IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

CORCEPT THERAPEUTICS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case PGR2019-00048
Patent No. 10,195,214 B2

DECLARATION OF UMA N. EVERETT IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR *PRO HAC VICE* ADMISSION

I, Uma N. Everett, declare as follows:

1. I am a Director with the law firm of Sterne Kessler Goldstein & Fox PLLC. I represent and advise Petitioner Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. ("Teva") in connection with the above-captioned post grant review ("PGR") proceeding. I also represent Teva in connection with the underlying district court litigation (*Corcept Therapeutics, Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.*, No. 1:18-cv-03632 (D.N.J.)) on the patent at issue in this PGR proceeding, 10,195,214 ("the '214 patent").

2. I have been a member in good standing of the Bar of the District of Columbia since 2002. I am admitted to practice in several U.S. district courts, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and the Third Circuit.

3. I have not been suspended or disbarred from practice before any court or administrative body.

4. No sanction or contempt citation has been imposed against me by any court or administrative body.

5. I have never had an application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body denied.

6. I practice litigation, primarily patent litigation, and have done so throughout my career as an attorney. I have litigated dozens of patent cases across the country, including in Delaware, New Jersey, and the International Trade

Commission.

7. I have extensively reviewed the '214 patent, its prosecution history and related materials, and the Patent Owner's infringement contentions served in the litigation against Teva. Additionally, I worked on Petitioner's invalidity contentions in the litigation, and accordingly have gained significant familiarity with the invalidity issues in that case. These issues significantly overlap with the corresponding issues in this PGR proceeding. My involvement in the concurrent litigation has made me very familiar with the proposed invalidity grounds and the cited references in this proceeding.

8. In this PGR proceeding, I have worked with lead counsel and backup counsel named in this proceeding to identify and analyze the references relied upon in the petition and to assist with drafting the petition.

9. The prior-art references at issue in the PGR proceeding are also relevant in the underlying litigation in the case against Teva, and I have reviewed a vast amount of additional, related prior art for the invalidity contentions in the district-court litigation.

10. I have conferred with Dr. Greenblatt, and I thoroughly understand Dr. Greenblatt's testimony related to prior-art publications cited in this PGR proceeding.

11. Since 2005, I have represented pharmaceutical companies in

connection with multiple patent litigations regarding various technologies, including, but not limited to, the mifepristone drug product at issue in this PGR. This includes the following recent litigations:

Par Pharm., Inc. v. American Regent, Inc., No. 1:19-cv-01490 (DED);

Cipla Ltd. v. AstraZeneca A.B., Nos. 1:19-cv-00733, 1:19-cv-00438 (DNJ);

Celgene Corporation v. Cipla Ltd., Nos. 2:18-cv-08964, 2:17-cv-06163 (DNJ);

Meda Pharm. Inc. v. Perrigo UK FINCO Ltd. P'ship, No. 1:16-cv-00794 (DED);

Meda Pharm. Inc. v. Apotex Inc., No. 1:14-cv-01453 (DED);

Auxilum Pharm. Inc. v. Upsher-Smith Labs., Inc. Nos. 1-13-cv-00148, 1-08-cv-00908 (DED);

Endo Pharm. Inc. v. Amneal Pharm., LLC, No. 1:12-cv-08115 (SDNY) ;

Lithium Silicate Materials & Prods. Containing the Same, 337-TA-911 (ITC); and

Corcept Therapeutics, Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc., No. 2:18-cv-03632 (DNJ).

12. Through this work, I have developed in-depth knowledge of the relevant issues in this proceeding. This knowledge includes my analysis of a significant number of patents, articles, books, and other materials regarding these technologies. My experience also includes knowledge gained from working closely with several technical experts from academia and industry. And I have participated in meetings with Teva's in-house employees regarding various technologies and applications, including, for example, as related to mifepristone.

13. Within the past three years, I have requested to appear *pro hac vice* before the Office in *Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC et al v. Cipla Limited et al.*, IPR2017-00807 (PTAB), and my request was granted.

14. I have read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

15. I understand that I will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq*. and disciplinary jurisdiction pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

16. I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true. I further declare that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-11-19

Uma N. Everett
Steptoe & Johnson Goldstein & Fox PLLC

District of Columbia, SS.
Subscribed and Sworn to before me
this 11th day of September, 2019

EARNESTEEN GINN, NOTARY PUBLIC