

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 DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

HELSINN HEALTHCARE, S.A. and
ROCHE PALO ALTO, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:

11-3962

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD.,
DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,
and TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL
INDUSTRIES, LTD.

TRIAL

Defendants.

_____ Clarkson S. Fisher United States Courthouse
402 East State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08608
June 10, 2015

B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE MARY L. COOPER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Certified as True and Correct as required by Title 28, U.S.C.,
Section 753

/S/ Regina A. Berenato-Tell, CCR, CRR, RMR, RPR
/S/ Carol Farrell, CCR, CRR, RMR, CCP, RPR, RSA

*United States District Court
Trenton, New Jersey*

Candiotti - Direct

1 that were run, even looking at the data from other companies
 2 that might be looking to buy each other's drugs or things
 3 along those lines.
 4 Q. And have you served as a reviewer for any peer-reviewed
 5 publications?
 6 A. Yes. I have been a peer reviewer for quite a few, but
 7 New England Journal, Anesthesiology, Anesthesia-Analgesia,
 8 those are probably our two top journals. Journal of Clinical
 9 Anesthesia. I guess that would be the third, but...
 10 Q. And do you serve on any journal editorial boards?
 11 A. I'm an editor on the Journal of Perianesthesia Nursing
 12 and the Journal of Anesthesia and Perioperative Medicine.
 13 MR. DITTMANN: Your Honor, at this time, plaintiffs
 14 proffer Dr. Candiotti as an expert in the clinical care of
 15 surgical patients, including the management of PONV, and
 16 clinical aspects of drug product research and development.
 17 MS. HUTTON: No objection, your Honor.
 18 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. Admitted as such.
 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DITTMANN:
 20 Q. Now I'd like to turn to the opinions you are offering in
 21 this case. Do you have a slide that summarizes what you're
 22 prepared to discuss today?
 23 A. Yes, I do. Thank you.
 24 MR. DITTMANN: Please bring up PDX-402.
 25 BY MR. DITTMANN:

United States District Court
 Trenton, New Jersey

Candiotti - Direct

1 BY MR. DITTMANN:
 2 Q. And we see reference on the slide a POSA, or a person of
 3 ordinary skill in the art. Do you have a slide setting forth
 4 the definition of a POSA you applied --
 5 A. Yes, sir.
 6 Q. -- in reaching your opinions?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 MR. DITTMANN: Please bring up PDX-403.
 9 BY MR. DITTMANN:
 10 Q. Is this the definition you applied?
 11 A. This is. I actually took this from Dr. Amidon, which I
 12 thought was quite relevant. And, basically, I feel I fit into
 13 this because I am very active in the development of
 14 pharmaceutical products.
 15 THE COURT: Whatever you are, you're not a person of
 16 ordinary skill.
 17 THE WITNESS: Oh.
 18 THE COURT: You're a higher skill in your field.
 19 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.
 20 THE COURT: But anyway, we're looking for a
 21 definition of what a person of ordinary skill in whatever the
 22 art is that we're trying to focus on here.
 23 Go right ahead.
 24 THE WITNESS: I should continue with this slide?
 25 THE COURT: Yes.

United States District Court
 Trenton, New Jersey

Candiotti - Direct

1 Q. And if you wouldn't mind, Doctor, would you please
 2 briefly walk us through what you are prepared to talk about
 3 today?
 4 A. So, just briefly, the first point being that a person of
 5 ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated at
 6 that time period of 2003 to pursue the development of another
 7 5-HT₃, specifically palonosetron. They probably would have
 8 focused more in the area of NK-1 receptor antagonists.
 9 Two, had palonosetron been pursued, a dose of not lower
 10 than 2 milligrams for treating emesis would have been chosen
 11 based on the prior art that was available.
 12 And, finally, a POSA would have been inclined or would
 13 have definitely pursued a volume of, really, 1 to
 14 2 milliliters, but 1 to 5 milliliters and, given the milligram
 15 dosing and the volume, would have subsequently pursued or
 16 would not have pursued, a POSA at the time, simply because of
 17 the milligrams and the volume, a concentration of
 18 .05 milligrams per mL.
 19 THE COURT: They would have had a higher
 20 concentration?
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes, just by the de facto of having
 22 2 milligrams or more in 1 to 5 ccs. I have a slide later on
 23 that. Just straight concentration would have come up much
 24 higher than that.
 25 THE COURT: Okay.

Candiotti - Direct

1 THE WITNESS: Okay. I possess a degree in medicine,
 2 and I have experience in designing, developing, evaluating,
 3 and testing pharmaceutical formulations. I possess an M.D.
 4 with many more years than one or two years of experience.
 5 BY MR. DITTMANN:
 6 Q. Dr. Candiotti, did you review the patents-at-issue in
 7 this case?
 8 A. I did.
 9 MR. DITTMANN: Could you please bring up PDX-404.
 10 BY MR. DITTMANN:
 11 Q. And can you explain what we see on the slide, Dr.
 12 Candiotti?
 13 A. So, this is the '219 patent, and I'm referring to Claim 1
 14 here. The part that would concern me for my background is
 15 simply the topic that this is a pharmaceutical single-use
 16 agent to reduce the likelihood of cancer chemotherapy-induced
 17 nausea and vomiting. It would be in a 5-mL sterile solution
 18 with an amount of .25 milligrams by weight.
 19 Q. And do you understand there are three other patents at
 20 issue in this case?
 21 A. Yes, sir.
 22 Q. Can we bring up PDX-405?
 23 THE COURT: Before we get there, I think, Mr.
 24 Dittmann, I interrupted when Dr. Candiotti was saying what his
 25 definition of person of ordinary skill in the art is, and we

Candiotti - Direct

1 saw the slide on the screen, but the slides are
2 demonstratives, and he didn't get a chance to say how he would
3 define the person of ordinary skill in the art for purposes of
4 these four patents.

5 So, I'd suggest you go back and get his testimony on
6 that, because the slide is just a demonstrative.

7 MR. DITTMANN: Sure.

8 BY MR. DITTMANN:

9 Q. Dr. Candiotti, you discussed the definition of a POSA we
10 see on PDX-403, correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And you understand this is a definition that was offered
13 by Dr. Amidon in connection with his expert reports, correct?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. And do you agree with this definition?

16 A. I do agree with it.

17 THE COURT: And what is, it for the record? Just
18 read it out from the slide.

19 MR. DITTMANN: Oh, for the record, the definition of
20 a person of ordinary skill in the art is "someone who is
21 actively involved in the development of pharmaceutical
22 products which involves collaborative teamwork among persons
23 with relevant experience. This person would have a degree in
24 chemistry, pharmaceutical chemistry, pharmacy, medicine,
25 clinical pharmacology, or another pharmaceutical

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

Candiotti - Direct

1 opinion listed here on the slide, that a POSA would not have
2 been motivated in 2003 to pursue palonosetron.

3 Do you have a slide discussing the types of classes of
4 drugs that were used to treat PONV in the 2003 time period at
5 issue in this case?

6 A. Yes, I do.

7 MR. DITTMANN: Can we please bring up PDX-406.

8 BY MR. DITTMANN:

9 Q. And can you please explain what we see here on the slide?

10 A. So, I believe something similar was presented to the
11 court the other day. This is simply just showing the classes
12 of medications that we use to either prevent or treat:
13 Phenothiazines, butyrophenones, dopamine antagonists,
14 steroids, antihistamines, 5-HT₂ receptor antagonists, which of
15 relevance are the drugs ondansetron, granisetron and
16 dolasetron. These three drugs were on the market at that time
17 and available for use.

18 Q. And we see here that ondansetron was introduced in 1991.
19 At this time when the first setron was introduced, how was
20 this class of drugs perceived by the medical community?

21 A. They were quite welcome. Nausea and vomiting, emesis,
22 was a problem, both a significant problem for chemotherapy
23 patients and post-operative patients. Whether the drugs
24 were -- had superior efficacy or not depends on how you look
25 at it, but for sure they had better side effects.

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

Candiotti - Direct

1 science-related field and experience in designing, developing,
2 evaluating, and/or testing pharmaceutical formulations with a
3 B.S. or master's degree in, and two to three years experience,
4 or a Ph.D. or M.D. degree and one to two years of experience."

5 Thank you, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Do you subscribe to that, sir?

7 THE WITNESS: I do.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Go on.

9 MR. DITTMANN: Thank you.

10 Can we go back to PDX-405, please.

11 BY MR. DITTMANN:

12 Q. And can you explain what we see here with respect to the
13 other patents-in-suit besides the '219 patent, Doctor?

14 A. So, the other three patents, basically, refer again to a
15 pharmaceutical agent for reducing emesis and reducing the
16 likelihood of emesis at a concentration of .05 milligrams per
17 mL of palonosetron.

18 Q. And, again, these are the portions of the claims on which
19 you focus your testimony today, correct?

20 A. Yes, sir. I'm clinically oriented, and that's what I
21 focused on.

22 MR. DITTMANN: Could we please bring up PDX-402

23 again?

24 BY MR. DITTMANN:

25 Q. And I would like to start, Doctor, with your first

Candiotti - Direct

1 The other drugs were not well tolerated, and sometimes
2 patients were almost more miserable from the drugs than they
3 were from the nausea and vomiting. And these drugs were very
4 welcome. They were extensively used, and I think made a big
5 difference to patients.

6 Q. So, that moving forward now about a decade later to the
7 2003 time period, how did the available setrons compare with
8 one another in terms of their efficacy and safety concerning
9 PONV?

10 A. I would say that the vast majority of the literature that
11 I'm aware of felt that the drugs were, basically,
12 interchangeable. The three 5-HT₂s, some minor differences in
13 dosing perhaps and cost at the time, but they really weren't
14 different from each other.

15 They were safe, as understood in 2003, and were used
16 almost interchangeably. You'd find different hospitals with
17 different 5-HT₂s for no particular reason. They would just
18 have one or the other.

19 Q. Now, in the 2003 time period, what was being done to try
20 to help improve the treatment of PONV?

21 A. So, since we had -- so the key to treating a patient --
22 and this was even recognized many years before this -- is
23 multimodal therapy, and what that really means is attacking
24 the different receptors to get a combined effect to help treat
25 or prevent a patient from getting sick.

Candiotti - Direct

1 So, we already had drugs to address these related
2 different receptors, whether it be the histamine or the
3 serotonin receptors, and, as I said, these three drugs were
4 basically interchangeable.

5 So, around that time period, including myself, people
6 started looking towards new drugs and new targets, and the
7 most or the best candidate at that time was the NK-1 receptor,
8 which is a receptor for something called substance P. And we
9 were trying to develop NK-1 receptor antagonists as part of
10 the armamentarium to develop drugs to help protect patients as
11 well as treat them.

12 MR. DITTMANN: Can we please bring up PTX-100?

13 THE COURT: As part of your arsenal, right?

14 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am, if you will.

15 THE COURT: Is that what you mean? okay.

16 BY MR. DITTMANN:

17 Q. Doctor, can you please tell us if you recognize this
18 document?

19 A. I do.

20 Q. What is it?

21 A. This is a paper by Dr. Gesztesi that was the first -- I
22 believe was the first trial for an NK-1 receptor antagonist
23 designated by its number CPP 122721.

24 This was -- this paper is from 2000, as I recall, and,
25 as I said, this was a major effort to try and develop the

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

Candiotti - Direct

1 limited efficacy and well known side effects associated with
2 the available antiemetic drugs, the search for more
3 efficacious compounds without side effects has continued."

4 Do you see that, Doctor?

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. What would a POSA understand this sentence to be saying?

7 A. So, they're really talking about two different things in
8 this sentence.

9 First of all, when they say given the limited efficacy
10 and well known side effects, they're talking about two things.
11 The efficacy of the 5-HT₃ receptor antagonists, as I read it,
12 who really didn't have a lot of side effects; but they're also
13 describing the problem with the side effects of the more
14 classic agents, if you will, droperidol and things like that.

15 Furthermore, they make the point that while there
16 are -- there were a fair number of drugs available at the
17 time, people were still getting sick. So, we had -- we did
18 better, but we needed to do better. And the goal was to
19 develop additional drugs to make a more comprehensive therapy
20 for patients by combining agents.

21 So, this being a whole new receptor, you could add it
22 to the list of receptors you were able to address.

23 THE COURT: And the NK-1 receptor had been identified
24 as playing a role in nausea and vomiting of patients?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes, and approximately -- substance P

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

Candiotti - Direct

1 NK-1s and bring them into clinical use.

2 Q. And do you recognize any of the authors of this article?

3 A. I personally know three of them.

4 Q. And can you explain who they are and how you know them?

5 A. I know Dr. Scuderi, Dr. White and Dr. D'Angelo. These
6 were all people doing research in the area of post-operative
7 nausea and vomiting, and it became kind of a circle, if you
8 will. You know the people who deal in the field that you deal
9 in.

10 Q. Do you know what their reputation was in the PONV field
11 in this time period of 2000 to 2003?

12 A. Yeah, they were viewed as good researchers, good
13 clinicians, well known.

14 Q. And could you briefly summarize what this article
15 generally discusses?

16 A. It shows the efficacy of this particular NK-1 receptor
17 antagonist. As I recall, this drug didn't happen to make it
18 to market, but -- for other reasons; but it showed good
19 efficacy in, I believe, the 200-milligram range or so, as I
20 recall. Basically, showed promise for these types of drugs in
21 this class.

22 Q. If we can look over on the right column around midway
23 down, yes, there's a sentence that starts, "Given the
24 limited." Do you see that?

25 I'll read it for the record. It states, "Given the

Candiotti - Direct

1 is quite old, it was known, I mean, for a long time, and we
2 knew what was involved probably in the 1990s.

3 BY MR. DITTMANN:

4 Q. And approximately --

5 THE COURT: Now, just a second.

6 There's a sentence right before what you have
7 highlighted there and -- from 2000, this article, it says,
8 well, even ondansetron has recently been reported with side
9 effects.

10 THE WITNESS: Every drug has side effects, but it was
11 unusual. As a matter of fact, that's why they even mentioned
12 it. You know, nobody mentioned that droperidol causes side
13 effects because it was so common. This was less common.

14 Ondansetron can cause allergic reactions, it can cause
15 EKG changes, as can the other drugs of the class; but,
16 generally, speaking it is extremely well tolerated. If you
17 compare it to what we had, way better, but no drug is
18 flawless. There's no question.

19 THE COURT: Okay. So, that's how you interpret that
20 sentence.

21 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

22 BY MR. DITTMANN:

23 Q. And turning to your Honor's question about NK-1s, if we
24 can look at the next paragraph and blow that up, please. You
25 see here the second sentence states, "It has been suggested

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.