <p>4 BY: RICHARD ERWINE, ESQ.</p> <p>5 ELLIOT CHOI, ESQ.</p> <p>6 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor</p> <p>7 New York, NY 10010</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:</p> <p>10 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER, LLP</p> <p>11 BY: MATTHEW WILK, ESQ.</p> <p>12 DAVID CAINE, ESQ.</p> <p>13 250 West 55th Street</p> <p>14 New York, NY 10019</p> <p>15 and</p> <p>16 MORRISON FOERSTER</p> <p>17 BY: DREW HILLIER, ESQ.</p> <p>18 12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100</p> <p>19 San Diego, CA, 92130-2040</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 ALSO PRESENT: Orson Braithwaite (videographer)</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p>	<p>1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We are 09:05:23</p> <p>2 going on the record at 9:05 a.m. on March 27, 2024. 09:05:24</p> <p>3 Please note that the microphones are sensitive and 09:05:30</p> <p>4 may pick up whispering and private conversations. 09:05:32</p> <p>5 Please mute your phones at this time. Audio and 09:05:36</p> <p>6 video recording will continue to take place unless 09:05:38</p> <p>7 all parties agree to go off the record. 09:05:41</p> <p>8 This is media unit 1 of the video-recorded 09:05:44</p> <p>9 deposition of Dr. Richard Manning in the matter of 09:05:46</p> <p>10 Samsung Bioepis Company, Ltd. versus Regeneron 09:05:51</p> <p>11 Pharmaceuticals, Inc. filed in the United States 09:05:56</p> <p>12 Patent and Trademark Office before the Patent Trial 09:05:59</p> <p>13 and Appeal Board, Case No. IPR-203 -- excuse me -- 09:06:03</p> <p>14 2023-00884. 09:06:07</p> <p>15 My name is Orson Braithwaite representing 09:06:12</p> <p>16 Veritext Legal Solutions, and I'm the videographer. 09:06:15</p> <p>17 The court reporter is Tina Alfaro from the firm 09:06:16</p> <p>18 Veritext Legal Solutions. 09:06:19</p> <p>19 Counsel will now state their appearances 09:06:20</p> <p>20 and affiliations for the record. 09:06:23</p> <p>21 MR. ERWINE: Richard Erwine of Quinn 09:06:25</p> <p>22 Emanuel on behalf of the Petitioner Samsung 09:06:28</p> <p>23 Bioepis. With me is my colleague Mr. Elliot Choi. 09:06:31</p> <p>24 MR. WILK: Matthew Wilk of Arnold & Porter 09:06:37</p> <p>25 on behalf of Patent Owner Regeneron. With me is my 09:06:40</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p>

<p>1 colleague David Caine. Also joining is Drew 09:06:44</p> <p>2 Hillier from the law firm of Morrison & Foerster 09:06:47</p> <p>3 and remotely is Eileen Woo from Regeneron. 09:06:52</p> <p>4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. 09:06:54</p> <p>5 Will you the court reporter please swear 09:06:55</p> <p>6 in the witness. 09:06:57</p> <p>7 (Witness sworn.) 09:07:04</p> <p>8 WHEREUPON: 09:07:04</p> <p>9 RICHARD MANNING, Ph.D., 09:07:04</p> <p>10 called as a witness herein, having been first duly 09:07:04</p> <p>11 sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 09:07:04</p> <p>12 EXAMINATION 09:07:04</p> <p>13 BY MR. ERWINE: 09:07:07</p> <p>14 Q. Good morning. Could you please state your 09:07:07</p> <p>15 name for the record. 09:07:09</p> <p>16 A. My name is Richard Manning. 09:07:10</p> <p>17 Q. And is it okay if I refer to you as 09:07:12</p> <p>18 Dr. Manning today? 09:07:15</p> <p>19 A. Sure. 09:07:16</p> <p>20 Q. Excellent. 09:07:17</p> <p>21 Dr. Manning, is there anything restricting 09:07:21</p> <p>22 you from providing complete and truthful testimony 09:07:23</p> <p>23 today? 09:07:23</p> <p>24 A. No. 09:07:23</p> <p>25 Q. Are you taking any medication that would 09:07:25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. And I think you -- in your CV 09:08:35</p> <p>2 you've indicated that you've testified a few times 09:08:38</p> <p>3 at trial; is that correct? 09:08:39</p> <p>4 A. Yes. 09:08:41</p> <p>5 Q. And is that -- have you testified at the 09:08:41</p> <p>6 PTAB for purposes of an IPR petition? 09:08:43</p> <p>7 A. So my understanding is that there is no 09:08:45</p> <p>8 live testimony at the PTAB, but I've submitted 09:08:47</p> <p>9 several declarations before the PTAB. 09:08:50</p> <p>10 Q. And how about District Court? 09:08:54</p> <p>11 A. I've testified in District Court four or 09:08:55</p> <p>12 five times. I'd have to, again, go back and look. 09:08:58</p> <p>13 Q. And were those patent cases? 09:08:59</p> <p>14 A. No. 09:09:01</p> <p>15 Q. Do you recall the general subject matter 09:09:02</p> <p>16 of those cases? 09:09:04</p> <p>17 A. Commercial litigation of various kinds. 09:09:05</p> <p>18 Q. And I think that you may have said this 09:09:12</p> <p>19 already, but you -- you've provided several 09:09:15</p> <p>20 declarations concerning the purported commercial 09:09:20</p> <p>21 success of Eylea? 09:09:25</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I have. 09:09:27</p> <p>23 Q. And do you recall how many declarations 09:09:28</p> <p>24 you've submitted with respect to commercial success 09:09:30</p> <p>25 of Eylea? 09:09:35</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p>
<p>1 impede your ability to provide complete and 09:07:27</p> <p>2 truthful testimony? 09:07:30</p> <p>3 A. No. 09:07:32</p> <p>4 Q. And Dr. Manning, I understand you've been 09:07:33</p> <p>5 deposed a number of times before? 09:07:37</p> <p>6 A. Yes. 09:07:38</p> <p>7 Q. Do you recall how many? 09:07:38</p> <p>8 A. Not exactly. Probably between 15 and 20, 09:07:40</p> <p>9 but I don't know the exact number. 09:07:43</p> <p>10 Q. And do you recall how many times you've 09:07:45</p> <p>11 been deposed with respect to the Regeneron/Samsung 09:07:47</p> <p>12 disputes at the PTAB? 09:07:53</p> <p>13 A. Regeneron/Samsung, I'd have to go back and 09:07:55</p> <p>14 look. I've been deposed by -- on Regeneron matters 09:07:58</p> <p>15 at the PTAB for different Petitioners. I don't 09:08:03</p> <p>16 remember the exact number. 09:08:08</p> <p>17 Q. And with respect to those depositions, the 09:08:11</p> <p>18 ones concerning Regeneron, did you review your 09:08:14</p> <p>19 deposition transcripts after the depositions to 09:08:20</p> <p>20 check for any errors? 09:08:22</p> <p>21 A. Yes. 09:08:24</p> <p>22 Q. And did you find any? 09:08:24</p> <p>23 A. I submitted errata for each of them. 09:08:27</p> <p>24 Nothing major, but I did have erratas for each of 09:08:30</p> <p>25 them. 09:08:34</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p>	<p>1 A. I would have to go count them on my CV. 09:09:36</p> <p>2 They're reflected on my CV. I believe it's six or 09:09:38</p> <p>3 seven, maybe five, in that neighborhood. 09:09:42</p> <p>4 Q. Do all of those declarations relate to the 09:09:45</p> <p>5 dosing regimen of Eylea? 09:09:47</p> <p>6 A. Generally the dosing regimen is an 09:09:51</p> <p>7 important element. It's not the only element that 09:09:54</p> <p>8 I discuss, but it is an important element. 09:10:00</p> <p>9 Q. Do you recall any of the other elements 09:10:02</p> <p>10 you discussed? 09:10:03</p> <p>11 A. Well, the elements that were at issue in 09:10:05</p> <p>12 each of the proceedings. I'd have to go back and 09:10:07</p> <p>13 look at those reports and verify, but dosing has 09:10:12</p> <p>14 been a very important one. 09:10:16</p> <p>15 Q. And do you recall the time period for 09:10:17</p> <p>16 which you submitted those declarations? 09:10:18</p> <p>17 A. I believe the first one was a couple years 09:10:21</p> <p>18 ago. Again, my CV reflects the exact date. 09:10:22</p> <p>19 Q. Would it be fair to say it was February of 09:10:27</p> <p>20 2022; does that sound right? 09:10:29</p> <p>21 A. If that's what my -- if that's what the 09:10:31</p> <p>22 record reflects. I don't remember the exact date. 09:10:34</p> <p>23 Q. And Dr. Manning, have your views changed 09:10:37</p> <p>24 at all over that time period with respect to the 09:10:43</p> <p>25 commercial success of Eylea? 09:10:46</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p>

<p>1 A. No. 09:10:49</p> <p>2 Q. So if I were to go back and look at one of 09:10:49</p> <p>3 your deposition transcripts or one of your 09:10:51</p> <p>4 declarations from a couple years ago, there isn't 09:10:53</p> <p>5 anything in there that you'd want to modify or 09:10:55</p> <p>6 change? 09:10:57</p> <p>7 A. Not that I'm aware of, no. 09:10:58</p> <p>8 Q. What did you do to prepare for today's 09:11:04</p> <p>9 deposition? 09:11:06</p> <p>10 A. I reviewed my declarations. I understand 09:11:07</p> <p>11 there are two declarations at issue here and I 09:11:09</p> <p>12 reviewed each of those. I reviewed Dr. Stewart's 09:11:13</p> <p>13 declarations. I reviewed some of the materials 09:11:17</p> <p>14 that I had used before or for -- in preparing the 09:11:20</p> <p>15 declaration. I reviewed -- I believe I reviewed my 09:11:26</p> <p>16 last deposition transcript. I met with counsel. 09:11:31</p> <p>17 Q. And when you say your last deposition 09:11:36</p> <p>18 transcript, do you recall which patent that was 09:11:38</p> <p>19 for? 09:11:40</p> <p>20 A. I'm sorry. I'm not remembering the number 09:11:42</p> <p>21 off the top of my head. Again, it's on my CV and 09:11:49</p> <p>22 in the record, but it was the one that was in 09:11:52</p> <p>23 December I believe. 09:11:55</p> <p>24 Q. The '681 Patent, does that sound close? 09:11:58</p> <p>25 A. I would want to make sure I looked at the 09:12:01</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. Great. 09:12:55</p> <p>2 And Dr. Manning, did you speak to anyone 09:12:57</p> <p>3 in preparation for today's deposition? 09:12:59</p> <p>4 A. Counsel, my staff. No one else that I 09:13:03</p> <p>5 recall. 09:13:08</p> <p>6 Q. So, for instance, did you speak to 09:13:09</p> <p>7 Dr. Stewart at all in preparation for today's 09:13:12</p> <p>8 deposition? 09:13:14</p> <p>9 A. Not in preparation for the deposition, 09:13:15</p> <p>10 no. 09:13:19</p> <p>11 Q. And you mentioned that you spoke to 09:13:19</p> <p>12 counsel. Did you meet with them in person? 09:13:20</p> <p>13 A. Yes. 09:13:22</p> <p>14 Q. And when was that? 09:13:23</p> <p>15 A. Yesterday. 09:13:24</p> <p>16 Q. And who did you meet with? 09:13:25</p> <p>17 A. The gentlemen here at the table. 09:13:27</p> <p>18 Q. And how long did you meet for? 09:13:29</p> <p>19 A. Three hours perhaps, the morning. 09:13:33</p> <p>20 Q. And you mentioned staff that you may have 09:13:38</p> <p>21 spoken to in preparation. Who on your staff did 09:13:40</p> <p>22 you speak to? 09:13:43</p> <p>23 A. Ryan Marsh. He's a Ph.D. economist that 09:13:44</p> <p>24 works for Intensity. 09:13:49</p> <p>25 Q. When you did speak to him? 09:13:50</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p>
<p>1 record to be certain. 09:12:03</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And do you recall, would it have 09:12:04</p> <p>3 been my colleague -- 09:12:05</p> <p>4 A. Yes. 09:12:06</p> <p>5 Q. -- Mr. Choi that took the deposition? 09:12:06</p> <p>6 A. Yes. 09:12:09</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Great. 09:12:09</p> <p>8 Now, you mentioned that you reviewed was 09:12:11</p> <p>9 it two declarations, that's the '572 and '601 09:12:14</p> <p>10 declarations that are at issue today? 09:12:19</p> <p>11 A. Yes. 09:12:22</p> <p>12 Q. Did you review any other declarations in 09:12:22</p> <p>13 preparation for today's deposition? 09:12:23</p> <p>14 A. I don't believe so, no. 09:12:25</p> <p>15 Q. I think you mentioned that you reviewed 09:12:26</p> <p>16 Dr. Stewart's declarations? 09:12:29</p> <p>17 A. Stewart? 09:12:32</p> <p>18 Q. Yes. Was it just his declarations for the 09:12:33</p> <p>19 '572 and '601 Patents? 09:12:36</p> <p>20 A. Yes. 09:12:41</p> <p>21 Q. And I think you indicated some materials 09:12:41</p> <p>22 that you have used that were part of your two 09:12:43</p> <p>23 declarations; is that correct? 09:12:45</p> <p>24 A. In the appendices or the attachments to my 09:12:50</p> <p>25 declarations, those are what I reviewed. 09:12:53</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p>	<p>1 A. Yesterday and I may have talked to him a 09:13:51</p> <p>2 couple days before, but intermittently throughout 09:13:53</p> <p>3 the last few days. 09:13:56</p> <p>4 Q. Was he part of the meeting with counsel 09:13:59</p> <p>5 yesterday? 09:14:01</p> <p>6 A. No. Oh yes, he was. Yeah. He was 09:14:04</p> <p>7 remote, but he was not physically there. 09:14:05</p> <p>8 Q. And did you -- and apologies if I'm going 09:14:11</p> <p>9 too fast. Did you speak to Mr. Marsh independently 09:14:11</p> <p>10 of your meeting with counsel? 09:14:13</p> <p>11 A. Yes. 09:14:16</p> <p>12 Q. When was that? 09:14:16</p> <p>13 A. Intermittently. 09:14:19</p> <p>14 Q. All right. 09:14:29</p> <p>15 So let me give you some documents to start 09:14:29</p> <p>16 the day. I think many of these have already been 09:14:31</p> <p>17 designated as exhibits. The first exhibit I'm 09:14:36</p> <p>18 going to hand you is Exhibit 2067. This is your 09:14:38</p> <p>19 declaration concerning the '572 Patent. So that's 09:14:45</p> <p>20 from the case IPR-2023-884. 09:14:50</p> <p>21 I'm also going to hand you your 09:15:05</p> <p>22 declaration from -- or for the '601 Patent and that 09:15:08</p> <p>23 is Exhibit 2043, IPR-2023-739. We'll get these 09:15:17</p> <p>24 all knocked out to begin with. 09:15:42</p> <p>25 I'm going to hand you this is United 09:15:44</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p>

<p>1 States Patent No. 11,253,572, and it's 09:15:49</p> <p>2 Exhibit 1001 and I believe it's just from the 09:15:53</p> <p>3 '572 IPR. And also United States Patent 09:16:00</p> <p>4 No. 10,888,601, which is Exhibit 1001 from the 09:16:16</p> <p>5 '601 IPR. And let's just do them all. 09:16:26</p> <p>6 This is Exhibit 2027. This is the 09:16:49</p> <p>7 declaration of Michael W. Stewart, M.D., and this 09:16:54</p> <p>8 is for the '601 Patent and I believe this is just 09:17:01</p> <p>9 from the '601 IPR, which is 739. We're killing a 09:17:05</p> <p>10 lot of trees here. 09:17:12</p> <p>11 And last but not least, this is the 09:17:18</p> <p>12 declaration of Michael W. Stewart for the 09:17:21</p> <p>13 '572 Patent, this is Exhibit 2065 and it's just 09:17:25</p> <p>14 in the '572 IPR, which is the 884 IPR. 09:17:31</p> <p>15 Now, Dr. Manning, I was going to start 09:17:54</p> <p>16 with your '572 IPR declaration and before I get 09:17:57</p> <p>17 started, so there appears to be a lot of similarity 09:18:03</p> <p>18 between the '572 and the '601 declarations. Is 09:18:07</p> <p>19 that your understanding? 09:18:13</p> <p>20 A. Yes. 09:18:14</p> <p>21 Q. I think a lot of my questions are probably 09:18:14</p> <p>22 going to overlap on the two. So is that all right 09:18:15</p> <p>23 with you if I combine some of those questions, or 09:18:21</p> <p>24 do you prefer that I go, you know, one by one in 09:18:24</p> <p>25 terms of the declarations? 09:18:28</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 that particular matter? 09:20:14</p> <p>2 A. I don't. 09:20:15</p> <p>3 Q. Ballpark? 09:20:16</p> <p>4 A. You know, I haven't looked at the record 09:20:17</p> <p>5 and I really don't know. 09:20:19</p> <p>6 Q. Same for '601? 09:20:20</p> <p>7 A. Yeah. Same answer, yes. 09:20:24</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. In terms of your overall work for 09:20:27</p> <p>9 Regeneron, do you have a sense for overall hours, 09:20:29</p> <p>10 amount of time you spent? 09:20:34</p> <p>11 A. I don't know that either. 09:20:35</p> <p>12 Q. All right. 09:20:36</p> <p>13 In paragraph 8 you reference some work by 09:20:39</p> <p>14 other members of your team; do you see that? 09:20:42</p> <p>15 A. Yes. 09:20:46</p> <p>16 Q. Is Mr. -- is it Mr. or Dr. Marsh? 09:20:46</p> <p>17 A. Dr. Marsh. 09:20:50</p> <p>18 Q. Dr. Marsh, is he one of the members of 09:20:50</p> <p>19 your team? 09:20:53</p> <p>20 A. He is. 09:20:54</p> <p>21 Q. Do you know what his billing rate is? 09:20:54</p> <p>22 A. Off the top of my head I do not. 09:20:56</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Are there other members of your 09:20:57</p> <p>24 team? 09:20:58</p> <p>25 A. Yes. 09:20:59</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p>
<p>1 A. I'm happy to have you ask the questions as 09:18:28</p> <p>2 you like. 09:18:31</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Great. 09:18:31</p> <p>4 I guess first turning to paragraph 8 of 09:18:35</p> <p>5 your declaration and this is, again, the '572 09:18:37</p> <p>6 declaration, but I think it's hopefully similar. I 09:18:44</p> <p>7 wanted to ask you about your hourly rate. So in 09:18:49</p> <p>8 the '572 declaration it's listed at 1,150 an hour; 09:18:56</p> <p>9 is that right? 09:19:01</p> <p>10 A. That's correct. 09:19:01</p> <p>11 Q. In the '601 declaration it's listed as 09:19:03</p> <p>12 1,050 an hour. I'm just curious. Was that a typo 09:19:06</p> <p>13 or what was the reason for the difference? 09:19:11</p> <p>14 A. I believe that is because the '601 09:19:13</p> <p>15 declaration was completed in 2023. Let me look at 09:19:16</p> <p>16 the date to be sure I'm not getting this wrong. 09:19:27</p> <p>17 Well, it's good a thing that I checked the 09:19:39</p> <p>18 date because that specific statement is not quite 09:19:41</p> <p>19 accurate, but the work was done based on an 09:19:43</p> <p>20 earlier -- on the billing rates that were in place 09:19:48</p> <p>21 during 2023. My billing rate was changed as of the 09:19:52</p> <p>22 end of the year. So that would explain the 09:19:57</p> <p>23 difference. 09:20:00</p> <p>24 Q. And with respect to the '572 IPR, do you 09:20:04</p> <p>25 know about how many hours you've spent on that in 09:20:10</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p>	<p>1 Q. Who are those? 09:20:59</p> <p>2 A. Elizabeth Parker has worked on it, Max 09:21:01</p> <p>3 Allman -- Urman has worked on it, on these cases. 09:21:04</p> <p>4 I don't know who has spent the more time on each 09:21:06</p> <p>5 declaration. I haven't managed the workflow to the 09:21:10</p> <p>6 extent -- at the level of detail that would help me 09:21:20</p> <p>7 remember that -- the answer to that question. 09:21:23</p> <p>8 Q. And was there one of the members of your 09:21:27</p> <p>9 team that was particularly focused on either '572 09:21:29</p> <p>10 or '601? 09:21:34</p> <p>11 A. I believe they each focused on both 09:21:37</p> <p>12 reports. 09:21:39</p> <p>13 Q. Got it. 09:21:40</p> <p>14 A. Or both declarations. 09:21:41</p> <p>15 Q. So let me ask you turning to paragraph 10 09:21:42</p> <p>16 of your report. That is on page -- looks like it's 09:21:45</p> <p>17 on page 9 of the document. You indicate that you 09:21:53</p> <p>18 relied on the declaration of -- of Michael W. 09:21:59</p> <p>19 Stewart, M.D., Exhibit 2065; do you see that? 09:22:05</p> <p>20 A. Yes. 09:22:09</p> <p>21 Q. And you have that exhibit in front of you. 09:22:09</p> <p>22 A. Uh-huh. 09:22:13</p> <p>23 Q. You also mentioned you had a conversation 09:22:13</p> <p>24 with Dr. Stewart; is that right? 09:22:13</p> <p>25 A. Yes. 09:22:14</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p>

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.