	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2	BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
3	
4	3M COMPANY, MERCK & CO., INC. and)
	MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.,) Case No.
5) IPR2018-01054
	Petitioners,) IPR2018-01055
6) Patent No.
	vs.) 8,936,177
7)
	APTAR FRANCE S.A.S.,)
8)
	Patent Owner.)
9)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	DEPOSITION OF CHARLES E. CLEMENS
15	San Diego, California
16	Tuesday, July 16, 2019
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
0.4	Reported by:
24	Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR
0.5	CSR No. 10891
25	Job No. 163986

	Page 2	Page 3
1		¹ A P P E A R A N C E S:
2		² For the Petitioners:
3		3 HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ AND COHN
4	Tuesday, July 16, 2019	⁴ 155 North Wacker Drive
5	9:18 a.m.	Chicago, Illinois 60606
6		⁵ BY: RON SKLAR, ESQ. GREGORY MORRIS, ESQ. (Via teleconference)
7		⁶ ANDREW CHIPOURAS, ESQ. (Via teleconterence)
8		7
9	DEPOSITION OF CHARLES E. CLEMENS,	8 9
10	taken at 501 West Broadway, Suite 800, San Diego,	10
11	California, commencing at 9:18 a.m. and concluding at	11 12
12	2:27 p.m., Tuesday, July 16, 2019, before	12
13	Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR, CSR 10891, a	14
14	Certified Shorthand Reporter.	AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD Two Commerce Square
15		¹⁵ Two Commerce Square 2001 Market Street
16		¹⁶ Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
17		¹⁷ BY: JASON WEIL, ESQ. ¹⁷ (Via teleconference)
18		18
19		19 20
20		²⁰ ²¹ For the Patent Owner:
21 22		²² McKOOL SMITH
23		²³ 300 Crescent Court Dallas, Texas 75201
24		BY: BENJAMIN MURRAY, ESQ.
25		24 25
	Page 4	Page 5
1	A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued):	¹ INDEX
2	For the Patent Owner:	² WITNESS: Charles E. Clemens
3	McKOOL SMITH	³ EXAMINATION PAGE ⁴ By Mr. Sklar
	300 Crescent Court	⁵ By Mr. Murray 127
4	Dallas, Texas 75201	7 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE
5	BY: RYAN HARGRAVE, ESQ. (Via teleconference)	
		⁸ Exhibit 1001 United States Patent No. 43
6		US 8,936,177
6 7		US 8,936,177 Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98
7 8	Also Present:	⁹ ⁹ ¹⁰ Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631
7 8 9	Also Present: CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith	⁹ ⁹ ¹⁰ Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631
7 8 9 10	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith	⁹ ⁹ ¹⁰ Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 ¹¹ Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 ¹² Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug ¹³ Products
7 8 9	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ.	 ⁹ US 8,936,177 ⁹ Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 ¹¹ Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 ¹² Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug ¹³ Products ¹⁴ Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019
7 8 9 10	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 ⁹ US 8,936,177 ⁹ Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 ¹¹ Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 ¹² Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug ¹³ Products ¹⁴ Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019
7 8 9 10 11	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ.	 Exhibit 1001 2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 Context States Faten Fro. 105 US 8,936,177 Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 Solides Fates Fa
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 Solides Fatch 140. 45 US 8,936,177 Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding Exhibit 2021.1 Declaration of Charles E. 8 Clemens In Support of Patent
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding Exhibit 2021.1 Declaration of Charles E. 8 Clemens In Support of Patent Owner's Response to Petition For Inter Partes Review of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 Solides Fatch 140. 145 US 8,936,177 Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding Exhibit 2021.1 Declaration of Charles E. 8 Clemens In Support of Patent Owner's Response to Petition
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding Exhibit 2021.1 Declaration of Charles E. 8 Clemens In Support of Patent Owner's Response to Petition For Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,936,177 Exhibit 2023.1 Declaration of Charles E. 7
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 For US 8,936,177 Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding Exhibit 2021.1 Declaration of Charles E. 8 Clemens In Support of Patent Owner's Response to Petition Exhibit 2023.1 Declaration of Charles E. 7 Clemens In Support of Patent Owner's Sur-Reply to Petition
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001.1001.1001.1701.1701.1701.1701.1701
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHLOE COLEMAN McKool Smith EMILY SAUTER, ESQ. In-House Counsel, Merck	 Exhibit 1001 Solides Fatch 140. 140. 145 US 8,936,177 Exhibit 1001.2 United States Patent No. 98 US 9,370,631 Exhibit 1013 Guidance for Industry - 35 Integration of Dose-Counting Mechanisms into MDI Drug Products Exhibit 1057 Deposition Transcript, Charles 25 E. Clemens, April 24, 2019 Exhibit 1075 Petitioners' Reply to Patent 22 Owner's Response Exhibit 2018 Article, Plastic Part Design 20 For Injection Molding Exhibit 2021.1 Declaration of Charles E. 8 Clemens In Support of Patent Owner's Response to Petition Exhibit 2023.1 Declaration of Charles E. 7 Clemens In Support of Patent Owner's Sur-Reply to Petition Exhibit 2023.1 Declaration of Patent Owner's Sur-Reply to Petition For Inter Partes Review of For Inter Partes Review of

2

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 2 of 53

	Page 6	Page 7
1	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JULY 16, 2019	¹ (Exhibit 2023.1 was referenced.)
2	9:18 A.M 2:27 P.M.	² BY MR. SKLAR:
3		³ Do you recognize this exhibit, Mr. Clemens?
4	MR. SKLAR: At the court reporter's request,	⁴ A Yes, I do.
5	if we could have the individuals joining by phone	⁵ Q And this is a copy of your declaration in
6	announce who is on, that would be appreciated.	⁶ support of Aptar's sur-reply in Case No. 2018-01054;
7	MS. SAUTER: I'll go ahead and start. This is	⁷ correct?
8	Emily Sauter. I'm from Merck.	⁸ A Yes.
9	MS. HARGRAVE: Ryan Hargrave with McKool Smith	⁹ (Recess due to technical difficulty.)
10	on behalf of Aptar.	¹⁰ BY MR. SKLAR:
11	MR. WEIL: This is Jason Weil from Akin Gump.	¹¹ Q Okay. Mr. Clemens, before we took that brief
12	MR. MORRIS: It's Greg Morris from Honigman	¹² break, I had handed you Exhibit 2032 sorry, excuse
13	for petitioners.	¹³ me 2023.1; correct?
14	MR. SKLAR: And I'm Ron Sklar on behalf of	¹⁴ A That is correct.
15	petitioners, as well.	¹⁵ And we had agreed that this is a copy of your
16	CHARLES E. CLEMENS,	¹⁶ declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in
17	having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:	¹⁷ Case No. 2018-01054; correct?
18	EXAMINATION	¹⁸ A Correct.
19	BY MR. SKLAR:	¹⁹ Q If I can ask you to turn to the last page of
20	Q We've met one time before, Mr. Clemens.	²⁰ that exhibit, is that your signature at the bottom of
21	Good morning.	the last page, Exhibit 2023.1?
22	A Good morning.	²² A It is.
23	Q I am going to start off, Mr. Clemens, by	²³ Q Before you signed this exhibit, did you
24 25	handing you a copy of an exhibit that I've labeled as	²⁴ carefully review this declaration?
25	Exhibit 2023.1.	²⁵ A I did.
	Page 8	Page 9
1	Q Okay. So looking at that statement above your	¹ BY MR. SKLAR:
2	signature, am I correct that as of June 13, 2019, it is	² Q Do you see that?
3	your belief that everything incorporated into this	3 A Yes.
4	declaration is true and correct?	4 Q Okay. And this document, which I've
5	A That is correct.	⁵ identified as Exhibit 2021.1
6	Q Is that still your belief today?	⁶ Let me correct the record. I identified this
7	A It is.	⁷ as Exhibit 2021.1. Correct?
8	Q Did you review any materials, Mr. Clemens,	⁸ A That's correct.
9	prior to drafting this declaration?	⁹ Q And Exhibit 2021.1 is a copy of your
10	A Of course. Off the top of my head, I don't	¹⁰ declaration in support of Patent Owner's Response To
11	remember all the documents, but yes.	¹¹ Petition For Inter Partes Review in Case No.
12	Q Do you remember any of the documents that you	¹² 2018-010554; correct?
13	reviewed prior to drafting the declaration that is	¹³ A Yeah. That's what it says. Uh-huh.
14	Exhibit 2023.1?	¹⁴ Q Okay. And I will turn your attention to
15	A Several of the patents, just reviewing all of	¹⁵ paragraph 12 on page 5 of this declaration, 2021.1.
16	the details of the patents, and pretty much the same	¹⁶ Do you see that you have listed materials
17	reference material that has been identified in my other	¹⁷ considered in that declaration there?
18	declarations.	¹⁸ A I'm looking at it again, but yes, I do see
19	Q Okay. So let's pull those out. I just want	¹⁹ that.
20	to make sure I have a clear understanding of what you	20 Q Are these the exhibits or the materials that
21	reviewed prior to drafting this. So if we could pull	²¹ you reviewed prior to drafting your declaration, which
22	it out here for a moment	we've identified as 2023.1?
23	Okay. Mr. Clemens, I'm handing you a copy of	²³ A I believe that that is true. To be honest, I
24	a document that I've marked as Exhibit 2021.	²⁴ don't have a complete memory of everything I reviewed,
24 25	a document that I've marked as Exhibit 2021. (Exhibit 2021.1 was referenced.)	 don't have a complete memory of everything I reviewed, but this looks pretty complete. So that that looks

3

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 3 of 53

1 presity good. MR. MURRAY: 1 would instruct you not to 2 Q. And just to be clear, so prior to drafting answer, but if it doesn't involve conversations with 3 your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in maybe clearity your question maybe 4 There Parts Review that's listed in Item A on page 5 of Exhibit 202.1.7 5 of Exhibit 202.1.7 O noy our own, did you identify any documents that are 7 A Theliver I did look at - WIR. SKLAR: 8 WIR. SKLAR 10 9 without's quot insolution, which is schubit 202.1.7 A Well, certainty law within about here. Of course 7 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Misstates the with a sections. 11 7 PO Noy our own, did hout as the sections. 12 8 FIRM. R. SKLAR: 14 14 9 Wowled you show, which - all the documents that are 14 13 andring this calculation? 15 14 Itel ado v hat sections. 15 15 anawyte dirich as the addition in support of Apar's sur-reply in this calculation? 16 14 Itel ado v hat sections of that documents that are 16 15		Page 10		Page 11
2 Q And just to be clear, so prior to drafting 2 answer, but if i doesn't involve conversations with 3 your doelaration is support of Apta's sur-reply in 3 your doelarity in support of Apta's sur-reply in 4 MR MURRAY. Objection. Missianes the 3 your doelarity in your question a little bit more. 7 A I believe I did look at - 8 WR. SKLAR: Q On your own, did you identify any documents that are part of his lisi just to recall and or here show prior to drafting your declaration with about here. Of course 11 look at sections of that documents that - 11 12 recall, you know, which - all the documents that - 12 13 bust read or what sections. 14 14 BY MR. SKLAR: 14 15 Q When you were drafting your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify which documents you fally on needed to look at prior to drafting this calculation? 14 16 MR MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you would - your answer would include anything that would 15 16 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional materials have been filed by the parties? 15 17 Dd you review the pattiens? 16 18 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 16	1	pretty good.	1	MR. MURRAY: I would instruct you not to
3 your declaration in support of Apalr's sur-reply in 3 4 Case 2018-01054, did you review the Petition For THE WITNESS: I would just ask if you could 5 of Eshibit 2021.17 A I believe I did look at 6 of Tschibit 2021.17 O no your own, did you identify any documents 7 A I believe I did look at MR. MURRAY: Objection. Mistates the 9 On your own, did you identify any documents that you fits you needed to review prior to drafting 10 THE WITNESS: I do believe that I1 did 11 look at sections of that document, but, again, I don't 12 recall, you know, which - all the documents that 13 that I read or what sections. 14 recall, you know, which - all the document shut 15 by which documents you refery how did you identify 16 support of Apair's sur-reply. how did you identify 17 which documents you refery how did you identify in this calculation? 18 VMR. SKLAR: 19 A I 10 A I 11 be privileged conversations between you and your adartime that would includ anything that would anything that would includ anything that would	2		2	
4 Case 2018-01054, did you review the Petition For - 5 Inter Parts Review that's listed in Item A on page 5 - 6 of Exhibit 2021.1? - 7 A Tbelievel Idd look at - 9 Winess's previous testimony. - 11 look at sections of that document, but, again, I don't - 12 recall, you know, which - all the documents that - 14 look at sections of that document, but, again, I don't - 15 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify - 16 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify - 17 which documents you fel you needed to look at prior to - 18 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify - 19 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you - 20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you - 21 would - your answer would include anything that would - 22 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. - 23 memory. - - 24 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. -	3		3	-
5 Inter Partes Review that's listed in Item A on page 5 imaybe clarify your question a little bit more. 6 of Exhibit 2021.17 BY MR, SKLAR. 7 A 1 believe 1 did look at MR, MURRAY: Objection. Misstates the BY MR, SKLAR. 9 THE WITNESS: I do believe that 1 1 did Destination, which we've identified as 10 THE WITNESS: I do believe that 1 1 did Destination, which we've identified as 12 recall, you know, which all the documents that are part of this list just to recall and erferies my memory 13 that 1 read or what sections. D 14 that is calculation. The wey identify any documents that are 15 apr of this list just to recall and erferies my memory 16 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify 17 which documents you fel you needed to look at prior to 18 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 20 Would - your anseve would include anything that would 21 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 22 MR. MURRAY: Objection, this is a more 23 fine. 24 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Yague. 25 fine. 26 by Wick StLAR: 27 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 28 <	4		4	
6 of Exhibit 2021.1? 6 BY MR. SKLÅR: 7 A I believe I did look at	5		5	
7 A I believel Idial look at	6		6	
a MR. MURRAY: Objection, Misstates the a that you felt you needed to review plor to drafting your declaration, which we've identified as your declaration, which we've identified as your declaration, which we've identified as 11 look as sections of that documents that - all the documents that are your documents your documents that are 12 track or what sections. ''' A 13 that I read or what sections. ''' ''' 14 BY MR. SKLAR: ''' ''' ''' 15 op on this declaration, which we're drafting the calculation? ''' ''' ''' 16 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify ''' ''' ''' ''' 16 would - your answer would include anything that would ''' ''' ''' ''' 17 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you ''' ''' ''' ''' 18 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's ''' ''' ''' ''' 19 be yrivileged conversations between you and your ''' ''' ''' '''' 10 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional<	7	A I believe I did look at	7	
9 witness's previous testimony. 9 your declaration, which we've identified as 10 THE WITNESS: 1 do believe that I – I did 10 A Well, certainly I reviewed documents that are 12 recall, you know, which – all the documents that – 11 A Well, certainly I reviewed documents that are 12 part of this list just to recall and refresh my memory 0 file topics that I've written about here. Of course 13 of the topics that I've written about here. Of course much of the information on this declaration were 14 support of Aptar's sur-reply. how did you identify is that a document, that you 16 which documents you felt you needed to look at prior to 7 17 which documents you felt you needed to look at prior to 7 18 of the topics that I've written about here. Of course 7 19 A 1 - 10 9 20 WR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent hat you 7 21 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 7 22 fine. Page 12 Page 13 23 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 7 <td>8</td> <td>MR. MURRAY: Objection. Misstates the</td> <th>8</th> <td></td>	8	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Misstates the	8	
11 look at sections of that document, but, again, I don't 11 A Well, certainly I reviewed documents that are 12 recail, you know, which all the documents that 113 of the topics that I've written about here. Of course 14 BY MR, SKLAR: 14 aready thoughts that I had developed earlier on, but 15 Q When you were drafting your declaration in 16 secures of the timing of things, I had to refresh my memory 16 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify 16 because of the timing of things, I had to refresh my memory 17 which documents you felt you needed to look at prior to 17 memory. 18 20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 10 21 Aptar's sur-reply? 21 would your answer would include anything that would 22 Exhibit 2023.1, which is your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply? 22 be privileged conversations between you and your 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. I believel 1did. 23 materials have been filed by the parties? 23 D you understand that? 24 MR, MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 THE WITNESS: Wast would those be? 5 36 D you understand that? 3	9	-	9	
12 recall, you know, which all the documents that 12 part of this list just to recall and refresh my memory 13 that I read or what sections. 13 14 BY MR, SKLAR: 14 15 Q. When you were drafting your declaration in 15 16 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify 16 16 drafting this calculation? 16 17 memory. Q. And this declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, 18 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 20 19 A. I ~ 16 20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 20 21 would your answer would include anything that would 20 22 fine. Page 12 Page 12 23 atorney. 23 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered. 24 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 9 Page 12 25 fine. Page 12 Page 13 24 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered. The Pattent Office rules are very clear in terms of what objection mats ir appropriate. We had an issue at objection stat ir appropriate. We had an issue at objection stat ir appropriate. We	10	THE WITNESS: I do believe that I I did	10	Exhibit 2023.1?
13 that I read or what sections. 13 of the topics that I've written about here. Of course much of the information on this declaration were analerady thoughts that I had developed carlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had to refresh my memory. 14 BY MR. SKLAR: 13 of the topics that I've written about here. Of course much of the information on this declaration were analerady thoughts that I had developed carlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had to refresh my memory. 15 A I Q And this declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, is that a document that you reviewed prior to drafting the volud pour assert would include anything that would Q And this declaration, which is synort of Aptar's sur-reply? 20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you attome, would neclearation is support of Aptar's sur-reply? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 21 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's fine. 23 22 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's THE WITNESS: Was the would those be? 34 34 Do you understand that? 34 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 34 6 BY MR. SKLAR: 0 7 O Sure. Wel, let me ask you this in a more straighforward manner. 7	11	look at sections of that document, but, again, I don't	11	A Well, certainly I reviewed documents that are
14 BY MR. SKLAR: 14 much of the information on this declaration were already thoughts that 1 had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had developed earlier on, but because of the timing of things, I had to refresh my memory. 13 A I ~ 24 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you would - your answer would include anything that would the statist 2023.1, which is your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply? 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's fine. 25 fine. 26 Page 12 27 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 3 Do you understand that? 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 5 THE WITNESS: What would hose be? 6 BY MR. SKLAR: 7 Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more straightforward manner. 7 D Aura'' sur-reply? 8 Strai	12	recall, you know, which all the documents that	12	part of this list just to recall and refresh my memory
13 Q When you were drafting your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify 13 already thoughts that I had developed earlier on, but 16 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify 16 memory. 18 drafting this calculation? 17 M. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 18 Would your answer would include anything that would 12 A 1 12 Q And this declaration, which is Stabibi 2021.1, is that a document that you reviewed prior to drafting Exhibit 2023.1, which is your declaration in support of 12 would your answer would include anything that would 12 KMR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe I did. 13 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 14 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 15 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. MR. SKLAR: 16 BY MR, SKLAR: 6 objection' wague'' is expressly identified as an 0 objection' wague'' is expressly identified as an 17 Q. Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.	13	that I read or what sections.	13	of the topics that I've written about here. Of course
16 support of Aptar's sur-reply, how did you identify 16 because of the timing of things, I had to refresh my 17 which documents you felt you needed to look at prior to 17 memory. Q And this declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, 18 A 1 19 is that a document that you reviewed prior to drafting 20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 20 Exhibit 2023.1, which is your declaration in support of 21 would your answer would include anything that would 20 Aptar's sur-reply? 22 be privileged conversations between you and your 21 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 23 attorney. 23 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 25 Q You understand that? 26 25 fine. Page 12 Page 13 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered. 3 Do you understand that? 3 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what 5 THE WTINESS: What would those be? 5 Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in	14	BY MR. SKLAR:	14	much of the information on this declaration were
17 which documents you felt you needed to look at prior to 17 memory. 18 drafting this calculation? 18 memory. 19 A I 18 Schult is beak adocument that you reviewed prior to drafting 20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you is that adocument that you reviewed prior to drafting 21 would your answer would include anything that would 20 22 be privileged conversations between you and your 21 23 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 76 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 73 25 fine. Page 12 26 Page 13 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 21 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 3 Do you understand that? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 MR. MURAY: Objection. Vague. MR. MURAY: Objection. Vague. MR. MURAY: Objection. Vague. 5 THE WTINESS: What would those be? 6 BY MR. SKLAR: 6 9 Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in 70 Q. Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more 8 11 of Ap	15	Q When you were drafting your declaration in	15	already thoughts that I had developed earlier on, but
113 drafting this calculation? 14 Q And this declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, 119 A 1 - 14 Q And this declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, 120 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 15 is that a document that you reviewed prior to drafting 121 would your answer would include anything that would 16 Aptar's sur-reply? 121 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 16 BY MR. SKLAR: Q You understand that since you submitted the 122 Page 12 Page 13 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered. 13 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered. 14 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 5 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. MR. SKLAR: 15 Do you understand that? 3 MR. SKLAR: And just a moment. The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what objection "maque" is expressly identified as an objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at our prior deposition with a number of objections that were made that were improper, and particularly due to the assurt of time that we have in this case, I'm going to taking your clearation in support of Aptar's sur-reply? 12 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 110 116 116 <t< td=""><td>16</td><td></td><th>16</th><td>because of the timing of things, I had to refresh my</td></t<>	16		16	because of the timing of things, I had to refresh my
13 A I 19 is that a document that you reviewed prior to drafting 20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you Exhibit 2023.1, which is your declaration in support of 21 would your answer would include anything that would 22 22 be privileged conversations between you and your 23 23 attorney. 23 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 25 7 Fine. 24 25 fine. Page 12 26 Page 12 Page 13 27 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Page 13 28 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 29 Do you understand that? 3 30 Do you understand that? 3 MR. SKLAR: And just a moment. 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 5 objection in tais of appropriate. We had an issue at 6 BY MR. SKLAR: 6 objection with a number of objections that 9 Did you review the petitioners' reply brie in 5 9	17			-
20 MR. MURRAY: Objection to the extent that you 20 Exhibit 2023.1, which is your declaration in support of 21 would your answer would include anything that would 21 Aptar's sur-reply? 22 be privileged conversations between you and your 22 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 23 attorney. 22 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 24 BY MR. SKLAR: 25 fine. Page 12 Page 13 4 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 3 Do you understand that? 3 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what objection rules are very clear in terms of what 5 THE WITNESS: Wat would those be? 6 objection rules are very clear in terms of what 6 BY MR. SKLAR: 6 objection with a number of objections that 9 Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in 10 this case prior to drafting your declaration in support of 11 of Aptar's sur-reply? 11 <td></td> <td></td> <th></th> <td></td>				
21 would your answer would include anything that would 21 Aptar's sur-reply? 22 be privileged conversations between you and your 22 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 23 attorney. 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe I did. 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 24 BY MR. SKLAR: 25 fine. 23 Q You understand that since you submitted the 26 Page 12 Page 13 1 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered. 3 Do you understand that? 3 MR. SKLAR: And just a moment. 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what objection star is on appropriate. We had an issue at our prior deposition with a number of objections that one straightforward manner. 6 objection 'vague'' is expressly identified as an objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at our prior deposition with a number of objections that we nave in this case, I'm going to ask you to keep your objections that we are in this case, I'm going to ask you to keep your objections. 10 this case prior to drafting your declaration which was submitted in support of patar's sur-reply? 14 11 G And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental declarati				
22 be privileged conversations between you and your attorney. 22 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe I did. 23 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's fine. 23 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's fine. 24 BY MR. SKLAR: Q You understand that since you submitted the 25 Page 12 Page 13 26 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional materials have been filed by the parties? 3 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 3 3 Do you understand that? 3 MR. SKLAR: And just a moment. 4 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 5 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 5 objection 'augue' is expressly identified as an objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at objection with a number of objections that were improper, and particularly due to the samount of time that were improper, and particularly due to the amount of time that were improper, and particularly due to the amount of time that were in this case. I'm going to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and "foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires, and if necessary, we will contact the Board. Q Let me go back to that prior question. 14 BY MR. SKLAR: 14 Q Let me go back to that prior question.<				
23 attorney. 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe I did. 24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 24 BY MR. SKLAR: 25 fine. 25 Q You understand that since you submitted the 26 Page 12 Page 13 1 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 2 Do you understand that? 3 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 7 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 5 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 6 objection stapermissible or not. In fact, the objection "vague" is expressly identified as an 7 Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more 7 objection stapportiate. We had an issue at 9 Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in 9 were made that were improper, and particularly due to 10 this case prior to drafting your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply? 10 10 11 of Aptar's sur-repl? 11 12 readestaware 13 THE WITNESS: I believe I did. 12 12 14 BY MR. SKLAR:				
24 MR. SKLAR: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. That's 24 BY MR. SKLAR: 25 fine. Page 12 Page 13 1 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 2 Do you understand that? 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 3 Do you understand that? 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 5 objection that sint appropriate. We had an issue at 6 BY MR. SKLAR: 6 objection that sint appropriate. We had an issue at 9 Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in 9 our prior deposition with a number of objections that 10 this case prior to drafting your declaration in support And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental 16 16 Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental 16 Did you review or drafting your 16 Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental 16 Did you review or drafting your 16 declaration, which was submitted in support of petitoners' reply brief prior to drafting your 17				-
25 fine. 23 Q You understand that since you submitted the Page 12 Page 13 1 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 3 Do you understand that? 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Sked and 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 1 MR. SKLAR: And just a moment. 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 6 BY MR. SKLAR: 6 objection "vague" is expressly identified as an objection with a number of objections that 9 Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in 9 were made that were improper, and particularly due to 10 this case prior to drafting your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply? 10 10 were made that were improper, and particularly due to 11 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 12 Q Let me go back to that prior question. 12 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 14 Q Let me go back to that prior question. 13 THE WITNESS: I believe I did. 14 Q Let me go back to that prior question. 14 Did you review any or examine any physical		-		
Page 12 Page 13 1 declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional 1 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and 2 Do you understand that? 3 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 4 4 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. 3 MR. SKLAR: And just a moment. 5 THE WITNESS: What would those be? 6 Objection wague" is expressly identified as an 0 objection "vague" is expressly identified as an 7 Q. Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more 6 objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at 9 Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in 9 were made that were improper, and particularly due to 16 the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going 10 were made that were improper, and particularly due to 17 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 12 "foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires, 18 BY MR. SKLAR: 14 Q Let me go back to that prior question. 15 18 BY MR. SKLAR: 14 Q Let me go back to that is in support - that you filed in support of Aptar's 19 MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. 15 Did you review any or examine any physical <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><th></th><td></td></t<>				
1declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1, additional materials have been filed by the parties?1MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague. Asked and answered.3Do you understand that?3MR. SKLAR: And just a moment.4MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague.4The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what objection stre permissible or not. In fact, the objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at our prior deposition with a number of objections that6BY MR. SKLAR:67Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more straightforward manner.79Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in this case prior to drafting your declaration in support910of Aptar's sur-reply?1011of Aptar's Sur-reply?1012MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1113THE WITNESS: I believe I did.1214BY MR. SKLAR:1415Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental declaration, which was submitted in support of petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your declaration, which was submitted in support of petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?16declaration, which was submitted in support of THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.17support that you filed in support of Aptar's sur-reply in this case?18BY MR. SKLAR:20Did you review any or examine any physical declearation that is in support that you filed in support of Aptar's support that you filed in support of Aptar's support that you filed in support of	25	fine.	25	Q You understand that since you submitted the
2materials have been filed by the parties?2answered.3Do you understand that?3MR. SKLAR: And just a moment.4MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague.4The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what5THE WITNESS: What would those be?5objections are permissible or not. In fact, the6BY MR. SKLAR:6objection "vague" is expressly identified as an7Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more78bid you review the petitioners' reply brief in99bid you review the petitioners' reply brief in910this case prior to drafting your declaration in support1011the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1213THE WITNESS: I believe I did.1314BY MR. SKLAR:1415Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental1616declaration, which was submitted in support of1617petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your1718declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?1819MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1910THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2011THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2012MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1713THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2014BY MR. SKLAR:2015Opicetion is support of Aptar's sur-reply?1816 </td <td></td> <td>Page 12</td> <th></th> <td>Page 13</td>		Page 12		Page 13
2materials have been filed by the parties?2answered.3Do you understand that?3MR. SKLAR: And just a moment.4MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague.4The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what5THE WITNESS: What would those be?5objections are permissible or not. In fact, the6BY MR. SKLAR:6objection "vague" is expressly identified as an7Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more78bid you review the petitioners' reply brief in99bid you review the petitioners' reply brief in910this case prior to drafting your declaration in support1011the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1213THE WITNESS: I believe I did.1314BY MR. SKLAR:1415Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental1616declaration, which was submitted in support of1617petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your1718declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?1819MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1910THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2011THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2012MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1713THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2014BY MR. SKLAR:2015Opicetion is support of Aptar's sur-reply?1816 </td <td>1</td> <td>declaration which is Exhibit 2021 1 additional</td> <th>1</th> <td>MR MURRAY. Objection Vague Asked and</td>	1	declaration which is Exhibit 2021 1 additional	1	MR MURRAY. Objection Vague Asked and
3Do you understand that?3MR. SKLAR: And just a moment.4MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague.4The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what objections are permissible or not. In fact, the objection "vague" is expressly identified as an objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at our prior deposition with a number of objections that6BY MR. SKLAR:6objection "vague" is expressly identified as an objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at our prior deposition with a number of objections that9Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in this case prior to drafting your declaration in support910this case prior to drafting your declaration in support1011of Aptar's sur-reply?1112MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1213THE WITNESS: I believe I did.1314BY MR. SKLAR:1415Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental1516declaration, which was submitted in support of declaration, which was submitted in support of1616petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your1718declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?1819MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1910THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2012MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1914BY MR. SKLAR:2015Q Did you review any or examine any physical26The WITNESS: Yes, I did.2027Q Did you review any or examine a	2		2	
4MR. MURRAY: Objection. Vague.4The Patent Office rules are very clear in terms of what5THE WITNESS: What would those be?5objections are permissible or not. In fact, the6BY MR. SKLAR:6objection "vague" is expressly identified as an7Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more7objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at8straightforward manner.8our prior deposition with a number of objections that9Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in9were made that were improper, and particularly due to10this case prior to drafting your declaration in support10the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going11of Aptar's sur-reply?11to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires, and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of a declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?1819MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.10the association in support of Aptar's sur-reply?1818declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?1819MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.1910THE WITNESS: Yes, I	3		3	
5THE WITNESS: What would those be?5objections are permissible or not. In fact, the6BY MR. SKLAR:6objection "vague" is expressly identified as an7Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more7objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at8straightforward manner.8our prior deposition with a number of objections that9Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in9were made that were improper, and particularly due to10this case prior to drafting your declaration in support10the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going11of Aptar's sur-reply?11to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires,13THE WITNESS: I believe I did.13and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you cl	4	-	4	
6BY MR. SKLAR:6objection "vague" is expressly identified as an7Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more7objection "vague" is expressly identified as an8straightforward manner.8our prior deposition with a number of objections that9Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in9were made that were improper, and particularly due to10this case prior to drafting your declaration in support10the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going11of Aptar's sur-reply?11to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires,13THE WITNESS: I believe I did.13and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in <td< td=""><td>5</td><td></td><th>5</th><td></td></td<>	5		5	
7QSure. Well, let me ask you this in a more7objection that isn't appropriate. We had an issue at8straightforward manner.8our prior deposition with a number of objections that9Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in9were made that were improper, and particularly due to10this case prior to drafting your declaration in support10the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going11of Aptar's sur-reply?10the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires,13THE WITNESS: I believe I did.13and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in2324support tha	6	BY MR. SKLAR:	6	
8straightforward manner.8our prior deposition with a number of objections that9Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in9were made that were improper, and particularly due to10this case prior to drafting your declaration in support10the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going11of Aptar's sur-reply?11to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires,13THE WITNESS: I believe I did.13and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical2223devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in2324support that you filed in support of Aptar's2424support that you filed in support of Aptar's24	7	Q Sure. Well, let me ask you this in a more	7	
9Did you review the petitioners' reply brief in this case prior to drafting your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?9were made that were improper, and particularly due to the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I believe I did.10the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and14BY MR. SKLAR:12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires, and if necessary, we will contact the Board.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?16Did you review or examine any physical devices18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?1919MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.2121BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:2323devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in support that you filed in support of Aptar's23Q Did you review anything that was not a publication?	8	straightforward manner.	8	
11of Aptar's sur-reply?11to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires,13THE WITNESS: I believe I did.13and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical23Q Did you review any of Aptar's23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	9		9	were made that were improper, and particularly due to
12MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.12"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires,13THE WITNESS: I believe I did.13and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical23Q Did you review any of Aptar's23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	10	this case prior to drafting your declaration in support	10	the amount of time that we have in this case, I'm going
13THE WITNESS: I believe I did.13and if necessary, we will contact the Board.14BY MR. SKLAR:14Q Let me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical23Q Did you review any of Aptar's23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review any thing that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	11	of Aptar's sur-reply?	11	to ask you to keep your objections to "form" and
14BY MR. SKLAR:14QLet me go back to that prior question.15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anyting that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	12	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.	12	"foundation," which is what the Patent Office requires,
15Q And did you review Mr. Piper's supplemental15Did you review or examine any physical devices16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your16support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anyt of Aptar's24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	13	THE WITNESS: I believe I did.	13	and if necessary, we will contact the Board.
16declaration, which was submitted in support of16prior to drafting your declaration that is in17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical23Q Did you review any of Aptar's23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review any of Aptar's24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	14		14	
17petitioners' reply brief prior to drafting your17support that you filed in support of Aptar's18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical23Q Did you review any or examine any physical23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	15			
18declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?18sur-reply in this case?19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?	16			
19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.19MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?				
20THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.20THE WITNESS: Could you clarify what you mean21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?				
21BY MR. SKLAR:21by "device"? What22Q Did you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23Q Did you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?		5		-
22QDid you review any or examine any physical22BY MR. SKLAR:23devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in23QDid you review anything that was not a24support that you filed in support of Aptar's24publication?				
 devices prior to drafting your declaration that is in support that you filed in support of Aptar's Q Did you review anything that was not a publication? 				-
²⁴ support that you filed in support of Aptar's ²⁴ publication?				
support that you mod in support of riptil 5 publication.				
- Sur-repry in uns case? A ridon t recail.				*
	20	SUL-LEDIV III IIIIS CASE /		A I UUII I ICUAII.

4

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 4 of 53

	Page 14		Page 15
1	Q You're not aware if you examined, for example,	1	not at this point in the case would be to just try
2	any inhalers prior to drafting the declaration that you	2	to help visualize how parts would interact or how they
3	submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply?	3	would come together.
4	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	4	BY MR. SKLAR:
5	THE WITNESS: I have a number of medical	5	Q And you don't know what device that was that
6	devices that on my well-organized desk. To be	6	you may have looked at?
7	honest, I don't recall exactly what those devices are	7	A No, I do not.
8	or if I picked one up and took a look at it, but it is	8	Q Would it have been an MDI?
9	possible.	9	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.
10	BY MR. SKLAR:	10	THE WITNESS: Well, like I said, I have a
11	Q Sitting here today, are you aware of any	11	number of medical devices on my desk, and there are one
12	reason, as it relates to the drafting of your opinions	12	or two MDIs.
13	expressed in Exhibit 2023.1, why you would have	13	BY MR. SKLAR:
14	examined a physical device?	14	Q Outside of the devices that were already
15	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	15	present on your desk, did you review any physical
16	THE WITNESS: Could you repeat that?	16	devices in drafting the opinions that are set forth in
17	BY MR. SKLAR:	17	your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply?
18	Q I'll repeat it.	18	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
19	A All right.	19	THE WITNESS: No.
20	Q Are you aware of any reason as it relates to	20	BY MR. SKLAR:
21	the drafting of your opinions expressed in 2023.1 why	21	Q Why didn't you include a list of materials
22	you would have examined a physical device?	22	considered in this declaration, 2023.1?
23	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.	23	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
24	THE WITNESS: One of the reasons I may have	24	THE WITNESS: I was not instructed to.
25	looked at a device which I don't recall if I did or	25	///
	looked at a device which I don't recan if I did of		
	Page 16		Page 17
1			
-	BY MR. SKLAR:	1	report.
2		1 2	report. BY MR. SKLAR:
	Q You did include a list of materials considered		1
2		2	BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3	Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct?A That's correct.	2 3	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was
2 3 4	Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct?A That's correct.Q Why did you include a list of materials	2 3 4	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1.
2 3 4 5	Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct?A That's correct.Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1?	2 3 4 5	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object
2 3 4 5 6	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. 	2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this
2 4 5 7 8 9	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials 	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? 	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the requests and requirements for working on the report. BY MR. SKLAR: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so let me just repeat it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the requests and requirements for working on the report. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it correct to say that it was not your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so let me just repeat it. I'm just trying to understand if it was your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the requests and requirements for working on the report. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it correct to say that it was not your decision whether or not to include a list of materials 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so let me just repeat it. I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the requests and requirements for working on the report. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it correct to say that it was not your decision whether or not to include a list of materials considered in your report? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so let me just repeat it. I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the requests and requirements for working on the report. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it correct to say that it was not your decision whether or not to include a list of materials considered in your report? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Relevance. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so let me just repeat it. I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the requests and requirements for working on the report. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it correct to say that it was not your decision whether or not to include a list of materials considered in your report? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Relevance. THE WITNESS: Again, it was a collaborative 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so let me just repeat it. I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered. Scope.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q You did include a list of materials considered in your declaration, which is Exhibit 2021.1; correct? A That's correct. Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Ask it again. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Why did you include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1? A Well MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: Sorry. In my collaboration with the attorneys and in putting together this declaration, that was one of the requests and requirements for working on the report. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it correct to say that it was not your decision whether or not to include a list of materials considered in your report? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Relevance. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Counsel, I'm also going to object to the scope of this question as beyond the limited scope of this deposition. I'll let you continue for now, but if it continues, we may have to shut down this line of questioning. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A Typically when I'm working on these kinds of reports, that is something that is discussed collaboratively. That's very common, as I've worked on these in the past. Q Sure. And that wasn't exactly my question, so let me just repeat it. I'm just trying to understand if it was your decision to include a list of materials considered in Exhibit 2021.1. MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.

5

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 5 of 53

Paσe	18
Lage	- U

	Page 18	Page 19
1	and that's one section that is usually discussed. It's	¹ You agree that an undercut can be eliminated
2	typically not something I would demand, but it is	² by adding a slot in the line of draw.
3	something that comes about through a collaborative	³ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
4	process.	⁴ THE WITNESS: Well, what I agree to in the
5	BY MR. SKLAR:	⁵ reports that I've written, which again I'm just giving
6	Q And would the same answer hold true as it	⁶ you my opinion, is that for the combinations that have
7	relates to Exhibit 2023.1?	⁷ been described by petitioner to be affected in the
8	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	⁸ combination, one would have to create holes or
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.	⁹ you've stated slots. They're probably the same in
10	BY MR. SKLAR:	¹⁰ concept. But holes/slots would have to be created in
11	Q Let's shift gears a little bit, and we're	¹¹ order to mitigate those undercut conditions.
12	going to talk about injection molding. Is that okay?	¹² BY MR. SKLAR:
13	A Sure.	¹³ Q Okay. Again, that didn't answer my question.
14	Q All right. You agree that an undercut can be	¹⁴ Just to be clear, you expressed your answer in
15	eliminated by adding a slot in the line of draw;	¹⁵ terms of what you agreed to in your report. I'm here
16	correct?	¹⁶ today to ask you about that report and understand what
17	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	¹⁷ your opinions were, and I can ask questions around
18	THE WITNESS: My opinion in my reports is that	¹⁸ that, for that purpose. Okay? So with that said, let
19	to mitigate an undercut condition with respect to the	¹⁹ me repeat my question, and I'd like you to answer my
20	devices that we're discussing here, one would have to	²⁰ question.
21	create openings in the device, which would affect the	²¹ You agree that an undercut can be eliminated
22	flow path.	²² by adding a slot in the line of draw?
23	BY MR. SKLAR:	²³ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and
24	Q That wasn't my question again. Let me ask it	²⁴ answered.
25	one more time.	²⁵ THE WITNESS: Perhaps you could ask it another
	Page 20	Page 21
1	way, because to me, I've answered your question.	¹ so I can appreciate where it's how this is adding to
2	(Exhibit 2018 was referenced.)	² the idea here?
3	BY MR. SKLAR:	³ Q Yes, you may.
4	Q All right. Mr. Clemens, I'm handing you a	⁴ A Okay.
5	document that I've marked as Exhibit 2018.	⁵ Q Okay. Let me repeat my question.
6	Do you see that?	⁶ Do you agree that an undercut can be
7	A I do.	⁷ eliminated by adding a slot in the line of draw?
8	Q And this document appears to be an article or	⁸ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Asked and answered.
9	book entitled "Plastic Part Design For Injection	⁹ THE WITNESS: I would agree with what is
10	Molding"; correct?	¹⁰ written in the document that you've shared with me, and
11	A Correct.	¹¹ if that is something that can occur in a part, it could
12	Q I'd like to turn your attention to page 99,	12 do that.
13	which is the last page of Exhibit 2018.	¹³ BY MR. SKLAR:
14	The last two sentences, I'm going to read them	¹⁴ Q We did confirm earlier that you reviewed the
15	for you, and then I'm going to ask you some questions.	¹⁵ petitioners' reply brief in this case; correct?
16	"The side action, and added tooling costs,	¹⁶ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Misstates the
17	could be eliminated if the part is designed with	¹⁷ witness's testimony.
18	consideration towards ejection. For example, the hole	18 THE WITNESS: I reviewed many documents. That
19	could be replaced by a slot in the line of draw, and as	¹⁹ was one of them.
20	a result, no special side actions or core pulls are	²⁰ BY MR. SKLAR:
21	required."	21 Q And you are familiar with the tool design that
22	Do you see that?	²² petitioners proposed in this case; correct?
23	A I do.	A That's correct.
24	Q Do you agree with that statement?	²⁴ Q And petitioners' tool design does add slots to
25	A Well, may I read the paragraph in its entirety	the housing; correct?

6

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 6 of 53

	Page 22	Page 23
1	A Could we review the document which you're	¹ holes to the bottom of the housing; correct?
2	referring to, that section?	² A Holes would be formed in some part of the
3	Q Sure.	³ housing, which is proximal to the flow path, not really
4	A Thank you.	⁴ wanting to necessarily claim the bottom is
5	(Exhibit 1075 was referenced.)	⁵ You know, what is bottom? So holes would be
6	BY MR. SKLAR:	⁶ created proximal to the flow path.
7	Q Okay. Mr. Clemens, I've handed you a copy of	⁷ Q And those holes are in the line of draw;
8	what I have marked down as Exhibit 1075. This is	⁸ correct?
9	petitioners' reply brief in Case No. 2018-01054.	⁹ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
10	Do you see that?	¹⁰ THE WITNESS: They would be in the line of
11	A Yes.	¹¹ draw. Correct.
12	Q And I will direct you to the figure on page 6	¹² BY MR. SKLAR:
13	of petitioners' reply brief.	¹³ Q You can put that to the side. Thank you.
14	Do you see that figure?	¹⁴ A Okay.
15	A I do.	¹⁵ MR. SKLAR: You know what? Why don't we take
16	Q And so my question was: You agree that	¹⁶ just a real quick break, and then we'll circle back.
17	petitioners' tool design does add slots to the housing	¹⁷ (Recess taken 10:02 a.m 10:09 a.m.)
18	of the inhaler body; correct?	¹⁸ BY MR. SKLAR:
19	A So my interpretation of the drawing and the	¹⁹ Q Welcome back, Mr. Clemens.
20	proposal of the tooling change here, I would	²⁰ A Thank you.
21	characterize what would happen to the inhaler housing	²¹ Q Are you familiar with the FDA guidance that
22	is that holes would be formed.	has been discussed in this case several times?
23	Q So let me restate it, just using your	A Yes. I have reviewed it a while ago, but yes.
24	terminology.	²⁴ Q And are you aware that in 2003, the FDA issued
25	You agree that petitioners' tool design adds	²⁵ final guidance stating that it recommended for
	Page 24	Dago 25
	_	Page 25
1	manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate	¹ the inhalation flow path; correct?
2	manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI?	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and
2 3	manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do.	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered.
2 3 4	manufacturers with MDIs under development to integratea dose-counting device into their MDI?A Yes, I do.Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not
2 3 4 5	manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer.
2 3 4 5 6	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.)
2 3 4 5 6 7	manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct?	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057.
2 4 5 7 8 9 10	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19. Sorry. Excuse me. 119.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19. Sorry. Excuse me. 119. A Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19. Sorry. Excuse me. 119. A Okay. Q Were you asked this question, and did you give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19. Sorry. Excuse me. 119. A Okay. Q Were you asked this question, and did you give this answer:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. Q Now, the addition of a dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path; correct? 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19. Sorry. Excuse me. 119. A Okay. Q Were you asked this question, and did you give this answer: "Question: And the inhalation flow path that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. Q Now, the addition of a dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path; correct? 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19. Sorry. Excuse me. 119. A Okay. Q Were you asked this question, and did you give this answer: "Question: And the inhalation flow path that you're referring to, that's from the stem
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. Q Now, the addition of a dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path; correct? 	 the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. THE WITNESS: I would say that "not necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer. (Exhibit 1057 was referenced.) BY MR. SKLAR: Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of what I've marked as Exhibit 1057. This is a copy of your deposition transcript from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct? A That's what it appears to be. Yes. Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19. Sorry. Excuse me. 119. A Okay. Q Were you asked this question, and did you give this answer: "Question: And the inhalation flow path that you're referring to, that's from the stem
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. Q Now, the addition of a dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: It does interact. Yes, it does. 	1the inhalation flow path; correct?2MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and3answered.4THE WITNESS: I would say that "not5necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer.6(Exhibit 1057 was referenced.)7BY MR. SKLAR:8Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of9what I've marked as Exhibit 1057.10This is a copy of your deposition transcript11from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct?12A That's what it appears to be. Yes.13Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19.14Sorry. Excuse me. 119.15A Okay.16Q Were you asked this question, and did you give17this answer:18"Question: And the inhalation flow path that19block out the mouthpiece?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. Q Now, the addition of a dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: It does interact. Yes, it does. BY MR. SKLAR: 	1the inhalation flow path; correct?2MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and3answered.4THE WITNESS: I would say that "not5necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer.6(Exhibit 1057 was referenced.)7BY MR. SKLAR:8Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of9what I've marked as Exhibit 1057.10This is a copy of your deposition transcript11from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct?12A That's what it appears to be. Yes.13Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19.14Sorry. Excuse me. 119.15A Okay.16Q Were you asked this question, and did you give17this answer:18"Question: And the inhalation flow path that19you're referring to, that's from the stem20block out the mouthpiece?21"Answer: So it's created literally it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. Q Now, the addition of a dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: It does interact. Yes, it does. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I just want to make sure we understand, 	1the inhalation flow path; correct?2MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and3answered.4THE WITNESS: I would say that "not5necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer.6(Exhibit 1057 was referenced.)7BY MR. SKLAR:8Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of9what I've marked as Exhibit 1057.10This is a copy of your deposition transcript11from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct?12A That's what it appears to be. Yes.13Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19.14Sorry. Excuse me. 119.15A Okay.16Q Were you asked this question, and did you give17this answer:18"Question: And the inhalation flow path that19you're referring to, that's from the stem20block out the mouthpiece?21"Answer: So it's created literally it's22created by the canister being in the way,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 manufacturers with MDIs under development to integrate a dose-counting device into their MDI? A Yes, I do. Q And do you agree that at the time of the FDA's final guidance Well, let me establish this. The FDA's final guidance was issued in March 2003; correct? A I believe that is correct. Q And at the time of the FDA's final guidance, MDIs generally did not include integrated dose counters; rights? A Dose counters were had existed in terms of concepts and patents. They had been worked on for several years, but at that time, I do not believe there was one that had been integrated into a device and was currently on the market. Q Now, the addition of a dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: It does interact. Yes, it does. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I just want to make sure we understand, because you sort of changed the wording there a little 	1the inhalation flow path; correct?2MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Asked and3answered.4THE WITNESS: I would say that "not5necessarily" is probably, you know, a better answer.6(Exhibit 1057 was referenced.)7BY MR. SKLAR:8Q Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you a copy of9what I've marked as Exhibit 1057.10This is a copy of your deposition transcript11from your oral deposition on April 24, 2019; correct?12A That's what it appears to be. Yes.13Q I'm going to direct your attention to page 19.14Sorry. Excuse me. 119.15A Okay.16Q Were you asked this question, and did you give17this answer:18"Question: And the inhalation flow path that19you're referring to, that's from the stem20block out the mouthpiece?21"Answer: So it's created literally it's22created by the canister being in the way,23whatever else, you know, parts of the design,

7

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 7 of 53

	Page 26		Page 27
1	Do you see that?	1	BY MR. SKLAR:
2	A I do.	2	Q And were skilled artisans at that time
3	Q So let me ask you again. The addition of a	3	meaning in 2003 able to use those tools in order to
4	dose counter interferes with the inhalation flow path.	4	optimize the inhalation flow path?
5	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Misstates previous	5	A They would have been able to use the tools to
6	testimony.	6	analyze and understand how the flow path was affected.
7	MR. SKLAR: And, again, this speaking	7	And when you say "optimize," what do you mean?
8	objection, that's the second time.	8	Q I'm using your words, actually, from your
9	Could you please mark that in the transcript?	9	declaration. You used the word "optimize."
10	And if it happens a third time, we will	10	A So in terms of what I was speaking to in my
11	contact the Patent Office so that we can proceed	11	deposition, they could optimize for a particular
12	properly.	12	reason. It wouldn't necessarily mean that
13	Q I'll ask the question one more time. The	13	When I say "optimize," what I mean is that you
14	addition of a dose counter interferes with the	14	could achieve the best result that your design could
15	inhalation flow path; correct?	15	allow.
16	A It is.	16	Q And if, let's say, during the design process a
17	Q Do you agree that skilled artisans knew in	17	part was changed or added such that it affected the
18	2003 how to re-optimize the inhalation flow path to	18	inhalation flow path, would a skilled artisan in 2003
19	account for changes in the MDI?	19	have been able to use those tools to improve the
20	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	20	inhalation flow path?
21	THE WITNESS: What I would agree to is that	21	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
22	engineers in that time frame knew how to analyze fluid	22	THE WITNESS: The tool could be used to
23	dynamics; that there were tools available that they	23	analyze the flow path; however, in the topic that we're
24	could analyze that.	24	discussing here, and what I've been forming opinions
25	///	25	about, is that the addition of these holes is a
	Page 28		Page 29
1	complication, which even though you could optimize, it	1	
2			A Correct.
	doesn't mean that it would perform correctly, and it	2	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such
3	would most definitely create complexities in the	2 3	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1
3 4	would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes,	2 3 4	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow
3 4 5	would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean	2 3 4 5	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient?
3 4 5 6	would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function.	2 3 4 5 6	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
3 4 5	would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR:	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed
3 4 5 6 7 8	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that 	2 3 6 7 8 9 10	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. Q And you understand there are two proposed 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. So once again, just to be clear, that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. Q And you understand there are two proposed combinations as it relates to the '177 patent; correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. So once again, just to be clear, that wasn't my question. And I think you can see at this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. Q And you understand there are two proposed combinations as it relates to the '177 patent; correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. So once again, just to be clear, that wasn't my question. And I think you can see at this point, I'm going to be a stickler for making sure that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. Q And you understand there are two proposed combinations as it relates to the '177 patent; correct? A Correct. Q And that's the combination of Elliott and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. So once again, just to be clear, that wasn't my question. And I think you can see at this point, I'm going to be a stickler for making sure that I get the answer to my question, and it certainly will
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. Q And you understand there are two proposed combinations as it relates to the '177 patent; correct? A Correct. Q And that's the combination of Elliott and Rhoades is Ground 1; right? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. So once again, just to be clear, that wasn't my question. And I think you can see at this point, I'm going to be a stickler for making sure that I get the answer to my question, and it certainly will go faster for all of us here, but I'll keep repeating
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. Q And you understand there are two proposed combinations as it relates to the '177 patent; correct? A Correct. Q And that's the combination of Elliott and Rhoades is Ground 1; right? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. So once again, just to be clear, that wasn't my question. And I think you can see at this point, I'm going to be a stickler for making sure that I get the answer to my question, and it certainly will go faster for all of us here, but I'll keep repeating if necessary. I also know we're limited by time to a
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 would most definitely create complexities in the design. So there's no guarantee that you could yes, certainly you could optimize it, but it doesn't mean that it would optimize it to function. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Have you performed any tests on a device, such as one that the petitioners have proposed in this case, to determine whether or not the flow path of that device would be sufficient? A Would you repeat that? Q You in your last answer had said you're testifying about a certain topic, and I presume you're talking about the combinations that have been proposed in this case; correct? A That's correct. Q And you understand there are two proposed combinations as it relates to the '177 patent; correct? A Correct. Q And that's the combination of Elliott and Rhoades is Ground 1; right? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Have you performed any tests on a device such as the ones that petitioners have proposed in Grounds 1 and 2 of this case to determine whether or not the flow path of those devices would be sufficient? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: What I have done is performed very large and complete computational fluid dynamics in devices that are similar, and I have had to adjust designs in order to achieve proper flow paths, which would make the device safe and effective. So I am aware I have experience and certain intuition that helps me to understand the effects on, you know, the flow path of these kinds of drug-delivery devices. For some part of my opinion, that's what I base that on. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. So once again, just to be clear, that wasn't my question. And I think you can see at this point, I'm going to be a stickler for making sure that I get the answer to my question, and it certainly will go faster for all of us here, but I'll keep repeating

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

877-702-9580

8

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 8 of 53

	Page 30		Page 31
1	the answers are nonresponsive. So if we can stick to	1	tests or analysis on similar devices, did those similar
2	that question, I think we'll be able to move this	2	devices have through holes like the ones that we've
3	forward a little faster.	3	discussed in both the Ground 1 and Ground 2
4	My issue with your response is that you	4	combinations?
5	mentioned that you had performed some analysis on	5	A They had through holes, but because these
6	similar devices. That's not what I had asked you	6	devices that we're discussing here in the combinations
7	about. Okay? So to be clear, I'll repeat my question.	7	are unique unto themselves, you know, they could never
8	Have you performed any tests on the devices	8	be identical. But, yes, there were through holes in
9	that would result from the Bason/Rhoades combination to	9	the other devices.
10	determine whether or not the flow path of those devices	10	Q What were those other devices that you
11	would be sufficient?	11	analyzed?
12	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	12	A I worked on an inhalation device for nicotine
13	THE WITNESS: That would be an impossible task	13	delivery and also developed test equipment for the
14	for me to perform.	14	analysis and optimization of the and confirmation of
15	BY MR. SKLAR:	15	the computational fluid dynamics model.
16	Q So you have not done that?	16	Q For that same inhalation device, for nicotine
17	A The physical combinations have never been	17	delivery?
18	created by anybody.	18	A Yes. Correct.
19	Q Have you performed any tests on the devices	19	Q Is that inhalation device for nicotine
20	that would result from the Elliott/Rhoades combination	20	delivery that you worked on an MDI?
21	to determine whether or not the flow path of those	21	A How would you define an MDI?
22	devices would be sufficient?	22	Q How would you define an MDI?
23	A Since they've never been created, a test could	23	A Well, you're asking the question. I would
24	never be performed.	24	like to understand what your question is getting to.
25	Q When you said earlier that you had performed	25	Q Sure. You are being presented here as a
	Page 32		Page 33
1	-	1	
1	skilled artisan or an expert in this field. I would	1 2	nicotine delivery device was that it be a rather small
2	like to understand what is your understanding of what	3	form factor. And so, much like the metered-dose
3 4	an MDI means in the context that we've been discussing	4	inhalers in the combination, we have, you know, a
	it.		canister, things that are formed upstream. When you
5	A Well, it can mean many things. An MDI in the	5	shrink that form factor way down, you lose an entry
6	context of the combinations that we're discussing,		point for fresh air to be pulled past the device that's
7	those are handheld devices that deliver a particular	7	generating the droplets. And so I was creating an
8	quantity of drug; thus, metered-dose inhalation.	8	air stream with those holes.
9	The nicotine delivery system I was working on	9	Q And what ultimately happened with that
10	also delivered a metered dose. So I would I would	10	project?
11	consider it and classify it as a metered-dose inhaler,	11	A Ultimately what happened with that project was
12	disposable usually. They're reusable for a period of	12	Hewlett-Packard sued the company, the start-up. There
13	time, but they're not durable. It's I think there	13	was so there was a disagreement, a business
14	are a large number of devices which could be captured	14	disagreement between Hewlett-Packard, who was supplying
15	under the umbrella of MDI.	15	the delivery, the actual droplet-forming device, and
16	Q Where were the through holes on the inhalation	16	put them out of business.
17	device for nicotine delivery that you worked on?	17	Q So that product did not move forward because
18	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	18	they were put out of business; correct?
19	THE WITNESS: They were located proximal to	19	A That's correct.
20	the well, they were proximal to the actual device	20	Q Are there any differences in terms of what you
21	that was creating the droplets.	21	analyzed as an engineer between the optimized
22	BY MR. SKLAR:	22	inhalation flow path for a nicotine delivery device and
23	Q Can you explain that in more detail?	23	the optimized inhalation flow path for a drug delivery
24	A I would consider it upstream of the droplet	24	device?
25	delivery device. One of the requirements for that	25	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.

TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580

9

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 9 of 53

	Page 34		Page 35
1	THE WITNESS: What I would say about that is	1	could disturb the inhalation flow path; right?
2	that every inhalation device is different from the	2	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
3	other, unless they're just replicates of the same. And	3	THE WITNESS: What I would say is that anytime
4	even when they're replicates, there's variation; right?	4	you would go into an MDI, an existing MDI, if you
5	But each inhalation device would be unique unto itself.	5	wanted to add something to it, again, that would fall
6	Yeah.	6	under the umbrella that I would refer to as sustaining,
7	BY MR. SKLAR:	7	that would require a check of the flow path.
8	Q When you work on the design of an MDI, is the	8	BY MR. SKLAR:
9	inhalation flow path always the correct inhalation flow	9	Q I'm going to hand you another document that
10	path from the beginning of the project through the end?	10	I'm marking as 1013.
11	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	11	(Exhibit 1013 was referenced.)
12	THE WITNESS: So, you know, it depends on the	12	BY MR. SKLAR:
13	project that you are working on. If you are assigned	13	Q And this exhibit is the final guidance from
14	to a project where you're creating a MDI or, you know,	14	the FDA; correct?
15	an inhalation device from scratch, you know, obviously	15	A It appears to be that. Yes.
16	it evolves.	16	Q That's from March 2003?
17	If you are sustaining a inhalation device, the	17	A Yep. Yes.
18	hope is that you don't disturb it, because you know,	18	Q And if you look at the Bates stamp in the
19	unless the flow path was at fault, unless there's a	19	lower right-hand corner, it's page 6 of 7. Do you see
20	problem with the flow path. So in terms of, you know,	20	a header, "General Recommendations"?
21	would the flow path be the same from beginning to end	21	A I see that, yes.
22	of the project? Well, it would depend.	22	On paragraph 8?
23	BY MR. SKLAR:	23	Q Yes.
24	Q But you agree that in 2003, based on the FDA's	24	And so the general recommendation one of
25	guidance, a change would have to be made to MDIs, which	25	the general recommendations from the FDA is that
	Page 36		Page 37
1	-	1	
2	manufacturers with metered-dose inhalers under	2	Q So I think that's a good point. I'd like to be clear about that.
3	development for oral inhalation integrate a	3	
4	dose-counting device into the development of their MDI drug product; correct?	4	Any change that you make to your design will require reverification of the product; correct?
5	A Correct.	5	A In medical devices, if you have an established
6	Q So am I correct that there could have been	6	device that's already on the market, you wouldn't
7	certain manufacturers who were already in the process	7	revalidate everything or re you wouldn't retest
8	of developing an MDI who would now have to make this	8	everything. You would test the specific areas that
9	change that the FDA is requiring? Correct?	9	might be affected. So that would be a retrospective
10	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	10	test, a verification test, as opposed to a validation,
11	THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe that's what this	11	but it would be a verification test. So not all things
12	is stating.	12	get tested, but anything subsystem which it may have an
13	BY MR. SKLAR:	13	effect on.
14	Q And that change could affect the inhalation	14	Q So inhalation flow path would be something
15	flow path; right? The addition of the counter could	15	that would be retested if, say, a change is made to the
16	affect the inhalation flow path.	16	design of the product.
17	I think we established that earlier; right?	17	A I believe that for MDIs, inhalation devices,
18	A As I said, if you're working on an inhaler and	18	because the delivery of the drug and the quantity of
19	you get into a sustaining situation where you're adding	19	the drug is critical to the safety and efficacy, that
20	something to you know, if the flow path has already	20	that would that would necessarily have to be
21	been established and then you now want to do something	21	retested, probably regardless for any changes except
22	that you fear might interfere with it. But even if you	22	for maybe labeling.
23	didn't fear that, you would be you would have to	23	Q And if the tools that engineers use to do that
24	check it, you know, as a you know, just to qualify	24	retesting determine that the addition of some component
25	it. So	25	or let me scratch that. Strike that.
_			

10

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 10 of 53

Page 38

Daa	~	30
Pag	e	33

	Page 38		Page 39
1	If the tools that engineers use to retest the	1	A I guess the simplest way to answer that would
2	inhalation flow path determine that some change to the	2	be just to say that the fluid dynamics of a vessel is
3	design of the MDI has caused an unsatisfactory change	3	impacted by many aspects of that vessel, and when you
4	to the inhalation flow path, what tools or what would	4	inject a feature it could be a bump or it could be a
5	an engineer do in order to try to correct that?	5	hole or it could be a rib or it could be you know,
6	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	6	there's many different effects by whatever changes you
7	THE WITNESS: Again, we can say a change	7	make in the flow path of the vessel. So obviously
8	you know, which is something different about the design	8	adding holes, one of the things
9	that you're evolving it to it could be a simple	9	I'm not going to be able to, you know,
10	change, or it could turn out to be a complicated	10	completely answer the question in terms of a particular
11	change. So in all cases, they would have to what	11	instance, because we don't, you know, have the tools in
12	would be common is that there would be tests that have	12	front of us to run it and to actually define what those
13	already been validated to show that there is a	13	are, but, for instance, one of the effects could be
14	correlation to how safe and effective the device is out	14	well, necessarily would be the addition of high
15	in the field. Those once established, they would	15	velocity fresh air being injected into an already
16	just continue to use those tools. The change, whatever	16	established flow path, and that would in MDIs, it's
17	the change is, could be like I said, have minor or	17	not only just the simple flow path, but it's how the
18	major effects, and sometimes those changes need to be	18	drug is being carried in the flow path, in what in
19	actually pulled back, because you could create a device	19	what area or portion of the cross-section of the flow
20	that is no longer meeting its spec. So it really is	20	path; the distance that the drug travels from point of
21	dependent on the change and the complexity that it	21	injection to the lung gets disturbed.
22	causes in the flow path.	22	So there's a myriad of considerations that get
23	BY MR. SKLAR:	23	impacted when you especially throw in a feature such as
24	Q How do through holes affect the inhalation	24	openings, which can create a lot of issues with the
25	flow path?	25	flow path. So it's rather complicated. Yes, there are
	Page 40		Page 41
1	tools that you would use to analyze it, but like I was	1	that the '177 patent does not discuss an inhalation
2	saying before, you know, there are simple changes, and	2	flow path, is it your opinion that a skilled artisan
3	then there are very complicated changes.	3	reading the '177 patent would be capable of making a
4	Q Are there any ways for skilled artisans to	4	fluid dispenser that has a proper inhalation flow path?
5	reduce the amount of fresh air being injected into a	5	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
6	flow path?	6	THE WITNESS: Okay. Let me just make sure I
7	A Certainly. There could be ways to do that.	7	got this right. So you're saying assuming the patent
8	Q Does the '177 patent say anything about an	8	says nothing about a flow path, would a skilled artisan
9	inhalation flow path?	9	be able to I'm sorry adjust? Modify?
10	A I don't recall.	10	BY MR. SKLAR:
11	I would add to that, however	11	Q To make a fluid dispenser like the ones
12	The patent is about metered-dose inhalers.	12	claimed in the '177 patent that has a proper inhalation
13	So, inherently, you know, it's a device for delivering	13	flow path.
14	drugs. So that is an aspect that immediately comes to	14	A Well, I guess I would have to say that the
15	your mind as you're reading the patent; that that is	15	presumption is that one would be able to make it work.
16	that's part of what that patent it's part of what	16	But given that the patent does incorporate in its
17	that patent is addressing.	17	specification, you know, many of the functioning
18	Q But the '177 patent doesn't specifically	18	features of an MDI, I would say yes, you know, you
19	describe how to set a proper inhalation flow path;	19	would be successful. So
20	right?	20	Q So if I were to incorporate all of those
21	A I don't recall.	21	features that are claimed in the '177 patent, you would
22	Q Let's assume for a moment that it doesn't.	22	have confidence that my device would have a proper
23	Okay? If I'm going	23	inhalation flow path? Because it has all the features.
24	I'm going to represent to you that it does	24	A Well, the '177 patent isn't a it's not a
25	not, okay, for purposes of this question. So given	25	design file for a particular MDI. It's a specification

877-702-9580

11

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 11 of 53

	Page 42		Page 43
1	-	1	that I have never analyzed a device that has been a
2	describing conceptually a unique approach to an MDI. So, I mean, I would have to see something that's more	2	a device reduced to practice from the patent itself.
3	of a design-related information.	3	But the presumption is, yes, you would be able to do
4	Q What do you mean you'd have to see something	4	that.
5	that's more design-related information?	5	(Exhibit 1001 was referenced.)
6	A Well, I believe you're asking, you know, you	6	BY MR. SKLAR:
7	would have a successful finished product, and what I	7	Q Okay. I'm going to hand you a document that
8	would have a successful finished product, and what i would say to that is that to analyze that, I would have	8	I've marked as Exhibit 1001.
9	to see the design file, the what is it that you've	9	This is the U.S. Patent No. 8,936,177;
10	reduced a practice from this patent? The	10	correct?
11	presumption as I stated before, the presumption is,	11	A Correct.
12	in following the specification that you would	12	Q And that's what we've been referring to as the
13	incorporate many, many aspects of functioning MDIs.	13	'177 patent; right?
14	And I'm just saying that I would like I would	14	A That is correct.
15	have to analyze that properly, I would have to see	15	Q I'll ask you to take a moment and take a look
16	what that's been reduced to practice.	16	at claim 1 of the '177 patent, which can be found in
17	Q So I guess I'm a little unclear about what	17	column 9. Let me know when you've had a chance to read
18	your testimony is. Is it your testimony that you're	18	claim 1.
19	not certain whether a skilled artisan would be able to	19	A Okay.
20	make a fluid dispenser pursuant to the claims of the	20	Q You agree that claim 1 does not say anything
21	'177 patent that would have a proper inhalation flow	21	about the inhalation flow path; correct?
22	path?	22	A I do not see those words in that claim.
23	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	23	Q Is there anything in that claim that provides
24	THE WITNESS: I guess what I'm saying is that	24	guidance to a skilled artisan as to how to set the
25	the question that you're proposing to me is abstract in	25	inhalation flow path?
	the question that you're proposing to me is abstract in		induction now putt.
	Page 44		Page 45
1	-	1	Page 45 A Yes.
1 2	Page 44 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI.	1 2	-
	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to		A Yes.
2	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI.	2	A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the
2 3	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate	2 3	A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"?
2 3 4	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you	2 3 4	A Yes.Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"?A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you
2 3 4 5	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser.	2 3 4 5	A Yes.Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"?A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe
2 3 4 5 6	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where	2 3 4 5 6	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising"
2 3 4 5 6 7	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. Q You have a number of patents to your name; 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having Do you agree that claim 1 could cover an MDI
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. Q You have a number of patents to your name; correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having Do you agree that claim 1 could cover an MDI that has through holes?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. Q You have a number of patents to your name; correct? A I do. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having Do you agree that claim 1 could cover an MDI that has through holes? MR. MURRAY: Same objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. Q You have a number of patents to your name; correct? A I do. Q Do you recall how many, off the top of your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having Do you agree that claim 1 could cover an MDI that has through holes? MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: I'm not an attorney, a patent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. Q You have a number of patents to your name; correct? A I do. Q Do you recall how many, off the top of your head? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having Do you agree that claim 1 could cover an MDI that has through holes? MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: I'm not an attorney, a patent attorney, so I'm not sure about the whatever the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. Q You have a number of patents to your name; correct? A I do. Q Do you recall how many, off the top of your head? A It's about a dozen. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having Do you agree that claim 1 could cover an MDI that has through holes? MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: I'm not an attorney, a patent attorney, so I'm not sure about the whatever the legal aspects of your question, but something that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A Well, I believe that the patent is directed to fluid dispensers, and one of those would be an MDI. And so inherently, you would you would associate that as part of it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be, you know, a successful fluid dispenser. Q Well, I guess what I'm asking you is: Where is that part of it coming from? Where is that knowledge about how to set the inhalation flow path coming from? A I guess it comes from what? over 50 years of development of metered-dose fluid-dispensing devices. Q Okay. So would it be correct to say it's based on the knowledge of the skilled artisan? A I think it's based on the fact that it's a patent directed to those devices. So it's inherent. Q You have a number of patents to your name; correct? A I do. Q Do you recall how many, off the top of your head? A It's about a dozen. Q Do you see the first line of claim 1 says "a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A Yes. Q So do you understand the significance of the word "comprising"? A I'm not sure what you're thinking, but if you can describe it maybe Q Sure. So in patent law, we say "comprising" is a transitional term, which means it's open-ended. So, in other words, the claim or the alleged infringing product to meet the claim must have all the limitations that are listed in claim 1, but it could have others. Do you understand that? A Yes. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to this line of question as calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. SKLAR: Q A an MDI having Do you agree that claim 1 could cover an MDI that has through holes? MR. MURRAY: Same objection. THE WITNESS: I'm not an attorney, a patent attorney, so I'm not sure about the whatever the legal aspects of your question, but something that is as general as a fluid dispenser, if that's all you're

12

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 12 of 53

	Page 46		Page 47
1	BY MR. SKLAR:	1	determine how much additional maintenance would be
2	Q And that could include that claim 1 could	2	required for a tool having arms such as the ones
3	cover an MDI that has through holes; correct?	3	proposed by petitioners in Ground 1 and Ground 2 of the
4	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.	4	'177 IPR?
5	THE WITNESS: It could include any features	5	A What my opinion is
6	that would	6	Petitioners are proposing that they make a
7	I'm assuming you're referring to just meeting	7	simple and easy combination and that the motivation of
8	that claim. Assuming it didn't have any relevance to	8	doing this is that because it is simple and easy and
9	the elements of the claim, I mean, yes, there are	9	essentially interchangable. What I know is what
10	many there could be many features that are included.	10	they're attempting to combine is not interchangable.
11	BY MR. SKLAR:	11	It will cause complexities, and there will be a nonzero
12	Q What would be the cost of a tool having the	12	effect on cost and complexity to the tooling, and it
13	arms that have been proposed by petitioners? And	13	will most likely be a large nonzero effect. So the
14	that's for both the Ground 1 and Ground 2 combinations	14	simple and easy motivation is I think, is not
15	in the '177 IPR.	15	accurate.
16	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	16	Q Again, that wasn't my question. You've done a
17	THE WITNESS: I wouldn't be able to answer	17	pretty good job at least, so I'll let you off the hook
18	that as I'm sitting here today, because there are many	18	easy. But I do want to get back again, and try to
19	variables associated with what that would be, and all	19	answer my question. Okay?
20	those variables would have to be defined and reviewed.	20	Did you perform any specific calculation to
21	So it's not I'm not comfortable trying to speculate	21	determine how much additional maintenance would be
22	on that right now.	22	required for a tool having arms such as the ones
23	BY MR. SKLAR:	23	disclosed by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177
24	Q Did you determine strike that.	24	IPR?
25	Did you perform any specific calculation to	25	A Again, how I answered previously: There are
	Page 48		Page 49
1	so many variables and dependencies that I would have to	1	were familiar with the injection molding concept of
2	do an actual calculation. But, again, what I do know	2	adding arms to create through holes?
3	is it's a nonzero effect and most likely a large	3	A I believe that that was something that is
4	nonzero effect.	4	very would have been known and understood. So I
5	Q Did you perform any specific calculation to	5	would have to say certainly.
6	determine how frequently the arms might break?	6	Q Did you perform any tests to determine how the
7	A My so my past experience in working with	7	cooling layout would be affected in the devices
8	plastic injection molding and tooling engineers, which	8	proposed by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177
9	has been in excess of 30 years, again, it tells me that	9	IPR?
10	there is a nonzero effect on complexity. And, in	10	A Again, we're talking about adding a
11	particular, when you're using these kinds of mold arms	11	significant feature in a tool that would have been
12	that are being proposed, there is a very large	12	existing without them that will have, like I said, a
13	maintenance issue that is associated with them,	13	large nonzero effect on the tooling costs. It will
14	particularly when you're using multicavity tools, which	14	also interfere with the layout of multicavity, large,
15	these devices produced by the millions dictate. And	15	multimillion-dollar tools which will have an effect on
1.0		1.0	

they're very large, complex tools that need to be done
 very, very carefully and very simply.
 So in terms of maintenance, yes, there will be

So in terms of maintenance, yes, there will be
a -- certainly a nonzero effect on that, and it will be
a large nonzero effect.
Q Is the effect the same for both Ground 1 and
Ground 2?

A They most likely would not be identical, but
 they will be similar.
 O Do you agree that in 2003 skilled artisans

- Q Do you agree that in 2003, skilled artisans
 - TSG Reporting Worldwide 877-702-9580

IPR?

that again.

the cooling layout. All these -- all these changes and

things will interact with the tooling costs, and

they're not simple; they're complicated and costly.

Q Again, that wasn't my question. Let's try

cooling layout would be affected in the devices

A Due to the fact that these devices don't

Did you perform any tests to determine how the

proposed by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177

13

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 13 of 53

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	Dama EQ	Dese	E 1
	Page 50	Page S	51
1	exist, there is no tooling that exists. There's no	¹ Q Okay. In your declaration	
2	software for mold flow analysis that exists. There is	² I'm still talking about your declaration for	
3	no way I could perform that kind of a test.	³ the '177 IPR. I believe we've identified it as 2023.1.	
4	Q Do skilled artisans or engineers have any	⁴ Correct?	
5	resources available to them to mitigate any of the	⁵ A Correct.	
6	potential effects that you've identified in your report	⁶ Q In your declaration, you state that the hoop	
7	of adding mold arms to the designs of Ground 1 and	⁷ stress or bending stress is undesirable because it can	
8	Ground 2 in the '177 petition?	⁸ exceed the plastic material yield point. Right?	
9	A Tooling engineers and tooling companies would	⁹ A Yes. Correct.	
10	definitely have tools to attempt to minimize the impact	¹⁰ Q Well, just so we can have consistent	
11	of these kinds of changes. And certainly if they are a	¹¹ terminology here, what is the units that that is	
12	good company and good engineers, they would try to	¹² measured in, the plastic material yield point?	
13	mitigate as much as they could. But I'm my opinion	¹³ A It could be well, depending upon, I guess,	
14	is that and that's incorporated in my opinion, that	¹⁴ your units that you're using, but, you know, pounds p	ber
15	that	¹⁵ square inch or, you know	
16	My assumption is that would have happened, but	¹⁶ It would vary depending upon, you know,	
17	yet even after that, it would still be a large nonzero	¹⁷ whether you're using the metric system or not. It's	
18	effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera.	¹⁸ usually measured in force per unit area.	
19	MR. SKLAR: All right. Why don't we take a	¹⁹ Q What is the plastic material yield point for	
20	quick break and come back.	²⁰ the devices resulting from the combinations proposed	d by
21	MR. MURRAY: Sounds good.	²¹ petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 patent?	
22	(Recess taken 11:03 a.m 11:15 a.m.)	²² MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	
23	BY MR. SKLAR:	²³ THE WITNESS: That would depend on what t	the
24	Q Welcome back, Mr. Clemens.	²⁴ materials are.	
25	A Thank you.	25 ///	
	Page 52	Page 5	53
1	-		53
1 2	BY MR. SKLAR:	¹ could be successful? In other words, it's possible	
	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler body 	ły
2	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished 	ły
2 3	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of 	ły
2 3 4	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs?	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? 	ły
2 3 4 5	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. 	ly ed
2 3 4 5 6	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question 	ły ed 1.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are 	ły ed 1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I 	ły ed 1.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what 	ły ed 1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or 	dy ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual 	dy ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. 	dy ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: 	dy ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what 	dy ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, what I'm stating in here, is that this is a complexity. 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplish without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by inserting the cam body into the inhaler body would be 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, what I'm stating in here, is that this is a complexity. It is not necessarily going to prove to be successful. 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by inserting the cam body into the inhaler body would b likely to exceed the plastic material yield point. A What I'm what my opinion is and what I'm 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, what I'm stating in here, is that this is a complexity. It is not necessarily going to prove to be successful. It is a complication, which is not a circumferential 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by inserting the cam body into the inhaler body would b likely to exceed the plastic material yield point. A What I'm what my opinion is and what I'm certain about is that it is going to be a nonsimple, 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, what I'm stating in here, is that this is a complexity. It is not necessarily going to prove to be successful. 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by inserting the cam body into the inhaler body would be likely to exceed the plastic material yield point. A What I'm what my opinion is and what I'm certain about is that it is going to be a nonsimple, 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, what I'm stating in here, is that this is a complexity. It is not necessarily going to prove to be successful. It is a complication, which is not a circumferential assembly. It is not necessarily what I would consider 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by inserting the cam body into the inhaler body would be likely to exceed the plastic material yield point. A What I'm what my opinion is and what I'm certain about is that it is going to be a nonsimple, complicated change to the design that will need to be 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, what I'm stating in here, is that this is a complexity. It is not necessarily going to prove to be successful. It is a complication, which is not a circumferential assembly. It is not necessarily what I would consider a simple, easy change to a design. And so therefore 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler body of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by inserting the cam body into the inhaler body would be likely to exceed the plastic material yield point. A What I'm what my opinion is and what I'm certain about is that it is going to be a nonsimple, complicated change to the design that will need to be addressed. And so, thus, my opinion is that this is 	dy ed n. ally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Is there any sort of standard that you've come across in the use of MDIs? What is the standard Well, let me ask this first: Is there a standard plastic material yield point for MDIs? A I think that all these devices are unique unto themselves. The materials that are selected are selected for many different reasons. So they're all going to be unique unto themselves. Q Did you perform any tests to determine whether a snap-fit would exceed the plastic material yield point in a respiratory device described by petitioners in Grounds 1 and 2 of the '177 IPR? A Well, I guess I'd have to answer that question based on the opinion that I render in my declaration, and that is that, again, it is a it is a complicated nonzero effect on change to the design. So my opinion, what I'm stating in here, is that this is a complexity. It is not necessarily going to prove to be successful. It is a complication, which is not a circumferential assembly. It is not necessarily what I would consider a simple, easy change to a design. And so therefore You know, that's that's what my opinion is 	 could be successful? In other words, it's possible that inserting Rhoades' cam body into the inhaler bod of either Ground 1 or Ground 2 could be accomplished without exceeding the plastic material yield point of the inhaler body? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: So I appreciate your question Not being able to actually see what these devices are and do a proper analysis, an engineering analysis, I can say that this will be a complication. To what degree it's a complication or whether it's possible or impossible would depend on what these devices actual look like. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So, to be clear, you're not certain to what degree this snap-fit that has been proposed by inserting the cam body into the inhaler body would be likely to exceed the plastic material yield point. A What I'm what my opinion is and what I'm certain about is that it is going to be a nonsimple, complicated change to the design that will need to be addressed. And so, thus, my opinion is that this is going in it's going against the notion that there 	dy ed n. ally

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

877-702-9580

14

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 14 of 53

	Page 54		Page 55
1	devices.	1	Can you tell me the degree of likelihood that
2	And this is truly a complicated change, which	2	inserting the Rhoades cam body into either of the
3	is going to have to be dealt with, so, you know,	3	Ground 1 or Ground 2 inhaler bodies would result in
4	that's without any physical devices to analyze;	4	exceeding the plastic material yield point of those
5	without, you know, any anything to really discuss	5	bodies?
6	among engineers.	6	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
7	We do know for certain it will be a	7	THE WITNESS: I would have to say that it's
8	complexity. It's an addition additional	8	really impossible to answer that question based on my
9	complexity, and it makes the combination nonsimple.	9	previous responses.
10	Q Does it mean that the combination is likely to	10	BY MR. SKLAR:
11	exceed the plastic material yield point?	11	Q Have you ever utilized snap-fits in any of the
12	A It depends on the design.	12	devices that you've worked on?
13	Q And you can't really say that without having	13	A Sure.
14	the actual devices and doing a proper analysis or	14	Q Can you identify those?
15	engineering analysis; correct?	15	A Off the top of my head, I can't I can't
16	A What I can say is that it's a significant	16	relate the specifics, but conceptually, it would have
17	enough complexity to the design that this is a	17	been additional parts, such as perhaps a cap that would
18	likelihood. An engineered skilled a skilled artisan	18	want that you would snap it into something. There
19	at the time would be immediately concerned about this	19	were some prototype designs I worked on, that they
20	as a risk, and certainly not necessarily one that can	20	snapped together in terms of the housing halves were
21	be managed.	21	designed to snap together.
22	Q I'm a little confused, because I've heard	22	So there have been various aspects of those
23	testimony saying it is likely, I've heard testimony	23	designs and many other designs.
24	saying it's not likely, and I'm not really sure where	24	Q These snap-fits that you've used in the past,
25	you've ended up. So I want to understand.	25	were these on medical devices?
	Page 56		Page 57
1	A Everything I've worked on in my career has	1	BY MR. SKLAR:
2	pretty much been medical devices.	2	Q And if you'll take a look at that
3	Q Can you estimate in total how many snap-fits	3	Are you familiar with that device that I've
4	you have used on devices that you've worked on?	4	handed you?
5	•	5	
5 6	A I cannot.	5 6	A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer.
	A I cannot. Q More than 100?		A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer.Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse
6	A I cannot.Q More than 100?A I have no idea. I honestly can't	6	A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer.
6 7	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many 	6 7	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand
6 7 8	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. 	6 7 8	A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before?
6 7 8 9	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? 	6 7 8 9	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand
6 7 8 9 10	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater 	6 7 8 9 10	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not.
6 7 8 9 10 11	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? 	6 7 8 9 10 11	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I gave just a few minutes ago, that some of those were 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality. A Oh, sure.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I gave just a few minutes ago, that some of those were related to inhaler devices. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality. A Oh, sure. Q So there's a flapper on top here.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I gave just a few minutes ago, that some of those were related to inhaler devices. Q Thank you for clarifying. I missed that, so I 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality. A Oh, sure. Q So there's a flapper on top here. Do you see that flapper?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I gave just a few minutes ago, that some of those were related to inhaler devices. Q Thank you for clarifying. I missed that, so I apologize. Thank you. Okay. I have a couple products here. I'm going to hand the first one to you. This is identified 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality. A Oh, sure. Q So there's a flapper on top here. Do you see that flapper? A I'd assume that that green part is like a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I gave just a few minutes ago, that some of those were related to inhaler devices. Q Thank you for clarifying. I missed that, so I apologize. Thank you. Okay. I have a couple products here. I'm going to hand the first one to you. This is identified as Exhibit 1071. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality. A Oh, sure. Q So there's a flapper on top here. Do you see that flapper? A I'd assume that that green part is like a silicone
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I gave just a few minutes ago, that some of those were related to inhaler devices. Q Thank you for clarifying. I missed that, so I apologize. Thank you. Okay. I have a couple products here. I'm going to hand the first one to you. This is identified as Exhibit 1071. (Exhibit 1071 was referenced.) 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality. A Oh, sure. Q So there's a flapper on top here. Do you see that flapper? A I'd assume that that green part is like a silicone Q Yes.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A I cannot. Q More than 100? A I have no idea. I honestly can't I'm not sure, but I've worked on many, many devices. Q More than 50? A It would certainly be it would be greater than, let's say, maybe you know, certainly more than ten. Q Were any of these devices respiratory medical devices that have snap-fits that you worked on? A I would refer to my previous answer that I gave just a few minutes ago, that some of those were related to inhaler devices. Q Thank you for clarifying. I missed that, so I apologize. Thank you. Okay. I have a couple products here. I'm going to hand the first one to you. This is identified as Exhibit 1071. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A It looks a little bit like a nebulizer. Q That's correct. It's the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer. Have you ever heard of that particular brand of nebulizer before? A No, I have not. Q But you're generally familiar with it as a nebulizer? A Yes. That's correct. Q And a nebulizer is a respiratory device? A That is correct. Q And I only have one of these, so I'm going to ask you to hand it back and forth with me as I sort of demonstrate some of its snap-fit functionality. A Oh, sure. Q So there's a flapper on top here. Do you see that flapper? A I'd assume that that green part is like a silicone

15

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 15 of 53

Page	5	8
------	---	---

1	Q Okay.	1	So I don't have my loupe handy, but what I
2	A Okay.	2	would just based on
3	Q Can we refer to that as a flapper?	3	It's a small feature. So based on what I see
4	A Flapper. I would agree.	4	here, it looks like it might be more of an interference
5	Q Okay. And do you see that there's a hinged	5	fit. You know, I'm not really sure how you're
6	piece above the flapper?	6	You know, when we say "snap-fit," we're both
7	A That is a living hinge. Correct.	7	envisioning something in our minds, but they're not
8	Q And if I push that hinge down without moving	8	necessarily the same.
9	the flapper, that hinge snaps into place; correct?	9	But what these two features look like is an
10	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Foundation.	10	interference fit and may not necessarily be a
11	Relevance.	11	snap-fit.
12	You can answer.	12	Q How do you differentiate between an
13	THE WITNESS: Just to be correct not	13	interference fit and a snap-fit?
14	critical but there is a male feature which fits into	14	A Well, a snap-fit typically entails features
15	a female feature. So it's not the hinge that's	15	that possess ramps to facilitate movement across each
16	snapping. It's the male and female features.	16	other, and then vertical walls relative to the ramps
17	BY MR. SKLAR:	17	such that they once they climb over the feature
18	Q Okay. Let me and thank you for that	18	itself, the two features come together rather quickly,
19	clarification. I think that's correct.	19	making creating a sound, snap, and the vertical
20	So to be clear, there is a male feature that	20	walls interact such that you can't pull them apart.
21	snaps into the female feature to hold the flapper in	21	In this instance, it looks like the features
22	place.	22	are designed to have an interference, but, again,
23	A May I see that again?	23	without a loupe, maybe they're
24	Q Yes. You break it, you buy it.	24	I mean, I don't see a true snap feature there,
25	A No. I get you.	25	but I would call that an interference fit.
	Page 60		Page 61
	-		_
1	Q Regardless of what you call it, is it correct	1	could have various solutions to that. So, I mean, it
2	that it appears for this male portion to be inserted	2	could be a one-and-done, or it could be something that
3	into the female portion, it has to have some effect on	3	is intended to be durable. So there is a lot of
4	the yield point of the body that it's fitting into?	4	answers, a lot of solutions to what that interference
5	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation.	5	fit might be.
6	THE WITNESS: The fact that it requires force	6	Q Regardless of whether it's one-and-done or
7	to create the connection and, you know, I am using	7	not, though, even to get the items together in the
8	the term "interference" there's got to be stress	8	first place, you need to ensure that placing those
9	applied in the parts.	9	items together into that interference fit or snap-fit
10	BY MR. SKLAR:	10	does not exceed the plastic material yield point of
11	Q And the same would hold true; that when you	11	those parts; correct?
12	have an interference fit, you have to make sure that	12	A So, you know, just to be clear,
13	you don't exceed the plastic material yield point of	13	"one-and-done," means probably something different to
14	the parts. Correct?	14	everybody, too. But it is not uncommon to exceed the
15	A If your parts did not previously have those	15	material yield point on something that is meant to
16	features and you suddenly needed to put one of those	16	connect once, and it is utilized and then thrown away.
17	features in, that is an additional change, complexity,	17	So it really depends on the design; it depends on the
18	to the design, and it would have to be analyzed.	18	requirements, the demands of the feature, and the
19	Q And to be clear, when you say it would have to	19	functionality of the feature.
20	be analyzed, you would have to make sure that even in	20	Q Just so I understand the one-and-done example
21	an interference fit, that you don't exceed the plastic	21	that you referenced, is it your testimony that in
22	material yield point of the parts.	22	getting those parts together in the first instance, it
23	A So depending upon the application and the	23	does not matter whether the parts exceed the plastic
24	criticality of, you know, the feature itself and what	24	material yield point of the components?
25	the demands are on it, you could have various you	25	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.

16

	Page 62	Page 63
1	THE WITNESS: What my answer was is that it	¹ those parts fit together, the plastic material yield
2	depends, and it depends on all of the things that I	² point has not been exceeded?
3	said previously. So, I mean, unless you want me to	³ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Foundation.
4	repeat them, I'll save time.	4 THE WITNESS: I do not know.
5	BY MR. SKLAR:	⁵ BY MR. SKLAR:
6	Q The particular component that we're looking at	⁶ Q Would you be able to see some sort of crack in
7	on this nebulizer, which I've identified as	⁷ the device if that plastic material yield point had
8	Exhibit 1071, is not a one-and-done type of fit;	⁸ been exceeded?
9	correct?	⁹ A A yield failure could take different forms.
10	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form and foundation.	¹⁰ So a crack wouldn't necessarily have to be there.
11	THE WITNESS: So are you referring to the	¹¹ Q Okay. What would you need in order to know
12	little feature, snap-fit, that you're calling	¹² whether or not the plastic material yield point has
13	BY MR. SKLAR:	¹³ been exceeded on this device?
14	Q That's correct.	¹⁴ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Foundation.
15	A To be honest, I'm not sure what that is being	¹⁵ THE WITNESS: To be accurate with your
16	used for. I don't know what the requirements are.	¹⁶ analysis, you probably would have to strain gauge it
17	Q Okay.	¹⁷ and perform your test, measure the strains, and do
18	A I mean, it could be a one-and-done to just get	¹⁸ calculations.
19	the flapper on it.	¹⁹ BY MR. SKLAR:
20	Q Would you agree that on this device, the hinge	²⁰ Q You're familiar with nebulizers of this
21	that we've been looking at, and specifically the male	²¹ type correct? of Exhibit 1071?
22	part of the hinge and the female part the male part	²² A I'm familiar with nebulizers in general. I
23	of that fit	haven't seen one like that, but I've worked on
24	A Yeah.	²⁴ nebulizers, yeah, in the past.
25	Q and the female part that it fits into, when	²⁵ Q Would you have any concern if assembling this
		Page 65
	Page 64	
1	Page 64	
1	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material	¹ does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to
2	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded?	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful
2 3	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can
2 3 4	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would
2 3 4 5	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed
2 3 4 5 6	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there.	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR:	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have 	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device 	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being 	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? 	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. 	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion into that female portion? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your 	1does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to2the patient, so that would certainly require careful3consideration. If there was any risk and I can4assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would5be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed6and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the7product and also well, just the life cycle is what8they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it9would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a10failure of that type.11Q12failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring13that the plastic material yield point was not conceded14by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion15into that female portion?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation17THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're 	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion into that female portion? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it would not result in a particular risk to the patient.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're holding and the hinged flap and the male and female	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion into that female portion? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it would not result in a particular risk to the patient.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're holding and the hinged flap and the male and female portion?	1does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to2the patient, so that would certainly require careful3consideration. If there was any risk and I can4assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would5be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed6and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the7product and also well, just the life cycle is what8they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it9would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a10failure of that type.11Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a12failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring13that the plastic material yield point was not conceded14by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion15into that female portion?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation17THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it18would not result in a particular risk to the patient.19And, again, our conversation, if I might just add, is20directed towards the device that's in your hand, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're holding and the hinged flap and the male and female portion? BY MR. SKLAR:	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion into that female portion? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it would not result in a particular risk to the patient. And, again, our conversation, if I might just add, is directed towards the device that's in your hand, and you know, specific to that particular instance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're holding and the hinged flap and the male and female portion? BY MR. SKLAR: Q Let's limit it to this device for now, yes. 	 does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to the patient, so that would certainly require careful consideration. If there was any risk and I can assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the product and also well, just the life cycle is what they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a failure of that type. Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring that the plastic material yield point was not conceded by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion into that female portion? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it would not result in a particular risk to the patient. And, again, our conversation, if I might just add, is directed towards the device that's in your hand, and you know, specific to that particular instance. BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're holding and the hinged flap and the male and female portion? BY MR. SKLAR: Q Let's limit it to this device for now, yes. A That again, that appears to be an 	1does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to2the patient, so that would certainly require careful3consideration. If there was any risk and I can4assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would5be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed6and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the7product and also well, just the life cycle is what8they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it9would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a10failure of that type.11Q12And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a13that the plastic material yield point was not conceded14by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion15into that female portion?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation17THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it18would not result in a particular risk to the patient.19And, again, our conversation, if I might just add, is20directed towards the device that's in your hand, and21you know, specific to that particular instance.22BY MR. SKLAR:23Q24Getting back to this device, I want to discuss
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're holding and the hinged flap and the male and female portion? BY MR. SKLAR: Q Let's limit it to this device for now, yes. A That again, that appears to be an interference fit. I don't 	1does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to2the patient, so that would certainly require careful3consideration. If there was any risk and I can4assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would5be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed6and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the7product and also well, just the life cycle is what8they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it9would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a10failure of that type.11Q And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a12failure of that type," you mean in terms of ensuring13that the plastic material yield point was not conceded14by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion15into that female portion?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundatior17THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it18would not result in a particular risk to the patient.19And, again, our conversation, if I might just add, is20directed towards the device that's in your hand, and21you know, specific to that particular instance.22BY MR. SKLAR:23Q Getting back to this device, I want to discuss24another component of that device, which is a cap.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 device resulted in the plastic yield of the material having been exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Obviously that would depend on what the feature was, the feature location, what its function is, where you know, how the function relates to the safety and efficacy of the functionality of the device. Lots of things to answer there. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So with respect to that first part that we have discussed, which is the male part that fits into the female part, as it relates to that, would you have any concern if assembling that part of the device resulted in the plastic material yield point being exceeded? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Just to clarify, is your question directed at that particular device that you're holding and the hinged flap and the male and female portion? BY MR. SKLAR: Q Let's limit it to this device for now, yes. A That again, that appears to be an 	1does appear to be in the proximity of the flow path to2the patient, so that would certainly require careful3consideration. If there was any risk and I can4assure you that in our risk analysis, that this would5be on it that it would have to be carefully analyzed6and shown that it's for the duration of the life of the7product and also well, just the life cycle is what8they call it, you know, from cradle to grave; that it9would not pose a risk to the patient in terms of a10failure of that type.11Q12And to be clear, when you say "in terms of a13that the plastic material yield point was not conceded14by was not exceeded by snapping the male portion15into that female portion?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation17THE WITNESS: Or if it if it did, that it18would not result in a particular risk to the patient.19And, again, our conversation, if I might just add, is20directed towards the device that's in your hand, and21you know, specific to that particular instance.22BY MR. SKLAR:23Q24Getting back to this device, I want to discuss

877-702-9580

17

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 17 of 53

h

	Page 66		Page 67
1	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation.	1	Well, let me give me a moment. I just want
2	THE WITNESS: I'll go along with that.	2	to read that last answer.
3	BY MR. SKLAR:	3	When you said that it appears to have ramps
4	Q Okay. I have removed the cap from the device.	4	And I'm talking this case. When you said that
5	Do you agree with that?	5	the cap appears to have ramps and vertical edges or
6	A Yes.	6	surfaces, are you suggesting that it's akin to an
7	Q And now I'm placing the cap back on the device	7	interference fit?
8	and snapping it into place; correct?	8	A What I would what I would say to that is
9	A Correct.	9	that you could incorporate an interference fit into a
10	Q Okay. Is that a snap-fit on this nebulizer,	10	snap-fit. Again, there are thousands of snap-fit
11	which is Exhibit 1071?	11	designs, as you can well imagine. Whether this one has
12	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation.	12	an interference fit, I don't know. I would have to
13	Relevance.	13	look at the design and analyze it. So
14	THE WITNESS: I'll take I'll look at the	14	Q Is there any less concern with exceeding the
15	parts here again.	15	plastic material yield point if you are using an
16	So I do see features that are similar to what	16	interference fit as opposed to a snap-fit?
17	I was describing earlier, which appear	17	A When you're designing parts, I would say that
18	Again, I don't have a loupe to see	18	where you are with respect to the yield of your
19	specifically, but they appear to have ramps and	19	materials is always a design consideration, and it's a
20		20	
20	vertical edges or surfaces which would fit within each	20	strategy you may be actually using it as part of
	other, and as you demonstrated a moment ago, that when	22	your design, but it's hardly ever, I would say never
22	it is assembled, it this particular device does emit		say never, but it's hardly ever an instance where
23	a snap sound.	23	you're not considering it.
24	BY MR. SKLAR:	24	Q So to be clear, you consider the plastic
25	Q And just to be clear, as it relates to	25	material yield point regardless of whether you're using
	Page 68		Page 69
	-		_
1	an interference fit or a snap-fit.	1	specific requirement of where you are with respect to
2	A What I'm saying is that whenever you're doing	2	the yield.
3	mechanical design and there is a you're trying to	3	BY MR. SKLAR:
4	put parts together obviously there's many ways of	4	Q Okay. So for both interference fits and
5	putting parts together, but if you're counting on an	5	snap-fits, engineers will have to account for the
6	interference fit or a snap-fit of this type of design,	6	plastic material yield point of the product.
7	that's just one of the check boxes that you have to	7	A It's part of the design process.
8	consider as you complete the design.	8	Q Are you familiar with this part of the
9	Q And I'm just trying to understand, because you	9	nebulizer?
10	sort of you distinguished a little bit between a	10	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
11	snap-fit or an interference fit, and so I'm just trying	11	THE WITNESS: I don't know the product.
12	to understand the significance	12	BY MR. SKLAR:
13	A Of that?	13	Q Are you familiar with a part called a
14	Q Yeah.	14	secondary?
15	And so are you suggesting that in some way,	15	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation.
16	perhaps an interference fit is less likely to exceed	16	THE WITNESS: Off the top of my head, I'm not
17	the plastic material yield point?	17	sure what aspect of the nebulizer that we're talking
18	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	18	about.
19	THE WITNESS: No. It just totally depends.	19	BY MR. SKLAR:
20	And as I said before, you could design a	20	Q Sure. Okay. So for purposes of today, I'm
21	snap-fit with or without interference, an interference	21	just trying to establish some language we can use so
22	fit. And I would assign the only significance I	22	that it's easier for us to converse.
23	would assign to the yield relative to your design work	23	Can we call this the internal portion of the
24	is if it you know, if it had an impact; you know,	24	nebulizer?
	15 II II VOU KIIOW, II II HAU AH HIDACE VOU KIIOW		
25	whether or not it's a requirement or if there's a	25	A Yes.

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

877-702-9580

18

	Page 70		Page /1
1	Q Thank you.	1	lower force, and the flat parts come together making
2	Okay. On this internal portion, do you see	2	that snap sound.
3	that there is another living hinge? Is that correct?	3	Q So on this particular respiratory device,
4	A Correct.	4	Exhibit 1071, we've identified at least three snap-fits
5	Q Okay. And the living hinge can be folded	5	or interference fits; correct?
6	down, and a male portion of the living hinge can be	6	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
7	inserted into a female portion and snapped together;	7	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
8	correct?	8	BY MR. SKLAR:
9	A It does appear	9	Q Are these types of products approved by some
10	Let's see. You know, without magnification, I	10	regulatory body?
11	can't see the features precisely, but judging just on	11	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Foundation.
12	the general look of it, it looks like it could be a	12	THE WITNESS: The FDA, it does provide
13	small snap-fit, but it would be very small.	13	clearance, marketing clearance, for respiratory devices
14	Q The sound certainly sounds like a snap; right?	14	such as that.
15	A Yeah. Now, the sound I'll just say that on	15	BY MR. SKLAR:
16	a true snap-fit, you're certainly going to hear that	16	Q And would effectiveness of the device play a
17	sound, because you're ramping over features which then	17	role in that clearance?
18	slam together. In some of these hinged designs, you	18	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Foundation.
19	could be just simply getting past a large feature,	19	Relevance.
20	which again goes more towards a press fit. But there	20	THE WITNESS: That is usually the foundation
21	is a bit of a difference. A true press fit wouldn't	21	of their approval, is to review the file and to see
22	necessarily emit the sound, but because there are flat	22	that the producer has achieved all the requirements for
23	surfaces coming together, when you achieve that fit	23	release to the market.
24	you know, that friction and fit, you have to exceed a	24	BY MR. SKLAR:
25	point of high force, which then suddenly reduces to a	25	Q And if these snap-fits on 1071 in some way
	Page 72		Page 73
1	make the product unsafe for use or ineffective, would	1	actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs having a
2	you expect that the FDA would reject that device?	2	canister that rotate relative to a valve stem?
3	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Foundation.	3	A My opinion is based on my previous experience
4	Relevance.	4	working with these devices in that time frame. And I
5	THE WITNESS: What the FDA would look for is	5	did so I didn't obtain in particular a canister from
6	indications that the developer has followed the typical	6	that time period and reanalyze it. I'm just familiar
7	requirements for a medical device launch. So they	7	with it from experience.
8	wouldn't actually be approving, you know, what they	8	Q Okay. That was a little unclear, and I think
9	did. They would just be looking for or the	9	in part you were talking about a couple different
10	technical correctness. They would be looking to see,	10	devices there. So let me reask my question.
11	for instance, did they do a risk analysis where things	11	In reaching your conclusion that significant
12	such as you're describing would show up, and, you know,	12	force would be required to rotate a canister during an
13	it would be produced; that, "Yes, we did look at these	13	actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have
14	things." And then they would say, "Okay. They did a	14	canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem?
15	risk analysis." So that's kind of what the FDA would	15	A Again, my opinion is based on my experience
16	be doing.	16	with the valves and canisters from that time period. I
17	BY MR. SKLAR:	17	think that plays directly into my opinion there.
18	Q I want to talk for a moment about the Bason	18	Q But, see, we have a little disconnect here,
19	and Rhoades combination in the '177 IPR. Okay?	19	because you're talking about your experience with
20	And your position is that significant force	20	valves and canisters from that time period, and we're
21	would be required to rotate a canister during an	21	not being clear about the functionality of the valves
22	actuation stroke. Is that right?	22	and canisters that you were actually looking at. So
23	A That's correct.	23	let me reask my question. Okay? Listen carefully, and
24	Q In reaching that conclusion, that significant	24	please answer my question.
25	force would be required to rotate a canister during an	25	In reaching your conclusion that significant
			-

19

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 19 of 53

Page 74		Page 75
force would be required to rotate a canister during an	1	THE WITNESS: Do you mind if I read the whole
actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have	2	page to get the context of this?
canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem?	3	BY MR. SKLAR:
A All of these valves will rotate if enough	4	Q Please do. Yes.
force is applied to them relative to the canister.	5	Have you had a chance to read that page,
Q I'd like you to take a look at Exhibit 1057.	6	Mr. Clemens?
And, again, that's your deposition transcript from	7	A I'm in the process of reading it. Thank you.
April 24, 2019; correct?	8	Okay. And the specific question that you're
A Yes.	9	asking is
Q I'd like you to take a look at page 202, and	10	Q Let me repeat it.
then we'll direct you to line 10.	11	A Sure.
Were you asked this question, and did you give	12	Q In reaching your conclusion that significant
this answer:	13	force would be required to rotate a canister during an
"Can the canister rotate about the stem?	14	actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have
"Answer: In the valve design certainly that	15	canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem?
I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how	16	A So my answer to that is that the valve designs
they're constructed."	17	are intended for axial movement, and they're not
Do you see that?	18	intended for rotational movement. But applying enough
A Yes.	19	force, of course you could rotate the two relative to
Q Okay. So let me repeat my question now.	20	each other. And for the purposes of the recent
In reaching your conclusion that significant	21	analysis, no, I did not. I did not locate drug
force would be required to rotate a canister during an	22	canisters from that time period to do testing.
actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have	23	Q Did you perform any calculation to determine
canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem?	24	how much force would be required to rotate the canister
MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	25	during the actuation stroke?
	force would be required to rotate a canister during an actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem? A All of these valves will rotate if enough force is applied to them relative to the canister. Q I'd like you to take a look at Exhibit 1057. And, again, that's your deposition transcript from April 24, 2019; correct? A Yes. Q I'd like you to take a look at page 202, and then we'll direct you to line 10. Were you asked this question, and did you give this answer: "Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve design certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." Do you see that? A Yes. Q Okay. So let me repeat my question now. In reaching your conclusion that significant force would be required to rotate a canister during an actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem?	force would be required to rotate a canister during an actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem?1A All of these valves will rotate if enough force is applied to them relative to the canister.3Q I'd like you to take a look at Exhibit 1057.6And, again, that's your deposition transcript from April 24, 2019; correct?7A Yes.9Q I'd like you to take a look at page 202, and then we'll direct you to line 10.10Were you asked this question, and did you give this answer:13"Can the canister rotate about the stem?14"Answer: In the valve design certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed."17Do you see that?18A Yes.19Q Okay. So let me repeat my question now. In reaching your conclusion that significant force would be required to rotate a canister during an actuation stroke, did you examine any MDIs that have canisters that rotate relative to the valve stem?20

Page 76

1	A Again, not having these specific parts or the	1	to obtain all of the information, because the design
2	design detail itself so that I could utilize legitimate	2	information is confidential to companies. So that was
3	data from that time period, I was not capable of	3	not an option for me.
4	performing a calculation. But my opinion is based on	4	BY MR. SKLAR:
5	design experience, knowledge, and the development of	5	Q You do have MDIs sitting on your desk;
6	devices which use these canisters that have the valves.	6	correct?
7	Q So is it your testimony that you have no way	7	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
8	of obtaining an MDI from the 2003 time period that is	8	THE WITNESS: I do.
9	capable of that has a canister capable of rotating	9	BY MR. SKLAR:
10	about the valve stem?	10	Q Are you capable of measuring the amount of
11	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	11	force required in the linear direction to overcome the
12	THE WITNESS: Just to repeat, given enough	12	frictional fit between the valve stem and the seal?
13	force, you can rotate them relative to each other, and	13	A Certainly I could do some measurements, some
14	my opinion is that that force is significant.	14	force measurements.
15	BY MR. SKLAR:	15	Q Did you do those force measurements in
16	Q That wasn't my question. Let me focus you	16	reaching the conclusions that you expressed in
17	again.	17	Exhibit 2023.1, which is your declaration in support of
18	You had just testified that not having these	18	Aptar's sur-reply?
19	specific parts, you couldn't perform a specific	19	MR. MURRAY: Object to form.
20	calculation. I'm just asking. Did you in any way	20	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What part are you
21	attempt to obtain an MDI from 2003 that was capable	21	referring to?
22	that had a canister capable of rotating about the valve	22	BY MR. SKLAR:
23	stem?	23	Q Same part we've been talking about for this
24	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	24	past ten minutes, about your testimony that a
25	THE WITNESS: That would I would be unable	25	significant amount of force would be required to rotate

20

Page 77

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 20 of 53

Page	78
Laye	10

1			rage /9
	the canister about the valve stem.	¹ direction d	changed significantly from 2003 to today?
2	So let me repeat my question. Did you perform	² A I do	on't know.
3	any force measurements on strike that.	3 Q Yo	u would agree that in 2003, the amount of
4	In reaching your conclusions in your	4 force requ	ired in the axial direction could not be more
5	declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the	⁵ than at lea	st the average user could exert; correct?
6	'177 IPR, did you measure the force required in the	6 A The	ere is certainly, you know, a human factor
7	linear direction to overcome the frictional fit between	⁷ aspect of t	this that was taken into consideration during
8	the valve stem and the seal?	⁸ those days	s, and even more so now. You know, what that
9	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	⁹ number is	today, I haven't done tests recently to know.
10	THE WITNESS: When you say "linear," do you	10 Q Wo	ould you have expected it to change
11	mean axial?	¹¹ significan	tly from 2003 to today? And, again, I'm
12	BY MR. SKLAR:	12 referring s	specifically to the amount of force required
13	Q Yes. In the direction that the user would	-	l direction.
14	depress the canister.		MURRAY: Objection. Form.
15	A I did not perform any specific force test and		E WITNESS: It probably would not, you know,
16	am relying on those kinds of tests and experiences that		n, you know, the fact that it's a medical
17	I've had in the past during the time of, you know, the		d the canisters have been made for quite a
18	patent. To perform an accurate force test on devices	¹⁸ long time.	-
19	back in that time frame would not be possible.	 ¹⁹ BY MR. S 	
20	Q Why do you say it would not be possible?		going back to physics class a little bit
21	A We're talking about 2019, and the time frame		u don't mind, but I presume that's okay with
22	between then and now has been so great that those	²² you.	
23	designs are no longer performing to what they were	2	would agree with me that the frictional
24	originally designed to perform at.		ween the valve stem and the valve seal is the
25	Q Has the amount of force required in the axial		rdless of whether the valve stem is moving
	Page 80		Page 81
1	axially or rotationally?	-	can put a leverage on that valve, because
2	A So it would depend on the forces of each	2 you're and	alwing a fance on the tan of the conjeten and
3		Joure up	plying a force on the top of the canister, and
	application.	³ so you ha	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of
4	Q Could you elaborate on that?	 ³ so you ha ⁴ angular cl 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak.
4 5	Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force.	 ³ so you ha ⁴ angular cl ⁵ And there 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. s's that's a concern that has always been
	Q Could you elaborate on that?A Well, you asked about frictional force.Q I did.	 3 so you ha 4 angular cl 5 And there 6 has alway 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. s's that's a concern that has always been s been a requirement in these canister and
5 6 7	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, 	 3 so you ha 4 angular cl 5 And there 6 has alway 7 valve des: 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. 's that's a concern that has always been ys been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I
5 6 7 8	Q Could you elaborate on that?A Well, you asked about frictional force.Q I did.	 so you ha so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. c's that's a concern that has always been rs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the
5 6 7 8 9	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, 	 so you ha so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. c's that's a concern that has always been vs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the vhy they're not really intended to be rotated
5 6 7 8	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that 	 so you ha so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. c's that's a concern that has always been rs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the
5 6 7 8 9	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same 	 3 so you ha 4 angular cl 5 And there 6 has alway 7 valve des: 8 believe 9 reasons w 10 relative to 11 axially. 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. 2's that's a concern that has always been 2's been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the 2'hy they're not really intended to be rotated bo one another; they're just intended to work
5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially	 so you ha so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. c's that's a concern that has always been ys been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the thy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR:
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result.	 so you ha so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR.S Q I g 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. e's that's a concern that has always been es been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the ethy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless 	 so you ha so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR.S Q I g 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. c's that's a concern that has always been ys been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the thy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR:
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. e's that's a concern that has always been es been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the ethy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. c's that's a concern that has always been ys been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the chy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. vs that's a concern that has always been vs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the vhy they're not really intended to be rotated o one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask ing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. vs that's a concern that has always been vs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the vhy they're not really intended to be rotated o one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask ing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking Oka 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. Vs that's a concern that has always been vs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the vhy they're not really intended to be rotated o one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask hing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all g you
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking Oka In th 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. c's that's a concern that has always been rs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the rhy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask ing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all g you iy. I will repeat my question.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Well, yes. That's definitely 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve dest believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking Oka In th moving ir 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. Vs that's a concern that has always been vs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the vhy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask sing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all g you ty. I will repeat my question. his case, regardless of whether you're
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Well, yes. That's definitely true. I am not familiar with all the designs of the 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve dest believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking Oka In th moving ir 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. e's that's a concern that has always been ys been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the ehy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask hing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all g you ny. I will repeat my question. his case, regardless of whether you're in the axial direction or the rotational the friction between the valve stem and the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Well, yes. That's definitely true. I am not familiar with all the designs of the valves, but you know, there are many aspects of the 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR.3 Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking Oka In th moving ir asial is the 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. e's that's a concern that has always been ys been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the ehy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask hing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all g you ny. I will repeat my question. his case, regardless of whether you're in the axial direction or the rotational the friction between the valve stem and the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Well, yes. That's definitely true. I am not familiar with all the designs of the valves, but you know, there are many aspects of the valve that could come into play as to how you might 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. S Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking Oka In th moving in seal is the A If to 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. Vs that's a concern that has always been vs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the vhy they're not really intended to be rotated o one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask hing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all g you ty. I will repeat my question. his case, regardless of whether you're in the axial direction or the rotational the friction between the valve stem and the e same.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Could you elaborate on that? A Well, you asked about frictional force. Q I did. A And frictional force is dependent on well, it's dependent on the normal force and the coefficient of friction between the surfaces that are in contact. So depending upon the normal force, assuming that you I'm assuming that we're talking about the same materials in contact, that would give you a potentially different result. Q I want to clarify. In this case, regardless of whether you're moving in the axial direction or the rotational direction, the friction is between the valve stem and the seal; correct? MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: Well, yes. That's definitely true. I am not familiar with all the designs of the valves, but you know, there are many aspects of the valve that could come into play as to how you might rotate the valve versus put them into an axial 	 so you ha angular cl And there has alway valve des: believe reasons w relative to axially. BY MR. 3 Q I g from wha you anyth question a I'm asking Oka I'm asking Oka In th moving in aseal is the A If t same as w 	ve a bit of a fulcrum. And any kind of hange to the valve stem could cause a leak. Vs that's a concern that has always been vs been a requirement in these canister and igns, you know, since the beginning. And so I it's my opinion that that's one of the vhy they're not really intended to be rotated to one another; they're just intended to work SKLAR: et it, but that's a totally different issue t I'm asking you about. Okay? I didn't ask ing about leaking. I'm simply asking you a about physics, if you will. Okay? And all g you yy. I will repeat my question. his case, regardless of whether you're a the axial direction or the rotational the friction between the valve stem and the e same. he my answer to that is hopefully the

21

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 21 of 53

	Page 82		Page 83
1	-	1	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
2	same, then you would have the same frictional force. Q That's all I'm asking.	2	THE WITNESS: Just to repeat what I said
3	A But I'm just saying that these valves are	3	before, all of these valve stems and canisters can
4	different, and there are other aspects of them which	4	rotate relative to each other given a high enough
5	could cause higher forces.	5	force.
6	Q And, again, you haven't analyzed an MDI that	6	BY MR. SKLAR:
7	has a canister that is capable of rotating around the	7	Q So I just want to make sure I'm clear.
8	valve stem; right?	8	You have canisters on your desk right now that
9	A My that's a mischaracterization of what I	9	are capable of rotating about the valve stem; correct?
10	said and what my opinion is. What I've said is you can	10	A They all will rotate relative to each other
11	rotate all of them given the proper force.	11	given enough force.
12	Q So in valve stems that you have seen, they are	12	Q Let's make clear we're answering my question.
13	constructed such that they can such that the	13	On your desk right now, in your office, you
14	canister can rotate about the valve stem.	14	have canisters that are capable of rotating about the
15	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	15	valve stem.
16	THE WITNESS: The canisters that I've worked	16	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
17	with in the past have all of them have required	17	THE WITNESS: All of the canisters and valves
18	significant force to rotate the canister relative to	18	that are out there in the world that are used for MDIs
19	the stem, the valve stem.	19	will rotate relative to each other given enough force.
20	BY MR. SKLAR:	20	BY MR. SKLAR:
21	Q So the valve stems that you have excuse me.	21	Q Including the ones sitting on your desk right
22	Sorry.	22	now.
23	The MDIs that you have on your desk, in your	23	A All of them do.
24	office, have canisters that are capable of rotating	24	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
25	about the valve stem.	25	///
	Page 84		Page 85
1	BY MR. SKLAR:	1	Page 85 BY MR. SKLAR:
1 2		1 2	
	BY MR. SKLAR:		BY MR. SKLAR:
2	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them.	2	BY MR. SKLAR:Q I didn't ask what excuse me.Let's focus, because we haveA I'm just trying to answer your question.
2 3	BY MR. SKLAR:Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now.A When I say "all," I'm including all of them.Q And those are the same canisters that were	2 3 4 5	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My
2 3 4	BY MR. SKLAR:Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now.A When I say "all," I'm including all of them.Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your	2 3 4 5 6	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much
2 3 4 5	BY MR. SKLAR:Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now.A When I say "all," I'm including all of them.Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the	2 3 4 5	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating that have canisters capable of rotating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating that have canisters capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question, there will be no interruptions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question, there will be no interruptions. Q Can you please answer the question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question, there will be no interruptions. Q Can you please answer the question? A Again, the canisters that were on my desk, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Those valve stems and canisters 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question, there will be no interruptions. Q Can you please answer the question? A Again, the canisters that were on my desk, as with all canisters, are capable of rotating with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Those valve stems and canisters would have required a significant force to rotate, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question, there will be no interruptions. Q Can you please answer the question? A Again, the canisters that were on my desk, as with all canisters, are capable of rotating with respect to each other, given enough force, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Those valve stems and canisters would have required a significant force to rotate, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question, there will be no interruptions. Q Can you please answer the question? A Again, the canisters that were on my desk, as with all canisters, are capable of rotating with respect to each other, given enough force, which is significant. And, yes, those canisters were on my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q And that includes the ones that are sitting on your desk right now. A When I say "all," I'm including all of them. Q And those are the same canisters that were sitting on your desk before you submitted your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply in the '177 IPR? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Again, "all" would include canisters on your desk and my desk and everybody else's desk. BY MR. SKLAR: Q I don't have any on my desk, but I just want to be clear. Those MDIs that are capable of rotating about the valve stem were on your desk in your office during the period of time that you were working on your declaration in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent? MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. THE WITNESS: Those valve stems and canisters would have required a significant force to rotate, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q I didn't ask what excuse me. Let's focus, because we have A I'm just trying to answer your question. Q But you're not answering my question. My question is very clear. I'm not asking you how much force would be required to rotate those. All I'm asking you, okay, is whether or not those canisters that were capable of rotating about the valve stem were available to you while you were working on forming your opinions that are expressed in the declaration that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-reply to the '177 patent. MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. Mr. Sklar, I'd ask that you please try to refrain from interrupting the witness when he's answering your question. MR. SKLAR: When he's answering the question, there will be no interruptions. Q Can you please answer the question? A Again, the canisters that were on my desk, as with all canisters, are capable of rotating with respect to each other, given enough force, which is

22

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 22 of 53

	Page 86	Page 87
1	a test to understand what the relative forces are, it	¹ kinds of things that engineers typically do.
2	would have been significant and is the basis for my	² Q Did you specifically test how much force would
3	opinion.	³ be required to rotate a canister about a valve stem?
4	Q But you didn't do that test to determine what	4 MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
5	the actual force would be to rotate the canister about	⁵ THE WITNESS: I did perform that test.
6	the valve stem during an actuation stroke.	⁶ BY MR. SKLAR:
7	A Again, I have answered this question before.	⁷ Q What were the results? Do you have that data?
8	I didn't do the test. It wouldn't be an accurate test.	⁸ A I do not have that information on the top of
9	But I have done tests in the past, which I draw upon	⁹ my head.
10	from my experience. So I have that knowledge.	10 Q Okay.
11	Q Those tests in the past, were they testing the	¹¹ A It was significant, though.
12	amount of force that would be required to rotate a	¹² Q When did you perform that test?
13	canister about a valve stem?	¹³ A Probably at least a few times between 2000 and
14	A Yes.	¹⁴ 2005.
15	Q Okay. When were those tests conducted?	¹⁵ Q So before your April 24, 2019 testimony;
16	A Back when I was working on MDIs in the past.	¹⁶ correct?
17	Q Can you be more specific?	¹⁷ A Correct.
18	A Well, as any good engineer would do, and being	¹⁸ Q And yet during that testimony, you testified
19	familiar with the design that you're working with and	¹⁹ that the valve stems cannot rotate or the canister
20	familiarizing yourself with the different elements of	²⁰ excuse me. Strike that.
21	inhalers, of course reviewing and analyzing the valves	²¹ During that testimony on April 24, 2019, you
22	and the canisters and how they're made is all part and	testified that the canister cannot rotate about the
23	parcel of understanding the design. So doing tests	²³ valve stem.
24	such as being you know, being aware of forces to	²⁴ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
25	actuate a valve or to disturb a valve, those are all	25 ///
	Page 88	Page 89
1	Page 88 BY MR. SKLAR:	Page 89 ¹ THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not
1 2	-	
	BY MR. SKLAR:	¹ THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not
2	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct?	¹ THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not ² disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I
2 3	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm
2 3 4	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you.
2 3 4 5	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before.	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So it is your testimony now that you have in
2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202.	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So it is your testimony now that you have in the past measured how much force is required to rotate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So it is your testimony now that you have in the past measured how much force is required to rotate a canister about a valve stem. A In the past, I have done tests for information purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem?	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So it is your testimony now that you have in the past measured how much force is required to rotate a canister about a valve stem. A In the past, I have done tests for information
2 4 5 7 8 9 10	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So it is your testimony now that you have in the past measured how much force is required to rotate a canister about a valve stem. A In the past, I have done tests for information purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So it is your testimony now that you have in the past measured how much force is required to rotate a canister about a valve stem. A In the past, I have done tests for information purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces are significant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed."	 THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm trying to express that to you. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So it is your testimony now that you have in the past measured how much force is required to rotate a canister about a valve stem. A In the past, I have done tests for information purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces are significant. Q But you did not do a specific calculation for this case to determine what the actual force would be e what actual force would be required to rotate a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way.	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? Let me ask the question again. Tell me, were 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,19which I could utilize to perform a calculation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? Let me ask the question again. Tell me, were you asked this question and did you give this answer: 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,19which I could utilize to perform a calculation.20BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? Let me ask the question again. Tell me, were you asked this question and did you give this answer: "Can the canister rotate about the stem? 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,19which I could utilize to perform a calculation.20BY MR. SKLAR:21Q And you did not attempt to do that on any of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? Let me ask the question again. Tell me, were you asked this question and did you give this answer: "Can the canister rotate about the stem? 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,19which I could utilize to perform a calculation.20BY MR. SKLAR:21Q And you did not attempt to do that on any of22the devices for this case that you had accessible to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? Let me ask the question again. Tell me, were you asked this question and did you give this answer: "Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,19which I could utilize to perform a calculation.20BY MR. SKLAR:21Q And you did not attempt to do that on any of22the devices for this case that you had accessible to23you, for example, in your office; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? Let me ask the question again. Tell me, were you asked this question and did you give this answer: "Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,19which I could utilize to perform a calculation.20BY MR. SKLAR:21Q And you did not attempt to do that on any of22the devices for this case that you had accessible to23you, for example, in your office; correct?24MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q Correct? A Can you show me what we're talking about in my Q It's the same transcript that we read before. Were you asked this question and did you give this answer? It's page 202. "Question: Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't how they're constructed." A That yeah. They're not intended to they're not intended to rotate. That's not how they're constructed. They're not constructed and intended to rotate that way. Q You do not say anything about intent here, do you? Let me ask the question again. Tell me, were you asked this question and did you give this answer: "Can the canister rotate about the stem? "Answer: In the valve designs certainly that I've seen and am familiar with, that isn't 	1THE WITNESS: You read the words. So I'm not2disputing that that's what I said. But I know what I3said, and I know what the meaning of that is, and I'm4trying to express that to you.5BY MR. SKLAR:6Q So it is your testimony now that you have in7the past measured how much force is required to rotate8a canister about a valve stem.9A In the past, I have done tests for information10purposes, for design purposes, and that those forces11are significant.12Q But you did not do a specific calculation for13this case to determine what the actual force would14be what actual force would be required to rotate a15canister about a valve stem?16MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.17THE WITNESS: Again, my answer to that was I18don't have access to confidential design information,19which I could utilize to perform a calculation.20BY MR. SKLAR:21Q And you did not attempt to do that on any of22the devices for this case that you had accessible to23you, for example, in your office; correct?

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

877-702-9580

23

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 23 of 53

	Page 90		Page 91
1	an instance in design; they don't represent the	1	BY MR. SKLAR:
2	complete design. To do that, I would need the proper	2	Q What is the calculation that you would use if
3	design documentation to perform that kind of analysis	3	you had the data to determine how much force would be
4	and calculation.	4	required to actuate an MDI if the canister was capable
5	BY MR. SKLAR:	5	of rotating about the valve stem during that actuation?
6	Q You agree with me that these devices have been	6	A I would probably utilize a torque watch of
7	around for decades; correct?	7	some kind and at least I would at least do that.
8	A Yes.	8	That would give a good indication.
9	Q We talked earlier that the amount of force	9	Q Is there an equation that you could use if you
10	required to move the device in the axial direction	10	knew, for example, the force of friction between the
11	probably would not have changed significantly between	11	valve stem and the seal? Is there an equation that you
12	2003 and now; correct?	12	could use to calculate the amount of force required to
13	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	13	activate an MDI if the canister was capable of rotating
14	THE WITNESS: That being an ergonomic,	14	about the valve stem?
15	patient-related, functional aspect, most likely has	15	A If I utilized the torque watch and did those
16	been pretty consistent; may have gotten a little less	16	tests, I could utilize that information and try to
17	over time. But I'm not again, I'm not familiar with	17	estimate what and studying the design of the valve,
18	what the trends have been since that time frame.	18	which would require the detailed drawings, I could
19	BY MR. SKLAR:	19	estimate the force that is being created by whatever
20	Q You could have approximated for purposes of	20	the design is. And, you know, I wouldn't be able to
21	this case using another MDI; correct?	21	assign where each component of the force is being
22	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	22	assigned to relative to the valve design, but at least
23	THE WITNESS: I already know that it's a	23	from an external standpoint, we would at least have
24	significant force. I'm not sure how that would have	24	that information.
25	added to my experience and knowledge.	25	MR. SKLAR: Okay. Let's take a quick break.
	Page 92		Page 93
1	MR. MURRAY: Before we go off the record, I	1	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JULY 16, 2019
2	just want to object on the record to the introduction	2	1:16 P.M 2:27 P.M.
3	of Exhibit 1071 as not being authenticated, lack of	3	
4	foundation, and relevance.	4	EXAMINATION (Continued)
5	MR. SKLAR: All right. Off the record.	5	BY MR. SKLAR:
6	(Lunch recess taken 12:32 p.m 1:16 p.m.)	6	Q Welcome back, Mr. Clemens.
7		7	A Thank you. Good to be back.
8		8	Q We agreed earlier that in 2003, MDIs generally
9		9	were not designed to require a patient to use maximum
10		10	force to actuate the device; correct?
11		11	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
12		12	THE WITNESS: What I would say is back then,
13		13	as it is true today, there was most likely an
14		14	established ergonomic force that was established and
15		15	determined by whatever company was developing the MDI,
16		16	and then that would establish the force range that they
17		17	were setting as a requirement for actuating.
18		18	BY MR. SKLAR:
19		19	Q You would agree they wouldn't set that
20		20	requirement at the maximum amount of force that a user
21		21	is generally capable of exerting; correct?
22		22	A A maximum force as
23		23	What would that be? I'm not sure I
24		24	understand.
25		25	Q Well, you explained that there's an ergonomic

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

877-702-9580

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 24 of 53

	Page 94		Page 95
1	factor. I presume that it wouldn't be good design to	1	A So if I'm understanding you correctly,
2	set the maximum actuation force at the	2	whatever the theoretical ergonomic force was back in
3	Sorry. Excuse me.	3	those days was certainly lower, if not much lower, than
4	It would not be a good design to set the	4	the maximum that a patient could exert, and so,
5	actuation force at the maximum amount of force that a	5	yeah, there would be a difference.
6	patient is generally capable of exerting; correct?	6	Q Correct.
7	A That would be a good assumption.	7	And so you could add some additional force
8	Q And so I think based on that, we agreed	8	requirement without exceeding the maximum force that a
9	earlier that, in 2003, MDIs generally were not designed	9	patient was capable of exerting.
10	to require a patient to use maximum force to actuate	10	A You could add force you could add force
11	the device; correct?	11	somewhere in between there. Correct.
12	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	12	Q In your declaration again, Exhibit 2023.1,
13	THE WITNESS: The maximum force, yes, that	13	which is your declaration in the '177 IPR you state
14	you're describing, which is the largest force	14	that "a rotation mechanism such as that in Rhoades
15	capable you know, a patient's capable of utilizing.	15	cannot impart the significant force necessary to rotate
16	Yeah. It would not have been designed that way.	16	the canister." Correct?
17	BY MR. SKLAR:	17	
18		18	A Well, let's read what I said here.
10	Q So some additional force could be required	19	Q And that's in paragraph 9, and it's on page 5.
20	without exceeding the maximum force that a patient is	20	A Sure. Yeah. So we're talking about a pen
	capable of exerting; correct?		mechanism, which is designed with very, very low forces
21	A Some say that again. Some	21	that would not be intended and capable.
22	Q If you start with sort of the standard MDIs in	22	Q So in making that statement in paragraph 9,
23	2003, some additional actuation force could be required	23	are you referring to the Rhoades cam body exactly as it
24	without still exceeding the maximum force that a	24	appears in Rhoades, such that you would just take it
25	patient is capable of exerting.	25	out of Rhoades and plop it into an MDI body?
	Page 96		Page 97
1	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	1	in mind, let me repeat the question.
2	THE WITNESS: I am my opinion is based on	2	Do all MDIs use the same type of seal between
3	the notion that you would utilize that kind of design,	3	the valve stem and the canister?
4	and but very closely. It wouldn't be exactly that	4	A I would say no, they do not, because there are
5	design. It's quite small. But it would have to be,	5	different manufacturers of valves, and they're
6	you know, resized.	6	constantly trying to improve on them. But I don't
7	But as I understand what petitioners are	7	know I don't know about them all. So but I would
8	suggesting, is that we just make a combination of these	8	just say that there isn't just one particular standard
9	things, essentially a substitution. And, you know,	9	that's always used.
10	that kind of mechanism just probably would not be able	10	Q Do you agree that the different seals that are
11	to do that.	11	used may impart a different amount of frictional force
12	BY MR. SKLAR:	12	between that seal and the valve stem?
13		13	
13	Q How much force can the rotation mechanism of Phondos import?	14	A I do not believe that there is a standard that
14	Rhoades impart?	14	they're necessarily following, which would necessitate
15	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	15	them to all achieve the same kind of design or force.
	THE WITNESS: Without actually having physical	10	I do not believe there is a standard.
17	parts and a particular design to analyze, it would be		Q I appreciate it. I think you tried to answer
18	pure speculation for me to attempt to do that, to	18	the question, but I want to make sure I'm clear. I'll
19	make to give that a number. So, you know, I	19	reask it. I think what you're saying is "yes."
	wouldn't be comfortable trying to do that	20	Do you agree that the different seals that are
20	wouldn't be comfortable trying to do that.	0.1	
21	BY MR. SKLAR:	21	used may impart a different amount of frictional force
21 22	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Do all MDIs use the same type of seal?	22	between that seal and the valve stem?
21 22 23	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Do all MDIs use the same type of seal? And when I'm referring to a seal, I'm	22 23	between that seal and the valve stem? A There will always be a variance in the forces,
21 22 23 24	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Do all MDIs use the same type of seal? And when I'm referring to a seal, I'm referring to the same seal that we've been discussing	22 23 24	between that seal and the valve stem? A There will always be a variance in the forces, and so not only would you necessarily see a variance
21 22 23	BY MR. SKLAR: Q Do all MDIs use the same type of seal? And when I'm referring to a seal, I'm	22 23	between that seal and the valve stem? A There will always be a variance in the forces,

25

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 25 of 53

	Page 98		Page 99
1	given valve design, you will also see a variance of	1	Q I'll read that for you. "The drawings to
2	force. Just that's the nature of designing. Again,	2	which the present description refers are therefore
3	the design.	3	highly simplified diagrams which do not show the fluid
4	(Exhibit 1001.2 was referenced.)	4	dispenser in detail, but only in very diagrammatic
5	BY MR. SKLAR:	5	manner relating to the various portions that can be
6	Q Okay. Mr. Clemens, I'm going to hand you	6	moved relative to one another."
7	what's been marked as Exhibit 1001.2. This is a copy	7	Do you see that?
8	of U.S. Patent No. 9,370,631; correct?	8	A I do.
9	A That is correct.	9	Q Do you agree with that statement?
10	Q And if I refer to this as the '631 patent,	10	A Yes, I do.
11	you'll understand what I'm talking; right?	11	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
12	A Yes, sir.	12	BY MR. SKLAR:
13	Q And you understand that this patent is the	13	Q And you agree that the '631 patent does not
14	subject of the other IPR in this case, which is	14	explain how all of the components, all of the claimed
15	2018-01055; right?	15 16	components of the patent, connect?
16	A I will take your words. I'll take it as	10	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
17 18	gospel.	18	THE WITNESS: The claims do not specifically
18 19	Q And do you agree that the drawings that are	19	detail the whatever geometric connections, if I
20	presented in this '631 patent are highly simplified	20	understand what you're saying. It does not go into that kind of fine detail.
20	diagrams which do not show the fluid dispenser in detail?	21	BY MR. SKLAR:
22		22	Q And, likewise, the figures don't go into all
23	And I'll refer you back to column 5, line 3. I'm actually using the inventor's own words. Let me	23	of that fine detail, showing the connections between
24	point you to that section.	24	all of the claimed components in the '631 patent;
25	A Sure.	25	correct?
	A Suit.		
	Page 100		Page 101
1	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	1	dispenser disclosed in Figures 1 through 8 of the '631
2	THE WITNESS: The patent and the schematics	2	patent to operate, there would need to be some sort of
3	do they do show	3	biasing force; correct?
4	Although it is schematically that is	4	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
5	true but it does show conceptually some geometries	5	I'd also add that I think this is
6	and interactions to support the claims that they're	6	potentially this line of questioning may exceed the
7	making.	7	scope of this deposition, to the extent it's limited to
8	BY MR. SKLAR:	8	Mr. Clemens' declaration submitted in support of
9	Q But it doesn't actually show all of the	9	Aptar's sur-reply.
10	connections between all of the components of the fluid	10	THE WITNESS: Well, we know that there is
11	dispenser described in the '631 patent; correct?	11	certainly a bias force that exists in the valves of the
12	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	12	canister. And it's been a while since I've reviewed
13	THE WITNESS: The patent doesn't show, let's	13	this in detail. I don't know if in the body of the
14	say, the connections that you might have to do in order	14	document, off the top of my head, if there are two,
15	to reduce it to practice. You know, an actual device,	15	three, or four other biasing forces, but I think
	it doesn't show that.	16	certainly by the nature of the biasing force in the
16		l . –	
16 17	BY MR. SKLAR:	17	valve, that I would say yes. Of course there's biasing
		17 18	force in this idea, this invention.
17	BY MR. SKLAR:		
17 18	BY MR. SKLAR: Q The first embodiment of this patent is	18	force in this idea, this invention.
17 18 19	BY MR. SKLAR: Q The first embodiment of this patent is disclosed in Figures 1 through 8. Why don't you just	18 19	force in this idea, this invention. BY MR. SKLAR: Q My question is slightly different. Let me turn you to column 7, line 17. It's the line that
17 18 19 20	BY MR. SKLAR: Q The first embodiment of this patent is disclosed in Figures 1 through 8. Why don't you just take a moment to look at those figures.	18 19 20	force in this idea, this invention. BY MR. SKLAR: Q My question is slightly different. Let me
17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. SKLAR: Q The first embodiment of this patent is disclosed in Figures 1 through 8. Why don't you just take a moment to look at those figures. You would agree with me that this	18 19 20 21	force in this idea, this invention. BY MR. SKLAR: Q My question is slightly different. Let me turn you to column 7, line 17. It's the line that
17 18 19 20 21 22	 BY MR. SKLAR: Q The first embodiment of this patent is disclosed in Figures 1 through 8. Why don't you just take a moment to look at those figures. You would agree with me that this Sorry. Have you had an opportunity to look at those figures? A Yes. I've scanned them. Thanks. 	18 19 20 21 22	force in this idea, this invention. BY MR. SKLAR: Q My question is slightly different. Let me turn you to column 7, line 17. It's the line that starts "With reference to FIG 5."
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY MR. SKLAR: Q The first embodiment of this patent is disclosed in Figures 1 through 8. Why don't you just take a moment to look at those figures. You would agree with me that this Sorry. Have you had an opportunity to look at those figures?	18 19 20 21 22 23	force in this idea, this invention. BY MR. SKLAR: Q My question is slightly different. Let me turn you to column 7, line 17. It's the line that starts "With reference to FIG 5." Do you see that?

26

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 26 of 53

	Page 102		Page 103
1		1	-
2	"With reference to FIG 5, it should be	2	shown, is it your position that a skilled artisan would
3	observed that when the user releases the pressure on	3	be able to figure out where to place that return spring in order to operate the fluid dispenser disclosed in
4	the actuator member 30, the return spring (not shown)	4	
5	of the dispenser returns the reservoir 2 to its	5	embodiment 1 of the '631 patent?
6	rest" and that's the number 2 "to its rest	6	MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form.
7	position by displacing the reservoir 2 axially relative	7	THE WITNESS: So given that the invention here is shown schematically, although the interactions are
8	to the body 1," so on and so forth. Do you see that?	8	described and helpful features are shown to do that, it
9	A Yes, I do see that.	9	gives a skilled artisan the broad a broad approach
10	Q Okay. So you agree that the return spring is	10	to how this could be achieved. So there could be many
11	not shown in the figures; correct?	11	solutions. So given that, it isn't being too specific
12	A Correct.	12	on the reduction of art. I would say that, you know,
13	Q Despite the fact that the return spring is not	13	there would be many, many options that could possibly
14	shown, is it your position that a skilled artisan would	14	work, and the skilled artisan would be able to latch
15	be able to figure out where to place that return spring	15	onto one of those.
16	in order to operate the fluid dispenser?	16	BY MR. SKLAR:
17	MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form.	17	Q Okay. You understand that in some of the
18	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Are you asking	18	combinations in this case and some of the prior art
19	Could you repeat it again just to make sure	19	references, gears had been molded onto the inhaler
20	I've got the right direction of your question?	20	body; correct?
21	BY MR. SKLAR:	21	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Outside
22	Q Yes, I can.	22	I'll just say again I think that these
23	Do you agree that oh, excuse me. Strike	23	questions, to the extent that you're asking Mr. Clemens
24	that.	24	to opine on what the '631 what a skilled artisan
25	Despite the fact that the return spring is not	25	would or would not do with respect to the '631 patent
	1 1 0		1 I
	Page 104		D 105
	1090 101		Page 105
1	-	1	-
1 2	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration.	1 2	onto the inhaler body; correct?
	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply		onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested
2	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR:	2	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct.
2 3	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question.	2 3	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the
2 3 4	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR:	2 3 4	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct.
2 3 4 5	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're	2 3 4 5	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to
2 3 4 5 6	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration.BY MR. SKLAR:Q You can answer the question.A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head.	2 3 4 5 6	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body.
2 3 4 5 6 7	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that	2 3 4 5 6 7	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; correct? The housing of the pen? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by, "your report," I'm referring to your declarations that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; correct? The housing of the pen? A I believe Rhoades does not show that. Rhoades 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by, "your report," I'm referring to your declarations that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-replies in both
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; correct? The housing of the pen? A I believe Rhoades does not show that. Rhoades is a stamped part. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by, "your report," I'm referring to your declarations that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-replies in both IPRs, the '177 IPR and the '631 IPR.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; correct? The housing of the pen? A I believe Rhoades does not show that. Rhoades is a stamped part. Q Okay. Not in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by, "your report," I'm referring to your declarations that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-replies in both IPRs, the '177 IPR and the '631 IPR. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object on the basis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; correct? The housing of the pen? A I believe Rhoades does not show that. Rhoades is a stamped part. Q Okay. Not in Okay. I understand. Okay. Let's refer, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by, "your report," I'm referring to your declarations that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-replies in both IPRs, the '177 IPR and the '631 IPR. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object on the basis of privilege, to the extent that your answer would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; correct? The housing of the pen? A I believe Rhoades does not show that. Rhoades is a stamped part. Q Okay. Not in Okay. I understand. Okay. Let's refer, then, to petitioners' Ground 1 and 2 combinations. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by, "your report," I'm referring to your declarations that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-replies in both IPRs, the '177 IPR and the '631 IPR. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object on the basis of privilege, to the extent that your answer would invade your discussions with attorneys, you should not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 are outside the scope of Mr. Clemens' reply declaration. BY MR. SKLAR: Q You can answer the question. A It seems like you have something that you're aware of that I can't think of off the top of my head. Is there something you could point to that could help me remember? Q Sure. Do you recall, for example, in the Bason and Rhoades combination that teeth were molded onto the inhaler body in the ground that was presented for on patentability? A Okay. So petitioners suggested this; right? Is that what you're Q Let me be clear. There's prior art that shows this as well. For example, you understand that Rhoades shows stop members molded onto the body of the pen; correct? The housing of the pen? A I believe Rhoades does not show that. Rhoades is a stamped part. Q Okay. Not in Okay. I understand. Okay. Let's refer, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	onto the inhaler body; correct? A Yeah. In reviewing their suggested combination, they propose that. Correct. Q You agree that if gears are molded to the inhaler body, those gears are stationary relative to the inhaler body. MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form. Calls for a legal conclusion. THE WITNESS: Well, if you have a part, you know, that you had molded and you call it a stationary part or you call it whatever you want, but there's a part, and you mold features to it, they would be, you know, features that are they're permanently formed relative to other features on the part. So I would agree I would agree to that. BY MR. SKLAR: Q Okay. What was your process for determining what issues you addressed in your report? And by, "your report," I'm referring to your declarations that you submitted in support of Aptar's sur-replies in both IPRs, the '177 IPR and the '631 IPR. MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object on the basis of privilege, to the extent that your answer would

27

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 27 of 53

Page 106

	Page 106		Page 107
1	THE WITNESS: And, again, what was my process?	1	describe it.
2	Is that what you said?	2	Q I'm trying to understand your
3	BY MR. SKLAR:	3	It seems like there's a qualification there.
4	Q Uh-huh.	4	So let me ask my question.
5	A Well, just briefly, as an engineer that has	5	Was it your approach if you identified an
6	been through a number of designs, you know, after a	6	issue that you disagreed with that petitioners were
7	while, you know, you develop an ability to kind of	7	advancing in their reply briefs and in their
8	visualize designs. And, you know, my basic process was	8	declarations in support of those reply briefs, would
9	to take the reports that petitioners advanced and read	9	you have addressed those issues in your declarations,
10	them carefully and analyze them on what they were	10	which are Exhibits 2023 in both IPRs?
11	saying and showing, if there was something to see, and,	11	MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form.
12	you know, analyze the design based on the input that	12	THE WITNESS: I analyzed the you know, the
13	I'm given. Very broadly, that's what I would do, and	13	descriptions, both by petitioners and by petitioners'
14	envision what their what they were advancing and how	14	expert, to visualize how the combinations were being
15	that would that might work.	15	
16	-	16	described to work, and applying them to the claims.
17	Q So was it your approach if you identified an	17	And, you know, I would in fact, I did identify those
18	issue that you disagreed with, an issue that	18	areas, those issues which I came across in trying to
19	petitioners were advancing that you disagreed with,	19	understand the combinations as they were advanced.
20	would you have addressed that in your declaration,	20	BY MR. SKLAR:
	Exhibits 2023 in both IPRs?		Q I'll ask you a different question.
21	A If I found an issue of a problem in terms of	21	Are you aware that you are permitted to submit
22	the combination of the parts or the of the	22	a seven-page declaration?
23	prior arts, you know, which were intended to be	23	MR. MURRAY: Objection to the form.
24 25	simplistic and easy to combine, if I found a problem	24	THE WITNESS: Ask it again.
25	associated with that, yes, I'd try to identify that and	25	///
		<u> </u>	
	Page 108		Page 109
1	BY MR. SKLAR:	1	Were you aware that you were permitted to
2	Q Are you aware that you are permitted to submit	2	submit a declaration of seven pages in each of these
3	a seven-page declaration?	3	IPRs?
4	A I don't	4	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.
5	I didn't even think about it.	5	THE WITNESS: Well, perhaps another answer I
6	Q But are you aware that you are permitted to	6	could offer you is that I'm aware that a declaration of
7	submit a seven-page declaration?	7	zero pages could could, you know, have been offered.
8	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	8	So, you know, again, I didn't I haven't even thought
9	THE WITNESS: Since I was collaborating with	9	about it. But you could either respond or not, and the
10	the attorneys, if there was a	10	response could be whatever pages that you would care
11	Again, I'm not a lawyer. If there was a legal	11	for it to be, unless there was some sort of legal
12	reason why that would not be permitted or otherwise	12	restriction.
13	qualified in any way, I would have relied on them to	13	BY MR. SKLAR:
14	advise me.	14	Q And so what I'm asking you is: Were you aware
15	BY MR. SKLAR:	15	that there was a seven-page limit for each of the IPRs
16	Q Okay. So let me just ask it again.	16	that you submitted sorry, excuse me for each of
17	Were you aware that you were permitted to	17	the declarations that you submitted in the two IPRs
18	submit a declaration up to and including seven total	18	that we're discussing today?
19	pages in each IPR?	19	A Again, if there
20	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Object to form.	20	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
21	THE WITNESS: I honestly didn't think about	21	THE WITNESS: If there was a legal restriction
22	it.	22	on the declarations, I was I didn't ask that
23	BY MR. SKLAR:	23	question and was not aware of it.
24	Q That wasn't my question. I didn't ask you if	24	BY MR. SKLAR:
25	you thought about it.	25	Q So as far as you were concerned, you could
	,		

28

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 28 of 53

1submit a declaration of any length; is that correct?1BY MR. SKLAR:2MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.2Q I didn't ask if you thought about it, and I3THE WITNESS: Again, I'll say that in3didn't ask if there was a legal limit. All I'm asking4collaborating with the attorneys that I was working4is if you were aware that there was a seven-page limit5with, that's what it was.5on the declarations that you submitted in this case.6BY MR. SKLAR:6MR. MURRAY: Same objection. Form.7Q It's really not a difficult question. Okay?7Relevance. Scope.8It's a "yes" or "no" question.8THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I just I simply9Were you aware of a seven-page limit with9didn't even think about it.10respect to the declarations that you submitted in these10BY MR. SKLAR:11two IPRs that we've discussed today?11Q So you don't know if you were ever aware of a12MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form,12page limit in this for your declarations in this13relevance, and scope. I don't see what this has to do13case?
2MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.2Q I didn't ask if you thought about it, and I3THE WITNESS: Again, I'll say that in3didn't ask if there was a legal limit. All I'm asking4collaborating with the attorneys that I was working4is if you were aware that there was a seven-page limit5with, that's what it was.5on the declarations that you submitted in this case.6BY MR. SKLAR:6MR. MURRAY: Same objection. Form.7Q It's really not a difficult question. Okay?7Relevance. Scope.8It's a "yes" or "no" question.8THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I just I simply9Were you aware of a seven-page limit with9didn't even think about it.10respect to the declarations that you submitted in these10BY MR. SKLAR:11two IPRs that we've discussed today?11Q So you don't know if you were ever aware of a12MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form,12page limit in this for your declarations in this
 collaborating with the attorneys that I was working with, that's what it was. BY MR. SKLAR: Q It's really not a difficult question. Okay? It's a "yes" or "no" question. Were you aware of a seven-page limit with respect to the declarations that you submitted in these two IPRs that we've discussed today? MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, is if you were aware that there was a seven-page limit on the declarations that you submitted in this case. MR. MURRAY: Same objection. Form. Relevance. Scope. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I just I simply didn't even think about it. BY MR. SKLAR: Q So you don't know if you were ever aware of a page limit in this for your declarations in this
 with, that's what it was. BY MR. SKLAR: Q It's really not a difficult question. Okay? It's a "yes" or "no" question. Were you aware of a seven-page limit with respect to the declarations that you submitted in these two IPRs that we've discussed today? MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, mathematical set of the declarations in this MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, mathematical set of the declarations in this
6BY MR. SKLAR:6MR. MURRAY: Same objection. Form.7QIt's really not a difficult question. Okay?7Relevance. Scope.8It's a "yes" or "no" question.8THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I just I simply9Were you aware of a seven-page limit with9didn't even think about it.10respect to the declarations that you submitted in these10BY MR. SKLAR:11two IPRs that we've discussed today?11QSo you don't know if you were ever aware of a12MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form,12page limit in this for your declarations in this
6BY MR. SKLAR:6MR. MURRAY: Same objection. Form.7QIt's really not a difficult question. Okay?7Relevance. Scope.8It's a "yes" or "no" question.8THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I just I simply9Were you aware of a seven-page limit with9didn't even think about it.10respect to the declarations that you submitted in these10BY MR. SKLAR:11two IPRs that we've discussed today?11QSo you don't know if you were ever aware of a12MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form,12page limit in this for your declarations in this
8 It's a "yes" or "no" question. 8 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I just I simply 9 Were you aware of a seven-page limit with 9 didn't even think about it. 10 respect to the declarations that you submitted in these 10 BY MR. SKLAR: 11 two IPRs that we've discussed today? 11 Q So you don't know if you were ever aware of a 12 MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, 12 page limit in this for your declarations in this
 ⁹ Were you aware of a seven-page limit with ¹⁰ respect to the declarations that you submitted in these ¹¹ two IPRs that we've discussed today? ¹² MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, ¹² MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form,
 ⁹ Were you aware of a seven-page limit with ¹⁰ respect to the declarations that you submitted in these ¹¹ two IPRs that we've discussed today? ¹² MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, ¹² MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form,
11two IPRs that we've discussed today?11QSo you don't know if you were ever aware of a12MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form,12page limit in this for your declarations in this
¹² MR. MURRAY: I'm going to object to form, ¹² page limit in this for your declarations in this
page mint in this for your declarations in this
¹³ relevance, and scope. I don't see what this has to do ¹³ case?
¹⁴ with the content of his declarations. ¹⁴ MR. MURRAY: Same objection.
¹⁵ THE WITNESS: Again, I will refer you to a ¹⁵ THE WITNESS: I didn't
¹⁶ previous answer that I gave, and that is if there was a ¹⁶ I never thought about it.
¹⁷ legal limit that was assigned, I was not aware of that, ¹⁷ BY MR. SKLAR:
¹⁸ but I was working in collaboration with them to create ¹⁸ Q Again, not my question. It's not a difficult
¹⁹ a response. ¹⁹ question, and I'm not sure why we're beating around the
²⁰ BY MR. SKLAR: ²⁰ bush here, which makes me a little more suspect. I
²¹ Q Did I reference legal limit in my question? ²¹ thought this was a relatively benign question.
²² MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. ²² Were you aware that there was a seven-page
²³ THE WITNESS: I am just trying to communicate ²³ limit for each of the declarations that you submitted
²⁴ to you that I didn't even think about it. ²⁴ in this in the IPRs that we have discussed here
²⁵ /// ²⁵ today?
Page 112 Page 113
¹ MR. MURRAY: Same objection. ¹ MR. MURRAY: Same objection.
² THE WITNESS: I was not aware that there was ² THE WITNESS: Was there a limit of
³ instructions, legal instructions, outside of the scope ³ instruction? Was there an instruction given to the

L

3	instructions, legal instructions, outside of the scope	3	instruction? Was there an instruction given to the
4	of my of my knowledge that may have existed to limit	4	parties that was limited to seven pages? Is that true?
5	the report to seven pages.	5	BY MR. SKLAR:
6	BY MR. SKLAR:	6	Q I'm asking the questions, and it's not it's
7	Q Again, there's a qualifier there, and I didn't	7	not relevant to the issue. Okay? The point is, I'm
8	say anything about legal instructions. So I want to	8	simply asking if you were aware that there was a
9	make sure we're very clear. Okay?	9	seven-page limit for the declarations that you
10	Were you aware that there was a seven-page	10	submitted that we've been discussing for the IPRs
11	limit for the declarations that you submitted in the	11	today.
12	IPRs that we have been discussing here today?	12	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.
13	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.	13	THE WITNESS: Again, I was not aware of any
14	THE WITNESS: I think my last answer should	14	instructions that may have been given to the parties to
15	have answered every everything that you were	15	limit their reports by page number.
16	asking.	16	BY MR. SKLAR:
17	BY MR. SKLAR:	17	Q Let me ask it a different way.
18	Q It did not, because you were talking about	18	Was it your understanding that you could draft
19	legal instructions, and I have not asked you anything	19	a declaration that was seven-pages in length?
20	about legal instructions. It's a very simple question.	20	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.
21	Okay?	21	THE WITNESS: The report was created on
22	"Yes" or "no." Were you aware that there was	22	based on a collaborative effort with the attorneys, and
23	a seven-page limit for the declarations that you	23	that is how it arrived at that point.
24	submitted in the IPRs that we have discussed here	24	BY MR. SKLAR:
25	today?	25	Q To be clear, I'm not asking about what you did

TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580

29

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 29 of 53

	Page 114	Pac	ge 115
1	with your attorneys; I'm not asking about legal	¹ BY MR. SKLAR:	-
2	instructions. Okay? All I want to know is your	² Q What do you mean by you did not have a	nv
3	knowledge. Okay? It's a "yes" or "no." Either you	³ foreknowledge?	ury
4	knew or you didn't know.	⁴ A Well, I'm just answering you honestly. I	
5	Did you know	⁵ worked in collaboration with the attorneys. We	
6	Let me repeat the question.	⁶ about many topics, and the more we talked about	
7	Did you know that the declarations that you	 and the more we were able to refine our the refine 	
8	were submitting in the two IPRs that we were discussing	⁸ topics and I was able to fine-tune my opinions,	-
9	today were to be limited to seven pages?	⁹ then it ended up in this form. I did not have	
10	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.	¹⁰ foreknowledge prior to that process that there w	as a
11	THE WITNESS: I was not aware, and I did not	¹¹ limitation of seven pages.	
12	know that there was an instruction for limitation until	¹² Q Prior to the filing of these declarations,	
13	working in collaboration with the attorneys, and we	¹³ which took place on June 13, 2019, at any point	prior
14	were able to take all the information that we had been	¹⁴ to that filing, were you aware that your declarat	
15	discussing, and the opinions I had been offering were	¹⁵ your declarations were to be limited to seven pa	
16	put into form.	¹⁶ length?	0
17	BY MR. SKLAR:	¹⁷ MR. MURRAY: Same objection. Form,	relevance.
18	Q Again, I'm not asking about an instruction.	¹⁸ scope.	,
19	Was it your understanding that your	¹⁹ THE WITNESS: I had no awareness, no	knowledge
20	declarations were not to exceed seven pages in length?	²⁰ beforehand that there was going to be a limitation	-
21	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.	²¹ any of the declarations.	
22	THE WITNESS: I did not have any foreknowledge	²² BY MR. SKLAR:	
23	that there was going to be a restriction of seven	²³ Q And when you say "beforehand," what d	o vou
24	pages.	²⁴ mean by "beforehand"?	-)
25	///	²⁵ A During the process of creating the	
	Page 116	Pac	ge 117
1	declaration.	¹ to seven pages?	
2	Q Well, I was clear about my time frame. I'm	² MR. MURRAY: Same objection.	
3	asking you prior to the filing of these declarations on	³ THE WITNESS: Again, I was I had n	0
4	June 13, 2019, were you aware that there was a	⁴ knowledge or awareness of any limitation that	was
5	seven-page limitation for your declarations?	⁵ placed on the number of pages for the declarat	ion.
6	MR. MURRAY: Same objection.	⁶ BY MR. SKLAR:	
7	THE WITNESS: I honestly had no awareness of a	7 Q Is there a reason why you can't give me	а
8	restriction on page limitation until it took its final	⁸ "yes" or "no" answer to whether or not you kn	ew that
9	form.	⁹ your declaration was to be limited to seven page	ges?
10	BY MR. SKLAR:	¹⁰ A Well, I'm just trying to answer your que	stion
11	Q Did it take its final form prior to the filing	¹¹ honestly.	
12	of the declaration on June 13, 2019?	¹² Q I don't think you are. I think the question	on
13	A Well, I was reviewing and editing very close	¹³ can be answered very easily with a "yes" or a '	'no."
14	to that time frame, but, again, I have to tell you I	Let me try it again.	
15	never even had a thought about the number of pages.	¹⁵ Prior to the filing of your declaration, we	ere
16	Q Not what I asked. Okay?	¹⁶ you aware that your declaration was to be limi	ted to
17	You said you had no awareness of a page	¹⁷ seven pages?	
18	limitation until the declaration took its final form;	¹⁸ MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Rel	evance.
19	correct?	¹⁹ Scope.	
20	A (Witness nods head up and down.)	²⁰ THE WITNESS: So help me understand	l what you
21	Q Okay. This declaration took its final form	²¹ mean by "awareness."	
22	before it was filed; correct?	²² BY MR. SKLAR:	
23	A Of course.	²³ Q You don't understand what "awareness"	means?
24	Q Okay. So before this declaration was filed,	A I don't understand perhaps what you are	e the
25	were you aware that the declaration was to be limited	²⁵ meaning that you're ascribing to the word "aw	areness."
	-		

30

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 30 of 53

	Page 118		Page 119
1	-	1	-
2	Q Did you think prior to the filing of this	2	At any point in time prior to filing the
2	paper that you could submit a 20-page	3	declarations Exhibits 2023 in both of the IPRs that
	Sorry. You know what? Let's strike that.		we've been discussing today was it your
4	At anytime prior to the filing of the	4	understanding that your declarations could not exceed
5	declarations that we have discussed here today,	5	seven pages?
6	Exhibits 2023 in both cases, were you informed that	6	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form. Relevance,
7	your declarations were to be limited to seven pages?	7	scope.
8	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Privileged.	8	THE WITNESS: I believe my last answer
9	To the extent it implicates conversations with	9	answered it.
10	your attorneys	10	BY MR. SKLAR:
11	BY MR. SKLAR:	11	Q It didn't. So can you answer my question
12	Q And I'm not asking you to tell me	12	"yes" or "no"? Okay. You haven't once answered that
13	I don't need to know if this person told you	13	question "yes" or "no." I'm going to try it again.
14	something or that person told you something. I don't	14	At any point in time prior to filing the
15	need to know what the conversation was. To be very	15	declarations, Exhibits 2023 in both of the IPRs that
16	clear, I'm respectful of that, and I'm not asking.	16	we've been discussing here today, was it your
17	I just want know what was your knowledge.	17	understanding that your declarations could not exceed
18	Okay?	18	seven pages?
19	A I'm going to just honestly say that I'm a	19	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form, relevance,
20	little confused by the whole questioning of this, but I	20	scope.
21	will say that I did not receive specific instructions	21	THE WITNESS: Well, I could not be aware or
22	to limit my thoughts to an amount that would fit on	22	have knowledge of a limitation on the number of pages
23	seven pages. I was not instructed to do that.	23	if I was not told that, and I've already answered
24	Q Wasn't my question. Okay? We'll try it	24	numerous times that I was not told that there was a
25	again.	25	limitation. So therefore I could not have knowledge or
	agam.		miniation. So increase r could not have knowledge of
	Page 120		Page 121
1	awareness of that limitation.	1	scope of this deposition.
2	BY MR. SKLAR:	2	I'm going to instruct you not to answer.
3	Q So is your answer "no"?	3	MR. SKLAR: It's very much within the scope of
4	A I was not given given any instructions that	4	this deposition, and I will explain to you for a moment
5	there was a limitation.	5	why that is, and then you can determine if you want to
6	Q Okay. If you had identified other errors	6	proceed with that instruction.
7	Let me step back.	7	First of all, we have been discussing today at
8	Do the positions that you've represented in	8	length numerous combinations that relate to Rhoades,
9	Exhibits 2023 in both of the IPRs represent all of the	9	that have Rhoades in the combination. You have
10	disagreements that you have with petitioners' positions	10	specifically addressed issues with respect to Rhoades'
11		11	
12	as represented in their reply brief and Mr. Piper's	12	cam body. You stated
13	expert declaration in support of that reply?	13	For example, we discussed whether or not
13	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Relevance.	13	Rhoades' cam body can be depressed or can be
	THE WITNESS: My response to that is these	14	inserted past the stop members, which implicates a
15	combinations do have numerous aspects to them and		certain relationship between the stop members and
16	interactions. And, yes, of course, I could probably	16	Rhoades' cam body.
17	identify other errors where there are some conflicts.	17	Obviously the actuation stroke and the
		1.0	
18	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering	18	movement of the cam body within Rhoades also implicates
18 19	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering and during the process of analysis, you don't find	19	the interactions between Rhoades' cam body and the stop
18 19 20	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering and during the process of analysis, you don't find much. You usually find a lot. So	19 20	the interactions between Rhoades' cam body and the stop members.
18 19 20 21	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering and during the process of analysis, you don't find much. You usually find a lot. So BY MR. SKLAR:	19 20 21	the interactions between Rhoades' cam body and the stop members. Q I'm also going to ask you for a moment I'm
18 19 20 21 22	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering and during the process of analysis, you don't find much. You usually find a lot. So BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it still your position that the Rhoades'	19 20 21 22	the interactions between Rhoades' cam body and the stop members. Q I'm also going to ask you for a moment I'm going to switch the line of questioning for a moment
18 19 20 21 22 23	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering and during the process of analysis, you don't find much. You usually find a lot. So BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it still your position that the Rhoades' plunger must be fully depressed before the Rhoades	19 20 21 22 23	the interactions between Rhoades' cam body and the stop members. Q I'm also going to ask you for a moment I'm going to switch the line of questioning for a moment and we'll get back to this to turn to Exhibit 2023
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering and during the process of analysis, you don't find much. You usually find a lot. So BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it still your position that the Rhoades' plunger must be fully depressed before the Rhoades cam body will rotate?	19 20 21 22 23 24	the interactions between Rhoades' cam body and the stop members. Q I'm also going to ask you for a moment I'm going to switch the line of questioning for a moment and we'll get back to this to turn to Exhibit 2023 of the '177 patent
18 19 20 21 22 23	It's rare that especially, you know, in engineering and during the process of analysis, you don't find much. You usually find a lot. So BY MR. SKLAR: Q So is it still your position that the Rhoades' plunger must be fully depressed before the Rhoades	19 20 21 22 23	the interactions between Rhoades' cam body and the stop members. Q I'm also going to ask you for a moment I'm going to switch the line of questioning for a moment and we'll get back to this to turn to Exhibit 2023

31

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 31 of 53

	Page 122		Page 123
1	THE WITNESS: Oh.	1	Q And then you say that the entirety of those
2	BY MR. SKLAR:	2	declarations are incorporated herein by reference;
3	Q My apologies. Yeah. So we're going to look	3	correct?
4	at 2023.1.	4	A That is what it says. Correct.
5	And, again, this is your declaration in	5	Q And earlier today I asked you we took a
6	support of the sur-reply in the '177 IPR; correct?	6	look at your signature page.
7	A Correct.	7	Do you remember that?
8	Q And I'm going to ask you for a moment, in	8	A Yes.
9	paragraph 2, what does it mean that you make this	9	Q And I asked you is it your testimony that
10	declaration as a supplement to the other declarations	10	everything incorporated into your declaration, meaning
11	that you have submitted in this matter?	11	Exhibit 2023, is true and correct; right?
12	A What does that mean?	12	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
13	Q Uh-huh.	13	THE WITNESS: I believe that's true.
14	A It just means that this is in addition to.	14	BY MR. SKLAR:
15	Q Okay. And then paragraph 3, you list out your	15	Q And you said that it was; right?
16	prior declarations in this case; correct?	16	A That's correct.
17	You list out, for example, your August 15,	17	MR. MURRAY: Object to the form.
18	2018, declaration, which is Exhibit 2005; correct?	18	BY MR. SKLAR:
19	A Uh-huh.	19	Q And Exhibit 2021, for example, is incorporated
20	Q And you list your February 13, 2019,	20	by reference into this declaration, Exhibit 2023;
21	declaration, which is Exhibit 2021; correct?	21	correct?
22	A Yep. I see that.	22	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.
23	Q And you list your March 7, 2019, supplemental	23	THE WITNESS: Ask the question again. It's
24	declaration; correct?	24	incorporated by reference? Is that what you said?
25	A Correct.	25	///
	Page 124		Page 125
1	BY MR. SKLAR:	1	MR. SKLAR: Let's take a break.
2	Q I'm using your words. Yeah. The entirety of	2	(Recess taken 2:06 p.m 2:16 p.m.)
3	those declarations is incorporated herein; correct?	3	BY MR. SKLAR:
4	A That's what the words say.	4	Q All right. Welcome back, Mr. Clemens.
5	Q So I'm going to ask you again.	5	A Thank you.
6	Is it still your position that Rhoades'	6	Q We established that the entirety of your prior
7	plunger must be fully depressed before the Rhoades	7	declarations is incorporated into Exhibit 2023.1;
8	cam body can rotate?	8	correct?
9	MR. MURRAY: And I'm going to object again and	9	A Okay.
10	maintain my objection.	10	MR. MURRAY: Form.
11	You should not answer that question on the	11	THE WITNESS: Yeah. You're referring to
12	basis of scope.	12	paragraph 3? Yeah. We went through all the my
13	The Board is clear that this is limited to the	13	previous declarations, and that the last sentence
14	scope of his reply of his declaration given in support	14	says the entirety of these declarations is
15	of Aptar's sur-reply. That content is not discussed	15	incorporated.
16	whatsoever in that sur-reply, so that is the basis of	16	BY MR. SKLAR:
17	my objection.	17	Q And I'd like to turn your attention again to
18	MR. SKLAR: It's very clearly incorporated	18	your signature page, if you could turn there. And
19	into this declaration.	19	through your signature, you declare the following: "I
20	MR. MURRAY: If you want to take it up with	20	declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the
21	the Board, you're welcome.	21	United States of America and the State of California,
22 23	BY MR. SKLAR:	22 23	that the foregoing is true and correct"; right?
23	Q Do you intend to follow the instruction of	23	A That's correct, what it says. That's
24	your attorney? A I do.	24	absolutely correct.
20	A 1 UO.	2.5	Q And we established that your statement there

32

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 32 of 53

	Page 126		Page 127
1	also refers to everything that you've incorporated into	1	MR. MURRAY: I'm still going to object as this
2	this declaration; correct?	2	being outside the scope, and on that basis instruct you
3	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	3	not to answer.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes.	4	BY MR. SKLAR:
5	BY MR. SKLAR:	5	Q And let me ask you. Is there anything you
6	Q Let me ask you. Given that statement, is	6	want to clarify, or do you intend to follow that
7	there anything any position that you have taken in	7	instruction? And, again, this is your signature on
8	Exhibit 2021 that you do not believe to still be true	8	Exhibit 2023?
9	and correct which you would like to correct now on the	9	A I believe I'll follow the instructions.
10	record?	10	MR. SKLAR: We will leave it at that.
11	A For Exhibit 2021?	11	All right.
12	Q Yes.	12	MR. MURRAY: Okay. I only have a brief
13	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form. I would	13	redirect.
14	object again on scope. This is outside the scope	14	EXAMINATION
15	MR. SKLAR: I'm just asking about this	15	BY MR. MURRAY:
16	declaration.	16	Q Mr. Clemens, earlier you testified or rather
17	MR. MURRAY: Oh. You're asking about the	17	earlier Mr. Sklar asked you "Do skilled artisans or
18	I'm sorry. The	18	engineers have any resources available to them to
19	THE WITNESS: Well, this is 2021. Is that the	19	mitigate any of the reported of adding mold arms to
20	one you're referring to?	20	the designs of Ground 1 and Ground 2 in the '177
21	BY MR. SKLAR:	21	petition?"
22	Q But I'm asking you with respect to this	22	And you responded "Tooling engineers and
23	statement in 2023. Is there anything in 2021 that you	23	tooling companies would definitely have tools to
24	do not believe to be true and correct that you would	24	attempt to minimize the impact of these kinds of
25	like to clarify on the record now?	25	changes, and certainly if they are a good company and
	Page 128		Page 129
1	good engineers, they would try to mitigate as much as	1	devices are highly optimized devices that have had
2	they could, but my opinion is that and that's	2	their designs modified and refined over many, many
	they could, but my opinion is that and that s		
3	incorporated in my opinion that my assumption is that	3	
3 4	incorporated in my opinion that my assumption is that that would have happened, but yet, even after that it	3 4	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled
3 4 5	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it	3 4 5	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of
4	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and	4	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which
4 5	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera."	4 5	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already
4 5 6	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and	4 5 6	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not
4 5 6 7	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do.	4 5 6 7	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted.
4 5 7 8	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that?	4 5 6 7 8	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me
4 5 7 8 9	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' 	4 5 7 8 9	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted.
4 5 7 8 9 10	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike 	4 5 7 8 9 10	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path?	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path? MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: That would have been an undesirable change to a design to even occur.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have never seen the design documents
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path? MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: That would have been an undesirable change to a design to even occur. BY MR. MURRAY:	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have never seen the design documents MR. SKLAR: Objection to form. Go ahead.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path? MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: That would have been an undesirable change to a design to even occur. BY MR. MURRAY: Q And why do you say that?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have never seen the design documents
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path? MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: That would have been an undesirable change to a design to even occur. BY MR. MURRAY: Q And why do you say that? A Because I'm probably I am probably not 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have never seen the design documents MR. SKLAR: Objection to form. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Oh. Sorry. BY MR. MURRAY:
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path? MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: That would have been an undesirable change to a design to even occur. BY MR. MURRAY: Q And why do you say that? A Because I'm probably I am probably not inaccurate by saying that billions of MDIs have been 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have never seen the design documents MR. SKLAR: Objection to form. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Oh. Sorry. BY MR. MURRAY: Q You can continue.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path? MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: That would have been an undesirable change to a design to even occur. BY MR. MURRAY: Q And why do you say that? A Because I'm probably I am probably not inaccurate by saying that billions of MDIs have been produced prior to this time, and none of them have 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have never seen the design documents MR. SKLAR: Objection to form. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Oh. Sorry. BY MR. MURRAY: Q You can continue. A And I really know nothing about it except for
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that would have happened, but yet, even after that, it would still be a large nonzero effect on cost and maintenance, et cetera." Do you remember that? A I do. Q Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in the '177 petition strike that. Specifically with respect to petitioners' proposed combinations in petitioners' reply with respect to the '177 petition, would a skilled artisan have been motivated to create a design that resulted in holes being introduced into the flow path? MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form. THE WITNESS: That would have been an undesirable change to a design to even occur. BY MR. MURRAY: Q And why do you say that? A Because I'm probably I am probably not inaccurate by saying that billions of MDIs have been 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 years, decades, and to just assume that a skilled artisan would, through the through the thinking of simply and easily substituting a combination which created holes suddenly in the flow path that's already been optimized over decades is it's just not thinkable and would not be attempted. MR. MURRAY: Okay. And could you pass me Exhibit 1071, the Monaghan Aeroeclipse nebulizer? MR. SKLAR: There you go. MR. MURRAY: Thank you. Q Now, Mr. Clemens, prior to your deposition today, have you ever seen this specific device before? A No, I have not. Q So have you ever done any formal analysis on the device marked as Exhibit 1071 before? A I've never seen the device before, I have never seen the design documents MR. SKLAR: Objection to form. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Oh. Sorry. BY MR. MURRAY: Q You can continue.

33

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 33 of 53

	Page 130		Page 131
1	inspection, and for the features that I've been	1	snap-fits prior to 2003?
2	asked about are substantially their size is	2	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.
3	substantially small enough where I can't honestly make	3	THE WITNESS: I suspect that they could have.
4	a proper inspection.	4	BY MR. SKLAR:
5	Q And do you know whether this specific device	5	Q I won't hold you to this number, but you
6	would have been available to a skilled artisan at the	6	referenced perhaps billions of MDIs that have existed
7	time of the invention?	7	throughout history. Let's just say a lot of MDIs have
8	MR. SKLAR: Objection. Form.	8	existed throughout history; correct?
9	THE WITNESS: I have no idea. I've never seen	9	A Maybe not as many as McDonald's hamburgers,
10		10	
11	it before. I don't know anything about it. MR. MURRAY: Okay. No further questions.	10	but yes.
12	· · ·	12	Q Did you speak with all of the designers of
13	That's all I have.	13	those MDIs to determine why they did or did not
	MR. SKLAR: Just a couple quick redirect.	14	incorporate certain design features?
14	FURTHER EXAMINATION		A Well, I've worked in conjunction with other
15	BY MR. SKLAR:	15	engineers that have that, you know, were working on
16	Q Nebulizers were certainly available prior to	16	MDIs similar to what I was doing, and in groups, my
17	2003; correct?	17	groups. So, yes, certainly there would have been
18	A Nebulizers also have been around for decades.	18	interaction for, you know, those kinds of discussions.
19	Q Do you expect that nebulizers prior to 2003	19	Q Okay. But you did not speak with all of the
20	used snap-fits?	20	designers of all of the prior MDIs to determine why
21	MR. MURRAY: Objection. Form.	21	they did or did not incorporate certain design
22	THE WITNESS: I don't know.	22	features; correct?
23	BY MR. SKLAR:	23	A I have not spoken to all of them. That is
24	Q Would you have expected them to use snap-fit?	24	correct.
25	Would you have expected nebulizers to have used	25	Q And you agree that prior to 2003, MDIs on the
	Page 132		Page 133
1	market did not include integrated dose counters.	1	I, Tricia A. Rosate, Certified Shorthand
2	Correct?	2	Reporter licensed in the State of California,
3	MR. MURRAY: Objection to form.	3	License No. 10891, hereby certify that the deponent
4	THE WITNESS: I believe that that's true.	4	was by me first duly sworn, and the foregoing testimony
5	MR. SKLAR: No further questions.	5	was reported by me and was thereafter transcribed with
6	MR. MURRAY: All right.	6	computer-aided transcription; that the foregoing is a
7			computer-alded transcription, that the foregoing is a
8	None for me.	7	
		7 8	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings.
9	None for me. (Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)		
9 10		8	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or
		8 9	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing
10		8 9 10	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested
10 11		8 9 10 11	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption.
10 11 12		8 9 10 11 12	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of
10 11 12		8 9 10 11 12 13	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's
10 11 12 13	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void.
10 11 12 13 14	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my
10 11 12 13 14 15	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019. Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019. Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019. Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019. Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019. Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019. Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Proceedings concluded at 2:27 p.m.)	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	full, complete, and true record of said proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption. The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the reporter's certificates null and void. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this day: July 18, 2019. Tricia Rosate, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR

TSG Reporting - Worldwide

877-702-9580

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 34 of 53

					Page	134
1		ERI	RAT	A SHEET		
2	Case N	ame:				
3	Deposi	tion Date:				
4	Depone	nt:				
5	Pg. N	o. Now Reads		Should Read	Reason	
6	37	2 "but anything subsystem"		"But any subsystem"	miss-heard, or miss-spoke	_
7	42	"what is it that"		"what it is that"	Miss-heard or miss-spoke	_
8	43	"that has been"		"that hasn't been"	Miss-heard and miss-quoted"	_
9	48	"that I would have to"		"that I would have to know t	o do" Miss-heard and miss-quoted	_
10	49	2 "that would have been"		"that wouldn't have been"	Miss-heard and miss-quoted	
11	52 2	0 "which is not a circumferen	ntial"	"which is a circumferential"	Miss-heard and miss-quoted	
12						
13						
14						_
15						
16						
17						
18						_
19						_
20						_
				(Elouns	
21				Sigr	nature of Deponent	
22	SUBSCR	IBED AND SWORN	BE	FORE ME		
23	THIS	DAY OF		, 2019.		
24	_					
25	(Notar	y Public) MY	CO	MMISSION EXPI	RES:	

3M Company Exhibit 1077 3M Company, Merck & Co., Inc., and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., v. AptarFrance S.A.S. IPR2018-01055 Page 35 of 53

A	40:11 65:19 95:7,10	3:14 6:11 67:6	47:25 86:7 112:15	78:5 84:7,19 85:12
a.m (7)	95:10 101:5	alleged (1)	117:13 119:9,12,23	101:9 105:20
2:5,11 6:2 23:17,17	added (3)	45:8	answering (5)	124:15
50:22,22	20:16 27:17 90:25	allow (1)	83:12 85:5,17,18	area (2)
	adding (11)	27:15	115:4	39:19 51:18
ability (1)	18:15 19:2,22 21:1,7	America (1)	answers (2)	areas (2)
106:7	36:19 39:8 49:2,10	125:21	30:1 61:4	37:8 107:17
able (20)	50:7 127:19	amount (15)	anybody (1)	arms (8)
27:3,5,19 30:2 39:9	addition (10)	13:10 40:5 77:10,25	30:18	46:13 47:2,22 48:6,11
41:9,15 42:19 43:3	24:17,25 26:3,14	78:25 79:3,12 86:12	anytime (2)	49:2 50:7 127:19
46:17 53:8 63:6	27:25 36:15 37:24	90:9 91:12 93:20	35:3 118:4	
91:20 96:10 102:15				arrived (1)
103:2,14 114:14	39:14 54:8 122:14	94:5 97:11,21	apart (1)	113:23
115:7,8	additional (10)	118:22	59:20	art (3)
absolutely (1)	12:1 29:25 47:1,21	analysis (16)	apologies (1)	103:12,18 104:16
125:24	54:8 55:17 60:17	30:5 31:1,14 50:2	122:3	article (2)
abstract (1)	94:18,23 95:7	53:9,9 54:14,15	apologize (1)	5:18 20:8
42:25	addressed (5)	63:16 65:4 72:11,15	56:20	artisan (16)
access (1)	53:22 105:18 106:19	75:21 90:3 120:19	APPEAL (1)	27:18 32:1 41:2,8
89:18	107:9 121:10	129:16	1:2	42:19 43:24 44:14
accessible (1)	addressing (1)	analyze (12)	appear (4)	54:18 102:14 103:1
89:22	40:17	26:22,24 27:6,23 40:1	65:1 66:17,19 70:9	103:9,14,24 128:14
accomplished (1)	adds (1)	42:8,15 54:4 67:13	appears (8)	129:4 130:6
53:3	22:25	96:17 106:10,12	20:8 25:12 35:15 60:2	artisans (6)
account (2)	adjust (2)	analyzed (8)	64:23 67:3,5 95:24	26:17 27:2 40:4 48:25
26:19 69:5	29:9 41:9	31:11 33:21 43:1	application (2)	50:4 127:17
accurate (4)	advanced (3)	60:18,20 65:5 82:6	60:23 80:3	arts (1)
47:15 63:15 78:18	16:25 106:9 107:18	107:12	applied (2)	106:23
86:8	advancing (3)	analyzing (1)	60:9 74:5	ascribing (1)
achieve (4)	106:14,18 107:7	86:21	applying (3)	117:25
27:14 29:10 70:23	advise (1)	ANDREW (1)	75:18 81:2 107:15	asked (21)
97:15	108:14	3:6	appreciate (3)	11:22 12:12,19 13:1
achieved (2)	Aeroeclipse (2)	angular (1)	21:1 53:7 97:17	15:9 17:22 19:23
71:22 103:10	57:6 129:10	81:4	appreciated (1)	21:8 25:2,16 30:6
action (1)	affect (4)	announce (1)	6:6	74:12 80:5 88:6,20
20:16	18:21 36:14,16 38:24	6:6	approach (4)	112:19 116:16
actions (1)	ago (3)	answer (52)	42:1 103:9 106:16	123:5,9 127:17
20:20	23:23 56:17 66:21	10:21 11:2,3 17:12	107:5	130:2
activate (1)	agree (37)	18:6 19:13,14,19	appropriate (1)	asking (27)
91:13	18:14 19:1,4,21 20:24	25:5,17,21 28:13	13:7	31:23 42:6 44:6 75:9
actual (8)	21:6,9 22:16,25	29:21 39:1,10 46:17	approval (1)	76:20 81:14,15,17
32:20 33:15 48:2	24:4 26:17,21 34:24	47:19 52:14 55:8	71:21	82:2 85:6,8 102:18
54:14 86:5 89:13,14	43:20 45:17 48:25	56:16 58:12 62:1	approved (1)	103:23 109:14
100:15	52:25 58:4 62:20	64:8 67:2 73:24	71:9	111:3 112:16 113:6
actuate (4)	66:5 79:3,23 90:6	74:13,15 75:16	approving (1)	113:8,25 114:1,18
86:25 91:4 93:10	93:19 97:10,20	81:23 85:4,20 88:7	72:8	116:3 118:12,16
94:10	98:18 99:9,13	88:10,20,22 89:17	approximated (1)	126:15,17,22
	100:21,25 102:10	97:17 104:4 105:23	90:20	aspect (4)
actuating (1) 93:17	102:23 105:4,15,15	105:25,25 109:5	April (5)	40:14 69:17 79:7
actuation (13)	131:25	110:16 112:14	5:14 25:11 74:8 87:15	90:15
72:22 73:1,13 74:2,23	agreed (4)	117:8,10 119:8,11	87:21	aspects (7)
	7:15 19:15 93:8 94:8	120:3 121:2 124:11	Aptar (2)	39:3 42:13 45:22
75:14,25 86:6 91:5	ahead (2)	120:3 121:2 124:11	1:7 6:10	55:22 80:21 82:4
94:2,5,23 121:17	6:7 129:20	answered (17)	Aptar's (19)	120:15
actuator (1) 102.2	air (4)	11:22 12:12,19 13:2	7:6,16 10:3,16 11:21	assembled (1)
102:3	33:6,8 39:15 40:5	15:9 17:22 19:24	12:11,18,24 13:17	66:22
add (9) 21:24 22:17 35:5	akin (3)	20:1 21:8 25:3	14:3 15:17 77:18	assembling (2)
21.27 22.17 JJ.J			I	

Page 1
63:25 64:13	awareness (8)	119:8 123:13 126:8	briefly (1)	97:3 101:12
	115:19 116:7,17	126:24 127:9 132:4	106:5	canisters (25)
assembly (1)				
52:21	117:4,21,23,25	bending (1)	briefs (2)	73:14,16,20,22 74:3
assign (3)	120:1	51:7	107:7,8	74:24 75:15,22 76:6
68:22,23 91:21	axial (9)	benefit (1)	broad (2)	79:17 82:16,24 83:3
assigned (3)	75:17 78:11,25 79:4	28:24	103:9,9	83:8,14,17 84:5,11
34:13 91:22 110:17	79:13 80:15,23	benign (1)	broadly (1)	84:16,22 85:8,21,22
associate (1)	81:20 90:10	111:21	106:13	85:24 86:22
44:3	axially (3)	BENJAMIN (1)	Broadway (1)	cap (6)
associated (3)	80:1 81:11 102:6	3:23	2:10	55:17 65:24,25 66:4,7
46:19 48:13 106:25	<u> </u>	best (1)	bump (1)	67:5
assume (3)		27:14	39:4	capable (25)
40:22 57:22 129:3	B (1)	better (1)	bush (1)	41:3 76:3,9,9,21,22
assuming (5)	5:6	25:5	111:20	77:10 82:7,24 83:9
41:7 46:7,8 80:10,11	B-a-s-o-n (1)	beyond (1)	business (3)	83:14 84:15,16 85:9
assumption (3)	28:25	17:7	33:13,16,18	85:22 91:4,13 93:21
50:16 94:7 128:3	back (21)	bias (1)	buy (1)	94:6,15,15,20,25
assure (1)	13:14 23:16,19 38:19	101:11	58:24	95:9,21
65:4	47:18 50:20,24	biasing (4)	C	caption (2)
attempt (5)	57:17 65:23 66:7	101:3,15,16,17		133:10,11
50:10 76:21 89:21	78:19 79:20 86:16	billions (2)	C (2)	captured (1)
96:18 127:24	93:6,7,12 95:2	128:23 131:6	3:1 4:1	32:14
attempted (1)	98:22 120:7 121:23	bit (8)	calculate (1)	care (1)
129:8	125:4	11:5 18:11 24:24 57:5	91:12	109:10
attempting (1)	base (1)	68:10 70:21 79:20	calculation (12)	career (1)
47:10	29:16	81:3	10:18 46:25 47:20	56:1
attention (4)	based (14)	block (1)	48:2,5 75:23 76:4	careful (1)
9:14 20:12 25:13	34:24 44:14,15 52:15	25:20	76:20 89:12,19 90:4	65:2
125:17	55:8 59:2,3 73:3,15	Board (5)	91:2	carefully (5)
attorney (5)	76:4 94:8 96:2	1:2 13:13 29:25	calculations (2)	7:24 48:17 65:5 73:23
10:23 45:20,21	106:12 113:22	124:13,21	63:18 64:25	106:10
124:24 133:9	basic (1)	bodies (2)	California (6)	carried (1)
attorneys (10)	106:8	55:3,5	1:15 2:11 6:1 93:1	39:18
11:3 16:15 105:24	basis (5)	body (26)	125:21 133:2	case (29)
108:10 110:4	86:2 105:22 124:12	22:18 53:2,2,5,17,17	call (7)	1:4 7:6,17 9:11 10:4
113:22 114:1,13	124:16 127:2	55:2 60:4 71:10	59:25 60:1 65:8,25	12:10,25 13:10,18
115:5 118:10	Bason (3)	95:23,25 101:13	69:23 105:10,11	15:1 21:15,22 22:9
August (1)	28:24 72:18 104:10	102:7 103:20	called (1)	23:22 28:9,16 29:4
122:17	Bason/Rhoades (1)	104:12,18 105:1,5,6		67:4 80:14 81:19
authenticated (1)	30:9	120:24 121:11,13	calling (2)	89:13,22 90:21
92:3	Bates (1)	121:16,18,19 124:8	45:14 62:12	98:14 103:18 111:5
available (6)	35:18	book (1)	Calls (1)	111:13 122:16
26:23 50:5 85:10	beating (1)	20:9	105:7	134:2
127:18 130:6,16	111:19	bottom (4)	cam (11)	cases (2)
average (1)	beginning (3)	7:20 23:1,4,5	53:2,17 55:2 95:23	38:11 118:6
79:5	34:10,21 81:7	boxes (1)	120:24 121:11,13	cause (4)
aware (31)	behalf (2)	68:7	121:16,18,19 124:8	47:11 81:4 82:5
14:1,11,20 23:24	6:10,14	brand (1)	canister (37)	133:11
29:12 86:24 104:6	belief (2)	57:8	25:22 33:4 72:21,25	caused (1)
107:21 108:2,6,17	8:3,6	break (7)	73:2,5,12 74:1,5,14	38:3
109:1,6,14,23 110:9	believe (23)	7:12 23:16 48:6 50:20	74:22 75:13,24 76:9	causes (1)
110:17 111:4,11,22	9:23 10:7,10 11:23	58:24 91:25 125:1	76:22 78:1,14 81:2	38:22
112:2,10,22 113:8	12:13 24:8,14 36:11	brief (8)	81:6 82:7,14,18	CCRR (3)
113:13 114:11	37:17 42:6 44:1	7:11 12:9,17 21:15	86:5,13 87:3,19,22	1:24 2:13 133:18
115:14 116:4,25	49:3 51:3 81:8	22:9,13 120:11	88:8,21 89:8,15	certain (10)
117:16 119:21	97:13,16 104:20	127:12	91:4,13 95:16 96:25	28:14 29:13 36:7

42:19 53:15,20 54:7 21:14 claimed (4) collaborative (4) 38:21 47:12 48:10 121:15 131:13,21 41:12,21 99:14,24 16:23 17:25 18:3 confirmation (1) 52:18 54:8,9,17 113:22 31:14 certainly (25) claims (4) 60:17 42:20 99:17 100:6 11:11 28:5 29:21,24 collaboratively (1) conflicts (1) complicated (7) 40:7 48:19 49:5 38:10 39:25 40:3 107:15 17:15 120:17 column (3) 49:18 52:16 53:21 confused (2) 50:11 54:20 56:11 clarification (1) 43:17 98:22 101:21 54:22 118:20 56:12 65:2 70:14,16 58:19 54:2 74:15 77:13 79:6 clarify (6) combination (15) complication (4) conjunction (1) 11:5 13:20 64:17 28:1 52:20 53:10.11 88:10,22 95:3 19:8 28:21 30:9,20 131:14 80:14 126:25 127:6 33:3 47:7 54:9.10 101:11,16 127:25 component (4) connect (2) clarifying (1) 72:19 96:8 104:11 37:24 62:6 65:24 61:16 99:15 130:16 131:17 105:3 106:22 121:9 91:21 certificates (1) 56:19 connection (1) 133:14 class (1) 129:5 components (5) 60:7 Certified (2) 61:24 99:14,15,24 79:20 combinations (17) connections (4) 99:18,23 100:10,14 2:14 133:1 classify (1) 19:6 28:15,19 30:17 100:10 consider (5) certify (2) 32:11 31:4.6 32:6 46:14 comprising (3) 133:3,8 clear (26) 51:20 103:18 44:24 45:3,6 32:11,24 52:21 67:24 8:20 10:2 13:4 19:14 cetera (2) 104:24 107:14.18 computational (2) 68:8 29:18 30:7 37:2 50:18 128:6 120:15 121:8 29:8 31:15 consideration (4) 53:15 58:20 60:19 20:18 65:3 67:19 79:7 chance (2) 128:10,13 computer-aided (1) 43:17 75:5 61:12 65:11 66:25 combine (3) 133:6 considerations (1) conceded (1) change (22) 67:24 73:21 83:7,12 47:10 53:24 106:24 39:22 22:20 34:25 36:9,14 84:15 85:6 97:18 considered (8) come (6) 65:13 9:17 15:22 16:2,6,11 37:3,15 38:2,3,7,10 104:16 112:9 15:3 50:20 52:2 59:18 concept (2) 113:25 116:2 71:1 80:22 19:10 49:1 16:21 17:4,20 38:11,16,17,21 52:17,22 53:21 54:2 118:16 124:13 concepts (1) considering (1) comes (3) 60:17 79:10 81:4 67:23 clearance (3) 18:3 40:14 44:10 24:13 128:19 71:13,13,17 comfortable (2) conceptually (3) consistent (2) 42:1 55:16 100:5 51:10 90:16 changed (4) clearly (1) 46:21 96:20 concern (4) 24:23 27:17 79:1 124:18 constantly (1) coming (4) 25:25 44:7,9 70:23 63:25 64:13 67:14 97:6 90:11 Clemens (28) 1:14 2:9 5:2,14,20,23 changes (9) commencing (1) 81:5 constructed (6) 26:19 37:21 38:18 6:16,20,23 7:3,11 concerned (2) 74:17 82:13 88:12,15 2:11 8:8,23 20:4 22:7 39:6 40:2,3 49:16 54:19 109:25 88:15,24 Commerce (1) contact (4) 50:11 127:25 23:19 25:8 50:24 3:15 concerns (1) 13:13 26:11 80:9,12 characterize (1) 75:6 93:6 98:6 COMMISSION (1) 80:25 134:25 content (2) 22:21 101:8 103:23 104:1 concluded (1) 110:14 124:15 common (2) Charles (8) 125:4 127:16 132:8 context (3) 1:14 2:9 5:2,14,19,22 129:13 132:14 17:15 38:12 concluding (1) 32:3.6 75:2 6:16 132:14 climb (1) communicate (1) 2:11conclusion (7) continue (3) check (3) 59:17 110:23 17:8 38:16 129:23 45:14 72:24 73:11.25 35:7 36:24 68:7 close (1) companies (3) 50:9 77:2 127:23 74:21 75:12 105:8 Continued (2) Chicago (1) 116:13 company (5) 4:1 93:4 3:4 closely (1) conclusions (2) **CHIPOURAS (1)** 96:4 1:4 33:12 50:12 93:15 77:16 78:4 continues (1) 127:25 condition (1) 17:9 3:6 coefficient (2) 18:19 conversation (2) CHLOE (1) 80:8 81:25 complete (6) 9:24,25 29:8 68:8 65:19 118:15 4:9 COHN (1) conditions (1) conversations (3) circle (1) 3:3 90:2 133:7 19:11 10:22 11:2 118:9 **COLEMAN (1)** completely (1) conducted (1) 23:16 converse (1) circumferential (1) 4:9 39:10 86:15 52:20 collaborating (2) complex (1) confidence (1) 69:22 cooling (3) claim (14) 108:9 110:4 48:16 41:22 confidential (2) 49:7,16,22 23:4 43:16,18,20,22 collaboration (4) complexities (2) 77:2 89:18 copy (9) 43:23 44:23 45:8,9 16:15 110:18 114:13 28:3 47:11 6:24 7:5,15 8:23 9:9 45:10,17 46:2,8,9 115:5 complexity (8) confirm (1)

TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580

Page 3

	11 17:6 133:8			17.1619.19
~	unter (6)	76:3 87:7 91:3 Date (1)	32:7 delivered (1)	37:3,16 38:3,8 41:25 42:9 52:17,22
	4:17,25 25:24 26:4	134:3	32:10	53:21 54:12,17
	26:14 36:15	day (2)	delivering (1)	60:18 61:17 67:13
	unters (3)	133:16 134:23	40:13	67:19,21 68:3,6,8
	4:11,12 132:1	days (2)	delivery (11)	68:20,23 69:7 74:15
	unting (1)	79:8 95:3	31:13,17,20 32:9,17	76:2,5 77:1 86:19
correct (142) 68		dealt (1)	32:25 33:1,15,22,23	86:23 89:10,18 90:1
	uple (3)	54:3	37:18	90:2,3 91:17,20,22
	5:21 73:9 130:13	decades (4)	demand (1)	94:1,4 96:3,5,17
	urse (7)	90:7 129:3,7 130:18	18:2	97:15 98:1,3 106:12
20:11 21:15,22,23 8:1	10 11:13 75:19	decision (3)	demands (2)	128:15,19 129:19
21:25 22:18 23:1,8 8	86:21 101:17	16:20 17:4,20	60:25 61:18	131:13,21
23:11 24:7,8,18 1	116:23 120:16	declaration (75)	demonstrate (1)	design-related (2)
	urt (3)	5:19,22 7:5,16,24 8:4	57:18	42:3,5
	22 4:3 6:4	8:9,13 9:10,15,17	demonstrated (1)	designed (8)
	ver (2)	9:21 10:3,15 11:9	66:21	20:17 55:21 59:22
	5:17 46:3	11:14,18,20 12:1,10	depend (5)	78:24 93:9 94:9,16
	ack (2)	12:16,18,23 13:16	34:22 51:23 53:12	95:20
, , , ,	3:6,10	14:2 15:17,22 16:3	64:4 80:2	designers (2)
,	adle (1)	16:16 27:9 51:1,2,6	dependencies (1)	131:11,20
51:5,9 54:15 57:6 65		52:15 77:17 78:5	48:1	designing (2)
· · · ·	eate (9) 8:21 19:8 28:3 38:19	84:7,19 85:11 95:12	dependent (3)	67:17 98:2
•••••		95:13 101:8 104:2	38:21 80:7,8 depending (4)	designs (19)
,	39:24 49:2 60:7 110:18 128:15	106:19 107:22	51:13,16 60:23 80:10	29:10 50:7 53:24
	eated (9)	108:3,7,18 109:2,6 110:1 113:19	depends (7)	55:19,23,23 67:11
	9:10 23:6 25:21,22	115:14 116:1,12,18	34:12 54:12 61:17,17	70:18 75:16 78:23
	30:18,23 91:19	116:21,24,25 117:5	62:2,2 68:19	80:20 81:7 88:10,22 97:25 106:6,8
	113:21 129:6	117:9,15,16 120:12	deponent (3)	127:20 129:2
	eating (5)	122:5,10,18,21,24	133:3 134:4,21	desk (17)
	2:21 33:7 34:14	123:10,20 124:14	deposition (14)	14:6 15:11,15 77:5
	59:19 115:25	124:19 126:2,16	1:14 2:9 5:14 13:8	82:23 83:8,13,21
	rescent (2)	declarations (34)	17:8 25:10,11 27:11	84:3,6,11,11,12,14
,	22 4:3	8:18 105:19 107:8,9	74:7 101:7 121:1,4	84:17 85:21,25
	itical (2)	109:17,22 110:10	129:13 134:3	Despite (2)
	7:19 58:14	110:14 111:5,12,23	depress (1)	102:13,25
	iticality (1)	112:11,23 113:9	78:14	detail (8)
123:16,21 124:3 60	0:24	114:7,20 115:12,15	depressed (3)	32:23 76:2 98:21 99:4
	oss-section (1)	115:21 116:3,5	120:23 121:13 124:7	99:18,20,23 101:13
	9:19	118:5,7 119:2,4,15	describe (3)	detailed (1)
, , ,	RR (3)	119:17 122:10,16	40:19 45:5 107:1	91:18
	24 2:13 133:18	123:2 124:3 125:7	described (5)	details (1)
	SR (3)	125:13,14	19:7 52:12 100:11	8:16
	24 2:13 133:19	declare (2)	103:8 107:15	determine (20)
	rrently (1)	125:19,20	describing (4)	28:10 29:4 30:10,21
••••••••••••(1)	4:16	define (3)	42:1 66:17 72:12	37:24 38:2 46:24
	cle (1)	31:21,22 39:12	94:14	47:1,21 48:6 49:6
cost (4) 65	D:/	defined (1)	description (2)	49:21 52:10 75:23
46:12 47:12 50:18	D	46:20	5:7 99:2 descriptions (1)	86:4 89:13 91:3
$\frac{128:5}{\operatorname{costly}(1)} \qquad \qquad \overline{\mathbf{D}(1)}$		definitely (4)	descriptions (1) 107:13	121:5 131:12,20
		28:3 50:10 80:19 127:23	design (61)	determined (1) 93:15
17.10	allas (2)	degree (4)	5:18 20:9 21:21,24	determining (1)
	23 4:4	29:24 53:11,16 55:1	22:17,25 25:23	105:17
20.10 19.19,17	123 4.4 Ita (3)	deliver (1)	27:14,16 28:4 34:8	develop (1)
	× /			

TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580

Page 4

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				rage 5
106.7	00.12.01.12.02.4	44.0		- (C
106:7	80:13 81:13 82:4	44:2	droplets (2)	effort (3)
developed (2)	86:20 97:5,10,11,20	displacing (1)	32:21 33:7	16:24 17:25 113:22
11:15 31:13	97:21 101:20	102:6	drug (9)	either (4)
developer (1)	107:20 113:17	disposable (1)	5:12 32:8 33:23 36:4	53:3 55:2 109:9 114:3
72:6	differentiate (1)	32:12	37:18,19 39:18,20	ejection (1)
developing (2)	59:12	disputing (1)	75:21	20:18
36:8 93:15	difficult (2)	89:2	drug-delivery (1)	elaborate (1)
development (5)	110:7 111:18	distance (1)	29:15	80:4
24:1 36:2,3 44:11	difficulty (1)	39:20	drugs (1)	elements (2)
76:5	7:9	distinguished (1) 68:10	40:14 due (2)	46:9 86:20
device (65)	direct (3)		due (3)	eliminated (5)
13:21 14:14,22,25	22:12 25:13 74:11	disturb (3) 34:18 35:1 86:25	7:9 13:9 49:25	18:15 19:1,21 20:17 21:7
15:5 18:21 24:2,15	directed (4)		duly (2)	
28:8,11 29:2,11	44:1,16 64:18 65:20	disturbed (1) 39:21	6:17 133:4	Elliott (1) 28:21
31:12,16,19 32:17	direction (12)	document (11)	durable (2) 32:13 61:3	
32:20,25 33:1,6,15	77:11 78:7,13 79:1,4	8:24 9:4 10:11 11:19	duration (1)	Elliott/Rhoades (1) 30:20
33:22,24 34:2,5,15	79:13 80:15,16 81:20,21 90:10	20:5,8 21:10 22:1	65:6	else's (1)
34:17 36:3 37:6				84:11
38:14,19 40:13	102:20	35:9 43:7 101:14 documentation (1)	dynamics (4) 26:23 29:8 31:15 39:2	embodiment (2)
41:22 43:1,2 52:12	directly (1) 73:17	90:3	20:23 29:8 31:13 39:2	100:18 103:4
57:3,14 62:20 63:7		documents (8)	E	
63:13 64:1,8,13,18	disagreed (3)	8:11,12 10:12,17 11:7	E (14)	Emily (2) 4:11 6:8
64:22 65:20,23,24	106:17,18 107:6	11:11 21:18 129:19	1:14 2:9 3:1,1 4:1,1	emit (2)
66:4,7,22 71:3,16	disagreement (2) 33:13,14	DOHME (1)	5:1,2,6,14,19,22	66:22 70:22
72:2,7 79:17 90:10		1:4	6:16 132:14	ended (2)
93:10 94:11 100:15	disagreements (1) 120:10	doing (6)	earlier (11)	54:25 115:9
129:14,17,18 130:5	disclosed (4)	47:8 54:14 68:2 72:16	11:15 21:14 30:25	engineer (4)
devices (56)	47:23 100:19 101:1	86:23 131:16	36:17 66:17 90:9	33:21 38:5 86:18
12:23 13:15 14:6,7 15:11,14,16 18:20	103:3	dose (8)	93:8 94:9 123:5	106:5
	disconnect (1)	24:10,12,17,25 26:4	127:16,17	engineered (1)
29:5,9,15 30:6,8,10	73:18	26:14 32:10 132:1	easier (1)	54:18
30:19,22 31:1,2,6,9 31:10 32:7,14 37:5	discuss (3)	dose-counting (3)	69:22	engineering (3)
37:17 44:12,16	41:1 54:5 65:23	5:12 24:2 36:3	easily (2)	53:9 54:15 120:18
48:15 49:7,22,25	discussed (11)	dozen (1)	117:13 129:5	engineers (14)
51:20 52:6 53:8,12	17:14 18:1 23:22 31:3	44:22	easy (6)	26:22 37:23 38:1 48:8
54:1,4,14 55:12,25	64:11 110:11	draft (1)	47:7,8,14,18 52:22	50:4,9,12 54:6 69:5
56:2,4,9,14,15,18	111:24 112:24	113:18	106:24	87:1 127:18,22
71:13 73:4,10 76:6	118:5 121:12	drafting (17)	edges (2)	128:1 131:15
78:18 89:22,25 90:6	124:15	8:9,13,21 9:21 10:2	66:20 67:5	ensure (1)
129:1,1	discussing (14)	10:15,18 11:8,19	editing (1)	61:8
diagrammatic (1)	18:20 27:24 31:6 32:3	12:10,17,23 13:16	116:13	ensuring (1)
99:4	32:6 96:24 109:18	14:2,12,21 15:16	effect (15)	65:12
diagrams (2)	112:12 113:10	draw (8)	37:13 47:12,13 48:3,4	entails (1)
98:20 99:3	114:8,15 119:3,16	18:15 19:2,22 20:19	48:10,19,20,21	59:14
dictate (1)	121:7	21:7 23:7,11 86:9	49:13,15 50:18	entirety (5)
48:15	discussions (2)	drawing (1)	52:17 60:3 128:5	20:25 123:1 124:2
Diego (4)	105:24 131:18	22:19	effective (2)	125:6,14
1:15 2:10 6:1 93:1	dismantling (1)	drawings (3)	29:11 38:14	entitled (1)
difference (2)	133:12	91:18 98:18 99:1	effectiveness (1)	20:9
70:21 95:5	dispenser (14)	Drive (1)	71:16	entry (1)
differences (1)	41:4,11 42:20 44:5,24	3:4	effects (5)	33:5
33:20	45:23,25 98:20 99:4	droplet (1)	29:14 38:18 39:6,13	envision (1)
different (19)	100:11 101:1 102:4	32:24	50:6	106:14
34:2 38:8 39:6 52:8	102:16 103:3	droplet-forming (1)	efficacy (2)	envisioning (1)
61:13 63:9 73:9	dispensers (1)	33:15	37:19 64:7	59:7
01.15 05.7 15.7				
L				

Page	6
------	---

		124.25	50.04 (0.04 (1.10	(0.01 (1.5.0.(0.0
equation (2)	exceeding (6)	134:25	59:24 60:24 61:18	60:21 61:5,9 62:8
91:9,11	53:4 55:4 67:14 94:19	explain (3)	61:19 62:12 64:5,5	62:23 63:1 64:24
equipment (1)	94:24 95:8	32:23 99:14 121:4	70:19	66:20 67:7,9,12,16
31:13	excess (1)	explained (1)	features (22)	68:1,6,11,16,22
ergonomic (4)	48:9	93:25	41:18,21,23 46:5,10	70:20,21,23,24
90:14 93:14,25 95:2	excuse (8)	express (1)	58:16 59:9,14,18,21	77:12 78:7 118:22
ERRATA (1)	7:12 25:14 82:21 85:2	89:4	60:16,17 66:16	fits (5)
134:1	87:20 94:3 102:23	expressed (5)	70:11,17 103:8	58:14 62:25 64:11
errors (2)	109:16	14:13,21 19:14 77:16	105:12,13,14 130:1	69:4 71:5
120:6,17	exert (2)	85:11	131:13,22	fitting (1)
especially (2)	79:5 95:4	expressly (1)	February (1)	60:4
39:23 120:18	exerting (5)	13:6	122:20	flap (1)
ESQ (7)	93:21 94:6,20,25 95:9	extent (6)	FELD (1)	64:19
3:5,5,6,16,23 4:4,11	exhibit (70)	10:20 101:7 103:23	3:14	flapper (8)
essentially (2)	5:7,8,10,11,14,16,18	105:23,25 118:9	felt (2)	57:20,21 58:3,4,6,9
47:9 96:9	5:19,22 6:24,25 7:1	external (1)	10:17 11:8	58:21 62:19
establish (3)	7:3,12,20,21,23	91:23	female (10)	flat (2)
24:6 69:21 93:16	8:14,24,25 9:5,7,9		58:15,16,21 60:3	70:22 71:1
established (9)	10:6 11:10,18,20	F	62:22,25 64:12,19	flow (60)
36:17,21 37:5 38:15	12:1 14:13 16:3,6	facilitate (1)	65:15 70:7	18:22 23:3,6 24:18
39:16 93:14,14	16:11 17:5,21 18:7	59:15	field (2)	25:1,18,25 26:4,15
125:6,25	20:2,5,13 22:5,8	fact (9)	32:1 38:15	26:18 27:4,6,18,20
estimate (3)	25:6,9 35:11,13	13:5 44:15 49:25 60:6	FIG (2)	27:23 28:10 29:4,10
56:3 91:17,19	43:5,8 56:23,24	79:16 80:25 102:13	101:22 102:1	29:15 30:10,21
et (2)	62:8 63:21 66:11	102:25 107:16	figure (4)	33:22,23 34:9,9,19
50:18 128:6	71:4 74:6 77:17	factor (4)	22:12,14 102:15	34:20,21 35:1,7
everybody (2)	92:3 95:12 98:4,7	33:2,5 79:6 94:1	103:2	36:15,16,20 37:14
61:14 84:11	121:23 122:18,21	failure (3)	figures (6)	38:2,4,22,25 39:7
evolves (1)	123:11,19,20 125:7	63:9 65:10,12	99:22 100:19,20,23	39:16,17,18,19,25
34:16	126:8,11 127:8	fall (1)	101:1 102:11	40:6,9,19 41:2,4,8
evolving (1)	120:0,11 127:0	35:5	file (3)	41:13,23 42:21
38:9	exhibits (7)	familiar (16)	41:25 42:9 71:21	43:21,25 44:8 50:2
exactly (4)	9:20 106:20 107:10	21:21 23:21 49:1 57:3	filed (5)	
14:7 17:17 95:23 96:4		57:11 63:20,22 69:8	12:2,24 13:17 116:22	65:1 128:16 129:6
EXAMINATION (5)	118:6 119:2,15	69:13 73:6 74:16	12.2,24 15.17 110.22 116:24	fluid (18)
5:3 6:18 93:4 127:14	120:9	80:20 86:19 88:11		26:22 29:8 31:15 39:2
130:14	exist (1)	88:23 90:17	filing (9)	41:4,11 42:20 44:2
	50:1		115:12,14 116:3,11	44:5,24 45:23,25
examine (7)	existed (4)	familiarizing (1)	117:15 118:1,4	98:20 99:3 100:10
12:22 13:15 73:1,13	24:12 112:4 131:6,8	86:20	119:1,14	100:25 102:16
74:2,23 75:14	existing (2)	far (1)	final (9)	103:3
examined (3)	35:4 49:12	109:25	23:25 24:5,6,9 35:13	fluid-dispensing (1)
14:1,14,22	exists (3)	faster (2)	116:8,11,18,21	44:11
example (10)	50:1,2 101:11	29:22 30:3	find (2)	focus (2)
14:1 20:18 61:20	expect (2)	fault (1)	120:19,20	76:16 85:3
89:23 91:10 104:10	72:2 130:19	34:19	fine (3)	folded (1)
104:17 121:12	expected (3)	FDA (9)	10:25 99:20,23	70:5
122:17 123:19	79:10 130:24,25	23:21,24 35:14,25	fine-tune (1)	follow (3)
exceed (15)	experience (9)	36:9 71:12 72:2,5	115:8	124:23 127:6,9
51:8 52:11 53:18	29:13 48:7 73:3,7,15	72:15	finished (1)	followed (1)
54:11 60:13,21	73:19 76:5 86:10	FDA's (4)	42:7	72:6
61:10,14,23 68:16	90:25	24:4,6,9 34:24	first (10)	following (3)
70:24 101:6 114:20	experiences (1)	fear (2)	6:17 44:23 52:4 56:22	42:12 97:14 125:19
119:4,17	78:16	36:22,23	61:8,22 64:10	follows (1)
exceeded (6)	expert (3)	feature (17)	100:18 121:7 133:4	6:17
63:2,8,13 64:2,15	32:1 107:14 120:12	39:4,23 49:11 58:14	fit (29)	force (84)
65:14	EXPIRES (1)	58:15,20,21 59:3,17	59:5,10,13,25 60:12	51:18 60:6 70:25 71:1
			,	

72:20,25 73:12 74:1	128:17 129:20	73:21	79:20 98:6 105:22	hamburgers (1)
74:5,22 75:13,19,24	130:8,21 131:2	functioning (2)	110:12 114:23	131:9
76:13,14 77:11,14	130:3,21 131:2	41:17 42:13	115:20 118:19	hand (8)
77:15,25 78:3,6,15	formal (1)	further (4)	119:13 121:2,21,22	25:8 35:9 43:7 56:22
	129:16	130:11,14 132:5		57:17 65:20 98:6
78:18,25 79:4,12,24			122:3,8 124:5,9	
80:5,7,8,10 81:2	formed (4)	133:8	127:1	133:16
82:1,11,18 83:5,11	22:22 23:2 33:4	G	good (16)	handed (3)
83:19 84:23 85:7,23	105:13		6:21,22 10:1 37:1	7:12 22:7 57:4
86:5,12 87:2 89:7	forming (2)	gauge (1)	47:17 50:12,12,21	handheld (1)
89:13,14 90:9,24	27:24 85:10	63:16	86:18 91:8 93:7	32:7
91:3,10,12,19,21	forms (1)	gears (4)	94:1,4,7 127:25	handing (3)
93:10,14,16,20,22	63:9	18:11 103:19 105:4,5	128:1	6:24 8:23 20:4
94:2,5,5,10,13,14	forth (3)	general (6)	gospel (1)	handy (1)
94:18,19,23,24 95:2	15:16 57:17 102:7	35:20,24,25 45:23	98:17	59:1
95:7,8,10,10,15	forward (2)	63:22 70:12	gotten (1)	happen (1)
96:13 97:11,15,21	30:3 33:17	generally (6)	90:16	22:21
98:2 101:3,11,16,18	found (3)	24:10 57:11 93:8,21	grave (1)	happened (4)
forces (9)	43:16 106:21,24	94:6,9	65:8	33:9,11 50:16 128:4
80:2 81:25 82:5 86:1	foundation (15)	generating (1)	great (1)	happening (1)
86:24 89:10 95:20	13:12 58:10 60:5	33:7	78:22	45:25
97:23 101:15	62:10 63:3,14 65:16	geometric (1)	greater (1)	happens (1)
foregoing (4)	66:1,12 69:15 71:11	99:18	56:11	26:10
125:22 133:4,6,9	71:18,20 72:3 92:4	geometries (1)	green (1)	Hargrave (3)
foreknowledge (3)	four (1)	100:5	57:22	4:4 6:9,9
114:22 115:3,10	101:15	getting (4)	Greg (1)	HAUER (1)
form (111)	frame (7)	31:24 61:22 65:23	6:12	3:14
13:11,19 14:4,15	26:22 73:4 78:19,21	70:19	GREGORY (1)	head (8)
15:18,23 16:7,22	90:18 116:2,14	give (10)	3:5	8:10 44:21 55:15
18:8,17 19:3,23	FRANCE (1)	25:16 67:1 74:12	ground (20)	69:16 87:9 101:14
23:9 24:19 25:2	1:7	80:12 88:6,20 91:8	28:22,25 31:3,3 46:14	104:6 116:20
26:20 27:21 29:6	frequently (1)	96:19 117:7 129:25	46:14 47:3,3 48:21	header (1)
30:12 32:18 33:2,5	48:6	given (18)	48:22 50:7,8 53:3,3	35:20
33:25 34:11 35:2	fresh (3)	40:25 41:16 76:12	55:3,3 104:12,24	hear (1)
36:10 38:6 41:5	33:6 39:15 40:5	82:11 83:4,11,19	127:20,20	70:16
42:23 46:16 51:22	friction (5)	85:23 98:1 103:6,11	Grounds (6)	heard (3)
53:6 55:6 60:5	70:24 80:9,16 81:21	106:13 113:3,14	29:3 47:23 49:8,23	54:22,23 57:8
61:25 62:10 64:3,16	91:10	120:4,4 124:14	51:21 52:13	help (3)
65:16 66:1,12 68:18	frictional (8)	126:6	groups (2)	15:2 104:8 117:20
69:10,15 71:6 72:3	77:12 78:7 79:23 80:5		131:16,17	helpful (1)
74:25 76:11,24 77:7	80:7 82:1 97:11,21	103:9	guarantee (1)	103:8
77:19 78:9 79:14	frictions (1)	giving (1)	28:4	helps (1)
	81:25	19:5	guess (8)	29:14
80:18 82:15 83:1,16	61.25 front (1)	19.5 go (10)	39:1 41:14 42:17,24	hereunto (1)
83:24 84:9,21 85:14	39:12	6:7 13:14 29:22 35:4	44:6,10 51:13 52:14	133:15
87:4,24 88:25 89:16	59.12 fulcrum (1)	66:2 92:1 99:19,22 66:2 92:1 99:19,22	guidance (9)	Hewlett-Packard (2)
89:24 90:13,22				33:12,14
93:11 94:12 96:1,15	81:3 f-11 (1)	129:11,20	5:11 23:21,25 24:5,7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
99:11,16 100:1,12	full (1)	goes (1)	24:9 34:25 35:13	high (3)
101:4 102:17 103:5	133:7 for Here (2)	70:20	43:24	39:14 70:25 83:4
105:7 107:11,23	fully (2)	going (42)	Gump (2)	higher (1)
108:8,20 109:20	120:23 124:7	6:23 13:10 17:6 18:12	3:14 6:11	82:5
110:2,12,22 111:6	function (3)	20:14,15 25:8,13	Н	highly (3)
114:16 115:9,17	28:6 64:6,6	29:20 35:9 39:9		98:19 99:3 129:1
116:9,11,18,21	functional (1)	40:23,24 43:7 45:13	H (1)	hinge (9)
117:18 119:6,19	90:15	45:24 52:9,19,24	5:6	58:7,8,9,15 62:20,22
123:12,17,22	functionality (4)	53:20,23,23 54:3	halves (1)	70:3,5,6
125:10 126:3,13	57:18 61:19 64:7	56:22 57:16 70:16	55:20	hinged (3)
1	I	I	I	1

	-	-		
58:5 64:19 70:18	Illinois (1)	77:1,2 87:8 89:9,18	113:14 114:2	105:24
history (2)	3:4	91:16,24 114:14	118:21 120:4 127:9	invention (3)
131:7,8	imagine (1)	informed (1)	integrate (2)	101:18 103:6 130:7
hold (4)	67:11	118:6	24:1 36:2	inventor's (1)
18:6 58:21 60:11	immediately (2)	infringing (1)	integrated (3)	98:23
131:5	40:14 54:19	45:8	24:10,15 132:1	involve (2)
holding (1)	impact (3)	inhalation (41)	Integration (1)	11:2 29:25
64:19	50:10 68:24 127:24	24:18 25:1,18 26:4,15	5:12	IPR (16)
hole (2)	impacted (2)	26:18 27:4,18,20	intend (2)	46:15 47:4,24 49:9,24
20:18 39:5	39:3,23	31:12,16,19 32:8,16	124:23 127:6	51:3 52:13 72:19
holes (20)	impart (4)	33:22,23 34:2,5,9,9	intended (10)	78:6 84:8 95:13
19:8 22:22 23:1,2,5,7	95:15 96:14 97:11,21	34:15,17 35:1 36:2	61:3 75:17,18 81:9,10	98:14 105:21,21
27:25 31:2,5,8	implicates (3)	36:14,16 37:14,17	88:13,14,15 95:21	108:19 122:6
32:16 33:8 38:24	118:9 121:14,18	38:2,4,24 40:9,19	106:23	IPR2018-01054 (1)
39:8 45:18 46:3	impossible (3)	41:1,4,12,23 42:21	intent (1)	1:5
49:2 128:16,25	30:13 53:12 55:8	43:21,25 44:8	88:17	IPR2018-01055 (1)
129:6	improper (1)	inhaler (14)	Inter (4)	1:5
holes/slots (1)	13:9	22:18,21 32:11 36:18	5:21,24 9:11 10:5	IPRs (15)
19:10	improve (2)	53:2,5,17 55:3	interact (4)	105:21 106:20 107:10
honest (3)	27:19 97:6	56:18 103:19	15:2 24:20 49:17	109:3,15,17 110:11
9:23 14:7 62:15	In-House (1)	104:12 105:1,5,6	59:20	111:24 112:12,24
honestly (7)	4:11	inhalers (5)	interaction (1)	113:10 114:8 119:2
56:7 108:21 115:4	inaccurate (1)	14:2 33:3 36:1 40:12	131:18	119:15 120:9
116:7 117:11	128:23	86:21	interactions (4)	issue (9)
118:19 130:3	inch (1)	inherent (1)	100:6 103:7 120:16	13:7 30:4 48:13 81:13
Honigman (2)	51:15	44:16	121:19	106:17,17,21 107:6
3:3 6:12	include (13)	inherently (2)	interchangable (3)	113:7
hook (1)	10:21 15:21 16:2,5,10	40:13 44:3	47:9,10 53:25	issued (2)
47:17	16:20 17:4,20 24:10	inject (1)	interested (1)	23:24 24:7
hoop (1)	46:2,5 84:10 132:1	39:4	133:10	issues (5)
51:6	included (1)	injected (2)	interfere (2)	39:24 105:18 107:9
hope (1)	46:10	39:15 40:5	36:22 49:14	107:17 121:10
34:18	includes (1)	injection (6)	interference (23)	Item (1)
hopefully (1)	84:2	5:18 18:12 20:9 39:21	59:4,10,13,22,25 60:8	10:5
81:23	including (3)	48:8 49:1	60:12,21 61:4,9	items (2)
housing (7)	83:21 84:4 108:18	input (1)	64:24 67:7,9,12,16	61:7,9
21:25 22:17,21 23:1,3	incorporate (6)	106:12	68:1,6,11,16,21,21	
55:20 104:19	41:16,20 42:13 67:9	inserted (3)	69:4 71:5	J
human (1)	131:13,21	60:2 70:7 121:14	interferes (5)	Jason (2)
79:6	incorporated (12)	inserting (3)	24:17,25 25:24 26:4	3:16 6:11
	8:3 50:14 123:2,10,19	53:2,17 55:2	26:14	job (2)
<u> </u>	123:24 124:3,18	inspection (2)	internal (2)	1:25 47:17
idea (4)	125:7,15 126:1	130:1,4	69:23 70:2	joining (1)
21:2 56:7 101:18	128:3	instance (8)	interpretation (1)	6:5
130:9	indication (1)	39:11,13 59:21 61:22	22:19	judging (2)
identical (2)	91:8	65:21 67:22 72:11	interrupting (1)	70:11 79:16
31:8 48:23	indications (1)	90:1	85:16	July (6)
identified (14)	72:6	instruct (3)	interruptions (1)	1:16 2:4,12 6:1 93:1
8:17 9:5,6,22 11:9	individuals (1)	11:1 121:2 127:2	85:19	133:16
13:6 50:6 51:3	6:5	instructed (2)	introduced (1)	June (4)
56:22 62:7 71:4	Industry (1)	15:24 118:23	128:16	8:2 115:13 116:4,12
106:16 107:5 120:6	5:11	instruction (7)	introduction (1)	
identify (6)	ineffective (1)	113:3,3 114:12,18	92:2	K
10:16 11:7 55:14	72:1	121:6 124:23 127:7	intuition (1)	keep (2)
106:25 107:16	information (12)	instructions (10)	29:13	13:11 29:22
120:17	11:14 16:25 42:3,5	112:3,3,8,19,20	invade (1)	kind (10)
	I	l	I	

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	50.3 72.15 81.3	69·21	64.22 109.15 110.9	70.12 72.5 13 74.6	marked (7)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				-	
kinds (8)48:12,16,20.49:13112:23:113:2,9:1looked (2)market (5) $17:13 29:15 48:11128:5118:22:15looking (7)315:24:16.37.6.71:23127:24 13:18largest (1)114:22:15:1.208:19:18.62:6.21.72.971:13127:24 13:14larch (1)119:22,25:20:1.5looking (7)35:1017:78103:14limitation (1)109:22,25:25:75:39:4.2135:1017:78103:14limitation (1)109:21,55:23:5,1572:7limitation (1)109:10113:4limitation (1)105:11100se (1)81:75:18,12,19:52:555:40:61:3,22:60:1131:73:33:34:12,1445:6113:41:49:11:5110:6(5)55:40:61:3,22:60:1155:40:61:3,22:60:1134:15,18,20:36:20laws (1)116:25:117:9,1639:24:61:3,41:20:2064:11,52:46:31:67:1534:15,18,20:36:20laws (1)line (16)Lots (1)67:26:88:17:90:644:54:79:48:2layout (4)20:19:21:73:7,10loupe (3)88:91:62:01:2259:66:07:24:61:2lav:11line (16)line (16)lower (4)77:11:78:7,10lise (19)lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)77:11:78:7,10lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)77:11:78:7,10lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)77:11:78:7,10lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)77:11:78:7,10lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)lise (12)77:11:78:7,10lise (12)$	-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
	17.13 29.15 48.11				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
knew (s) 94/14 116.5.8.18 117.4 72:10 73.22 77:13 2617.22 91:01 1144 launch (l) launch (l) </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			-		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	<i>,</i>				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
78:17 79:2,6,8,9,15 legal (14) 16:20 17:4,20 lung (1) 94:13,19,24 95:4,8 79:16 80:21 81:7 45:14,22 105:8 122:15,17,20,23 39:21 McDonald's (1) 86:24 89:2,3 90:23 108:11 109:11,21 110:17,21 111:3 9:16 10:5 45:10 McDonald's (1) 96:19 97:7,7 100:15 112:3,8,19,20 114:1 legitimate (1) 73:23 magnification (1) 73:23 105:10,13 106:6.7,8 100:1 113:19 114:20 litterally (1) 25:21 maintenance (6) 32:15 34:8,14 35:4 111:11 114:2,4,5,7 115:16 121:8 115:18 11 24:23 30:3 42:17 54:22 57:5 50:18 128:6 41:18,25 42:1 44:2 118:17 120:18 8:19 18:11 27:16 62:12 68:10 73:8,18 major (1) 35:4 36:3,8 38:3 131:15,18 kets (17) 64:22 70:10 83:12 118:20 making (6) 90:21 91:4,13 93:15 9:25 112:11 11:3 118:3 125:1 131:7 10ecatel (1) 62:21,22 64:11,19 51:1 25:2 55:12 55:14 70:6 75:21 118:17 119:22,25 81:1 locatel (1) 32:19 59:22 100:7 Malk (10) 95:23 128:25 37:17 39:16 42:13 118:17 119:22,25 81:1 locatel (1) 62:21,22	,				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	· · · ·				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				0,00	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				M	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-			magnification (1)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-				
107:16 109:7.8110:1 113:19 114:20little (15)maintenance (6)32:15 34:8,14 35:4111:11 114:2,4,5,7115:16 121:811:5 18:11 24:23 30:347:1,21 48:13,1835:4 36:3,8 38:3114:12 118:3,13,15let's (17)42:17 54:22 57:550:18 128:641:18,25 42:1 44:2129:24 130:5,10,228:19 18:11 27:1662:12 68:10 73:8,18major (1)45:16,17 46:3 76:8131:15,1840:22 49:19 56:1279:20 90:16 111:2018:1876:21 80:25 82:6131:15,1864:22 70:10 83:12118:20making (6)90:21 91:4,13 93:1544:8,14 76:5 86:10100:13 104:2358:7 70:3,5,695:22 100:790:25 112:4 114:3118:17 119:22,2581:1locate (1)58:14,16,20 60:237:17 39:16 42:1349:4133:3locate (1)65:14 70:674:23 75:14 77:549:4133:3location (1)managed (1)82:23 83:18 84:1513:2life (2)79:1812:8 99:5131:6,7,12,16,20,256:2465:6,7long (2)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:218:155 11lock(20)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:2,110:7,11,17 14:8 35:1824:7 35:16 122:2313:20,27:7,12,13 28:213:2lok(20)38:20 78:2324:7 35:16 122:2313:20,27:7,12,13 28:213:2lok(20)38:20 78:2324:7 35:16 122:2332:5 42:2,446:9 54:10 59:2499:2243:15 53:13 57:236:17 97:5,2513:20,27:7,12,13 28:213:2likelihood (2)38:20 78:2324:7 35					
111:11114:2,4,5,7115:16121:8115:18:1124:2330:347:1,2148:13,1835:435:436:3,838:3114:12118:3,13,15let's (17)8:1911:518:1124:2330:347:1,2148:13,1835:435:135:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:435:135:435:435:135:435:135:435:135:435:1115:1115:1111:20118:120:1118:120:1114:131:110:2	-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
118:17 120:18 8:19 18:11 27:16 62:12 68:10 73:8,18 major (1) 45:16,17 46:3 76:8 129:24 130:5,10,22 40:22 49:19 56:12 79:20 90:16 111:20 38:18 76:21 80:25 82:6 131:15,18 40:22 70:10 83:12 118:20 118:20 18:10 29:20 41:3 59:19 71:1 95:25 128:25 44:8,14 76:5 86:10 100:13 104:23 58:7 70:3,5,6 95:22 100:7 95:25 128:25 95:15 115:19 117:4 118:3 125:1 131:7 locate (1) 75:21 58:14,16,20 60:2 37:17 39:16 42:13 118:17 119:22,25 81:1 located (1) 62:21,22 64:11,19 52:3,5 73:1,13 74:2 known (1) License (1) 32:19 65:14 70:6 74:23 75:14 77:5 49:4 133:3 location (1) 82:23 83:18 84:15 82:23 83:18 84:15 133:2 life (2) 79:18 12:8 99:5 131:6,7,12,16,20,25 13beling (1) likelihood (2) 38:20 78:23 24:1 36:1,7 97:5,25 131:6,7,12,16,20,25 37:22 54:18 55:1 look (20) 38:20 78:23 24:7 35:16 122:23 46:9 54:10 59:24 92:3 99:22 43:15 53:13 57:2 mark (1) 61:1 62:3,18					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
131:15,18 64:22 70:10 83:12 118:20 making (6) 90:21 91:4,13 93:15 44:8,14 76:5 86:10 90:25 112:4 114:3 100:13 104:23 58:7 70:3,5,6 95:22 100:7 MDIs (31) 90:25 112:4 114:3 118:3 125:1 131:7 locate (1) 95:22 100:7 MDIs (31) 115:19 117:4 leverage (1) 75:21 58:14,16,20 60:2 37:17 39:16 42:13 118:17 119:22,25 81:1 located (1) 62:21,22 64:11,19 52:3,5 73:1,13 74:2 known (1) License (1) 32:19 65:14 70:6 74:23 75:14 77:5 49:4 133:3 location (1) manner (2) 96:22 97:2 128:23 133:2 long (1) 64:5 54:21 86:16 93:8 94:9,22 133:2 long (1) manner (2) 96:22 97:2 128:23 131:6,7,12,16,20,25 6:24 65:6,7 longer (2) 38:20 78:23 12:8 99:5 131:6,7,12,13 28:2 13:20 1ikelihood (2) 38:20 78:23 24:1 36:1,7 97:5,25 Mach (3) 28:5 32:5 42:2,4 10:7,11,17 14:8 35:18 10:7,11,17 14:8 35:18 24:7 35:16 122:23 46:9 54:10 59:24 92:3 99:22 43:15 53:13 57:					
knowledge (12)85:3 91:25 95:17living (4)29:20 41:3 59:19 71:195:25 128:2544:8,14 76:5 86:10100:13 104:2358:7 70:3,5,695:22 100:7MDIs (31)90:25 112:4 114:3118:3 125:1 131:7locate (1)58:14,16,20 60:237:17 39:16 42:13115:19 117:4leverage (1)75:2158:14,16,20 60:237:17 39:16 42:13118:17 119:22,2581:1located (1)62:21,22 64:11,1952:3,5 73:1,13 74:249:4133:3location (1)82:23 83:18 84:15133:2long (1)54:554:2186:16 93:8 94:9,22133:2long (1)12:8 99:5131:6,7,12,16,20,256:2465:6,7longer (2)38:20 78:2312:8 99:5131:6,7,12,16,20,25labeling (1)s5:11look (20)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:20 27:7,12,13 28:237:2254:18 55:1look (20)10:7,11,17 14:8 35:1824:7 35:16 122:2328:5 32:5 42:2,446:9 54:10 59:2499:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					· · ·
90:25 112:4 114:3 115:19 117:4 118:17 119:22,25118:3 125:1 131:7 leverage (1)locate (1) 75:21male (10) 58:14,16,20 60:2 62:21,22 64:11,1915:12 24:1,10 34:25 37:17 39:16 42:13known (1) 49:4License (1) 133:3Jocated (1) 32:1958:14,16,20 60:2 65:14 70:615:12 24:1,10 34:25 37:17 39:16 42:13LLicense (1) 133:3Jocated (1) 32:1958:14,16,20 60:2 64:537:17 39:16 42:13 52:3,5 73:1,13 74:2LLicense (1) 133:2Jocation (1) 64:564:5managed (1) 54:2154:21 96:22 97:2 128:23LIdeling (1) 37:22Ikelihood (2) 54:18 55:1Maner (2) 10:7,11,17 14:8 35:18manufacturers (5) 24:1 36:1,7 97:5,25mean (22) 13:20 27:7,12,13 28:2Jabeling (1) 37:22Ikewise (1) 99:2210:7,11,17 14:8 35:18 43:15 53:13 57:2mank (1)15:12 24:1,10 34:25 37:17 39:16 42:13			0 ()	95:22 100:7	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	· · ·				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
known (1)License (1)32:1965:14 70:674:23 75:14 77:549:4133:3location (1)64:5managed (1)82:23 83:18 84:15L133:2long (1)54:2186:16 93:8 94:9,22133:2long (1)79:1812:8 99:5131:6,7,12,16,20,25labeling (1)likelihood (2)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,25manufacturers (5)37:2254:18 55:1look (20)10:7,11,17 14:8 35:1824:7 35:16 122:2313:20 27:7,12,13 28:292:399:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12					
49:4 133:3 location (1) managed (1) 82:23 83:18 84:15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Llicensed (1)64:554:2186:16 93:8 94:9,22133:2133:2long (1)manner (2)96:22 97:2 128:231abeled (1)life (2)79:1812:8 99:5131:6,7,12,16,20,256:2465:6,7longer (2)manufacturers (5)mean (22)labeling (1)likelihood (2)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:20 27:7,12,13 28:237:2254:18 55:1look (20)March (3)28:5 32:5 42:2,4lack (1)99:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12					
L133:2long (1)manner (2)96:22 97:2 128:23labeled (1)life (2)79:1812:8 99:5131:6,7,12,16,20,256:2465:6,7longer (2)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:20 27:7,12,13 28:2labeling (1)stile the state (1)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:20 27:7,12,13 28:237:2254:18 55:1look (20)March (3)28:5 32:5 42:2,4lack (1)99:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12					
labeled (1)life (2)79:1812:8 99:5131:6,7,12,16,20,256:2465:6,7longer (2)manufacturers (5)mean (22)labeling (1)likelihood (2)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:20 27:7,12,13 28:237:2254:18 55:1look (20)March (3)28:5 32:5 42:2,4lack (1)likewise (1)10:7,11,17 14:8 35:1824:7 35:16 122:2346:9 54:10 59:2492:399:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12	L			manner (2)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
6:2465:6,7longer (2)manufacturers (5)mean (22)labeling (1)likelihood (2)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:20 27:7,12,13 28:237:2254:18 55:1look (20)March (3)28:5 32:5 42:2,4lack (1)99:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12	labeled (1)	life (2)			131:6,7,12,16,20,25
labeling (1)likelihood (2)38:20 78:2324:1 36:1,7 97:5,2513:20 27:7,12,13 28:237:2254:18 55:1look (20)March (3)28:5 32:5 42:2,4lack (1)99:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12				manufacturers (5)	
37:2254:18 55:1look (20)March (3)28:5 32:5 42:2,4lack (1)likewise (1)10:7,11,17 14:8 35:1824:7 35:16 122:2346:9 54:10 59:2492:399:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12		likelihood (2)			
lack (1)likewise (1)10:7,11,17 14:8 35:1824:7 35:16 122:2346:9 54:10 59:2492:399:2243:15 53:13 57:2mark (1)61:1 62:3,18 65:12				March (3)	
92:3 99:22 43:15 53:13 57:2 mark (1) 61:1 62:3,18 65:12					
				mark (1)	
		limit (16)			<i>c</i>
	0 0 ()			l	,

	1	1	1	
117:21 122:9,12	59:7	58:8 79:25 80:15	name (2)	number (14)
meaning (4)	minimize (2)	81:20	44:17 134:2	13:8 14:5 15:11 32:14
27:3 89:3 117:25	50:10 127:24	multicavity (2)	named (1)	44:17 79:9 96:19
123:10	minor (1)	48:14 49:14	133:10	102:5 106:6 113:15
means (5)	38:17	multimillion-dollar	nature (2)	116:15 117:5
32:3 45:7 61:13	minutes (3)	49:15	98:2 101:16	119:22 131:5
117:23 122:14	56:17 77:24 129:25	49.15 Murray (156)	nebulizer (11)	
		3:23 5:5 10:8,20 11:1		numerous (3) 119:24 120:15 121:8
meant (1) 61:15	mischaracterizatio 82:9		57:5,7,9,12,14 62:7	119.24 120.13 121.8
		11:22 12:4,12,19	66:10 69:9,17,24	0
measure (2)	missed (1)	13:1,19 14:4,15,23	129:10	
63:17 78:6	56:19	15:9,18,23 16:7,13	nebulizers (7)	object (11)
measured (3)	Misstates (3)	16:22 17:6,22 18:8	63:20,22,24 130:16	17:6 45:13 77:19 92:2
51:12,18 89:7	10:8 21:16 26:5	18:17 19:3,23 21:8	130:18,19,25	105:22 108:20
measurements (4)	mitigate (6)	21:16 23:9 24:19	necessarily (14)	110:12 123:17
77:13,14,15 78:3	18:19 19:11 50:5,13	25:2 26:5,20 27:21	23:4 25:5 27:12 37:20	124:9 126:14 127:1
measuring (1)	127:19 128:1	29:6 30:12 32:18	39:14 52:19,21	objection (139)
77:10	model (1)	33:25 34:11 35:2	54:20 59:8,10 63:10	10:8,20 11:22 12:4,12
mechanical (1)	31:15	36:10 38:6 41:5	70:22 97:14,24	12:19 13:1,6,7,19
68:3	modified (1)	42:23 45:13,19 46:4	necessary (3)	14:4,15,23 15:9,18
mechanism (4)	129:2	46:16 50:21 51:22	13:13 29:23 95:15	15:23 16:7,13,22
95:14,20 96:10,13	Modify (1)	53:6 55:6 58:10	necessitate (1)	17:22 18:8,17 19:3
Mechanisms (1)	41:9	60:5 61:25 62:10	97:14	19:23 21:8,16 23:9
5:12	mold (5)	63:3,14 64:3,16	need (9)	24:19 25:2 26:5,8
medical (8)	48:11 50:2,7 105:12	65:16 66:1,12 68:18	38:18 48:16 53:21	26:20 27:21 29:6
14:5 15:11 37:5 55:25	127:19	69:10,15 71:6,11,18	61:8 63:11 90:2	30:12 32:18 33:25
56:2,14 72:7 79:16	molded (6)	72:3 74:25 76:11,24	101:2 118:13,15	34:11 35:2 36:10
meet (1)	103:19 104:11,18,25	77:7,19 78:9 79:14	needed (3)	38:6 41:5 42:23
45:9	105:4,10	80:18 82:15 83:1,16	10:17 11:8 60:16	45:19 46:4,16 51:22
meeting (2)	molding (5)	83:24 84:9,21 85:14	never (12)	53:6 55:6 58:10
38:20 46:7	5:18 18:12 20:10 48:8	87:4,24 88:25 89:16	30:17,23,24 31:7 43:1	60:5 61:25 62:10
member (1)	49:1	89:24 90:13,22 92:1	67:21,22 111:16	63:3,14 64:3,16
102:3	moment (12)	93:11 94:12 96:1,15	116:15 129:18,19	65:16 66:1,12 68:18
members (4)	8:22 13:3 40:22 43:15	99:11,16 100:1,12	130:9	69:10,15 71:6,11,18
104:18 121:14,15,20	66:21 67:1 72:18	101:4 102:17 103:5	nicotine (7)	72:3 74:25 76:11,24
memory (3)	100:20 121:4,21,22	103:21 105:7,22	31:12,16,19 32:9,17	77:7 78:9 79:14
9:24 11:12,17	122:8	107:11,23 108:8,20	33:1,22	80:18 82:15 83:1,16
mentioned (1)	Monaghan (2)	109:4,20 110:2,12	nods (1)	83:24 84:9,21 85:14
30:5	57:6 129:10	110:22 111:6,14	116:20	87:4,24 88:25 89:16
Merck (4)	morning (2)	112:1,13 113:1,12	nonresponsive (1)	89:24 90:13,22
1:4,4 4:11 6:8	6:21,22	113:20 114:10,21	30:1	93:11 94:12 96:1,15
met (1)	Morris (3)	115:17 116:6 117:2	nonsimple (2)	99:11,16 100:1,12
6:20	3:5 6:12,12	117:18 118:8 119:6	53:20 54:9	101:4 102:17 103:5
metered (1)	motivated (1)	119:19 120:13,25	nonzero (11)	103:21 105:7
32:10	128:15	121:25 123:12,17	47:11,13 48:3,4,10,19	107:11,23 108:8,20
metered-dose (6)	motivation (3)	123:22 124:9,20	48:20 49:13 50:17	109:4,20 110:2,22
32:8,11 33:2 36:1	47:7,14 53:24	125:10 126:3,13,17	52:17 128:5	111:6,14 112:1,13
40:12 44:11	mouthpiece (1)	127:1,12,15 128:20	normal (3)	113:1,12,20 114:10
metric (1)	25:20	129:9,12,22 130:11	80:8,10 81:25	114:21 115:17
51:17	move (3)	130:21 131:2 132:3	North (1)	116:6 117:2,18
MILLER (1)	30:2 33:17 90:10	132:6	3:4	118:8 119:6,19
3:3	moved (1)	myriad (1)	Notary (1)	120:13,25 123:12
millions (1)	99:6	39:22	134:25	123:22 124:10,17
48:15	movement (5)		notion (2)	126:3,13 128:17
mind (4)	59:15 75:17,18 80:24	<u> </u>	53:23 96:3	129:20 130:8,21
40:15 75:1 79:21 97:1	121:18	N (3)	null (1)	131:2 132:3
minds (1)	moving (4)	3:1 4:1 5:1	133:14	objections (3)
	l	l	I	I

				- 2 -
13:5,8,11	ones (7)	1:8 3:21 4:2	parts (20)	3:16
observed (1)	29:3 31:2 41:11 47:2	Owner's (4)	15:2 25:23 55:17 60:9	perform (20)
102:2	47:22 83:21 84:2	5:16,20,23 9:10	60:14,15,22 61:11	28:2 30:14 46:25
obtain (3)	open-ended (1)		61:22,23 63:1 66:15	47:20 48:5 49:6,21
73:5 76:21 77:1	45:7	P	67:17 68:4,5 71:1	50:3 52:10 63:17
obtaining (1)	openings (2)	P (4)	76:1,19 96:17	75:23 76:19 78:2,15
76:8	18:21 39:24	3:1,1 4:1,1	106:22	78:18,24 87:5,12
obviously (5)	operate (3)	p.m (9)	pass (1)	89:19 90:3
34:15 39:7 64:4 68:4	101:2 102:16 103:3	2:12 6:2 92:6,6 93:2,2	129:9	performed (8)
121:17	opine (1)	125:2,2 132:8	patent (60)	28:8 29:2,7 30:5,8,19
occur (2)	103:24	page (22)	1:1,2,6,8 3:21 4:2 5:8	30:24,25
21:11 128:19	opinion (23)	5:3,7 7:19,21 9:15	5:10,16,20,21,23,24	performing (2)
offer (1)	18:18 19:6 29:16 41:2	10:5 20:12,13 22:12	9:10 13:4,12 26:11	76:4 78:23
109:6	47:5 50:13,14 52:15	25:13 35:19 74:10	28:19 40:8,12,15,16	period (8)
offered (1)	52:17,23 53:19,22	75:2,5 88:7 95:18	40:17,18 41:1,3,7	32:12 73:6,16,20
109:7	73:3,15,17 76:4,14	111:12 113:15	41:12,16,21,24	75:22 76:3,8 84:18
offering (1)	81:8 82:10 86:3	116:8,17 123:6	42:10,21 43:2,9,13	perjury (1)
114:15	96:2 128:2,3	125:18	43:16 44:1,16 45:6	125:20
office (8)	opinions (8)	pages (21)	45:20 51:21 78:18	permanently (1)
1:1 13:4,12 26:11	14:12,21 15:16 19:17	108:19 109:2,7,10	84:20 85:13 98:8,10	105:13
82:24 83:13 84:17	27:24 85:11 114:15	112:5 113:4 114:9	98:13,19 99:13,15	permissible (1)
89:23	115:8	114:20,24 115:11	99:24 100:2,11,13	13:5
oh (6)	opportunity (1)	115:15 116:15	100:18 101:2 103:4	permitted (6)
10:24 57:19 102:23	100:22	117:1,5,9,17 118:7	103:25 121:24	107:21 108:2,6,12,17
122:1 126:17	opposed (2)	118:23 119:5,18,22	patentability (1)	107.21 108.2,0,12,17
129:21	37:10 67:16	paper (1)	104:13	person (2)
okay (81)	optimization (1)	118:2	patents (4)	118:13,14
7:11 8:1,19,23 9:4,14	31:14	paragraph (8)	8:15,16 24:13 44:17	petition (8)
10:24 18:12 19:13	optimize (8)	9:15 20:25 35:22	path (58)	5:20,23 9:11 10:4
19:18 21:4,5 22:7	27:4,7,9,11,13 28:1,5	95:18,22 122:9,15	18:22 23:3,6 24:18	50:8 127:21 128:10
23:14 25:15 29:18	28:6	125:12	25:1,18,25 26:4,15	128:14
30:7 40:23,25 41:6	optimized (4)	parcel (1)	26:18 27:4,6,18,20	petitioner (1)
43:7,19 44:13 47:19	33:21,23 129:1,7	86:23	27:23 28:10 29:5,15	19:7
51:1 56:21 58:1,2,5	option (1)	part (35)	30:10,21 33:22,23	petitioners (36)
58:18 62:17 63:11	77:3	5:18 11:12 16:25 20:9	34:9,10,19,20,21	1:5 3:2 5:16 6:13,15
66:4,10 69:4,20	options (1)	20:17 21:11 23:2	35:1,7 36:15,16,20	12:9,17 21:15,22,24
70:2,5 72:14,19	103:13	27:17 29:16 40:16	37:14 38:2,4,22,25	22:9,13,17,25 28:9
73:8,23 74:20 75:8	oral (2)	40:16 44:4,7 57:22	39:7,16,17,18,20,25	29:3 46:13 47:3,6
79:21 81:14,16,18	25:11 36:2	62:22,22,22,25	40:6,9,19 41:2,4,8	47:23 49:8,23 51:21
85:8 86:15 87:10	order (8)	64:10,11,12,13	41:13,23 42:22	52:12 96:7 104:14
91:25 98:6 101:25	19:11 27:3 29:10 38:5	67:20 69:7,8,13	43:21,25 44:8 65:1	104:24 106:9,18
102:10 103:17	63:11 100:14	73:9 77:20,23 86:22	128:16 129:6	107:6,13,13 120:10
104:14,22,23,23	102:16 103:3	104:21 105:9,11,12	paths (1)	128:9,12,13
105:17 108:16	original (1)	105:14	29:10	Pg (1)
110:7 112:9,21	133:13	Partes (4)	patient (10)	134:5
113:7 114:2,3	originally (1)	5:21,24 9:11 10:5	65:2,9,18 93:9 94:6	Philadelphia (1)
116:16,21,24	78:24	particular (15)	94:10,19,25 95:4,9	3:16
118:18,24 119:12	outcome (1)	27:11 32:7 39:10	patient's (1)	phone (1)
120:6 122:15 125:9	133:11	41:25 48:11 57:8	94:15	6:5
127:12 129:9	outside (7)	62:6 64:18 65:18,21	patient-related (1)	physical (8)
130:11 131:19	15:14 103:21 104:1	66:22 71:3 73:5	90:15	12:22 13:15 14:14,22
once (5)	112:3 120:25	96:17 97:8	pen (3)	15:15 30:17 54:4
29:18 38:15 59:17	126:14 127:2	particularly (2)	95:19 104:18,19	96:16
61:16 119:12	overcome (2)	13:9 48:14	penalty (1)	physics (2)
one-and-done (6)	77:11 78:7	parties (4)	125:20	79:20 81:16
61:2,6,13,20 62:8,18	Owner (3)	12:2 113:4,14 133:9	Pennsylvania (1)	picked (1)
	l			I

· ·				2
14:8	120:8,10	63:16 79:15 87:13	proximal (4)	83:12 85:4,5,6,17
piece (2)	possess (1)	90:11 91:6 96:10	23:3,6 32:19,20	85:18,20 86:7 88:6
57:25 58:6	59:15	120:16 128:22,22	proximity (1)	88:8,19,20 97:1,18
	possible (7)		65:1	
Piper's (2) 12:15 120:11		problem (3)		101:20 102:20
	14:9 45:24 52:25 53:1	34:20 106:21,24	Public (1)	104:4 107:4,20
place (7)	53:11 78:19,20	problematic (1)	134:25	108:24 109:23
58:9,22 61:8 66:8	possibly (1)	52:24	publication (1)	110:7,8,21 111:18
102:15 103:2	103:13	proceed (2)	13:24	111:19,21 112:20
115:13	potential (1)	26:11 121:6	pull (3)	114:6 117:10,12
placed (1)	50:6	proceeding (1)	8:19,21 59:20	118:24 119:11,13
117:5	potentially (2)	133:10	pulled (2)	123:23 124:11
placing (2)	80:12 101:6	proceedings (2)	33:6 38:19	questioning (4)
61:8 66:7	pounds (1)	132:8 133:7	pulls (1)	17:10 101:6 118:20
plastic (26)	51:14	process (11)	20:20	121:22
5:18 20:9 48:8 51:8	practice (4)	18:4 27:16 36:7 69:7	pure (1)	questions (6)
51:12,19 52:5,11	42:10,16 43:2 100:15	75:7 105:17 106:1,8	96:18	19:17 20:15 103:23
53:4,18 54:11 55:4	precisely (1)	115:10,25 120:19	purpose (1)	113:6 130:11 132:5
60:13,21 61:10,23	70:11	produced (3)	19:18	quick (5)
63:1,7,12 64:1,14	present (3)	48:15 72:13 128:24	purposes (6)	23:16 50:20 91:25
65:13 67:15,24	4:8 15:15 99:2	producer (1)	40:25 69:20 75:20	129:25 130:13
68:17 69:6	presented (3)	71:22	89:10,10 90:20	quickly (1)
play (2)	31:25 98:19 104:12	product (10)	pursuant (1)	59:18
71:16 80:22	press (2)	33:17 36:4 37:4,16	42:20	quite (2)
plays (1)	70:20,21	42:7 45:9 65:7 69:6	push (1)	79:17 96:5
73:17	pressure (1)	69:11 72:1	58:8	79.17 90.5
please (5)	102:2	products (3)	put (8)	R
26:9 73:24 75:4 85:15	presume (3)	5:13 56:21 71:9	23:13 33:16,18 60:16	$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}(2)}$
85:20	28:14 79:21 94:1	project (6)	68:4 80:23 81:1	K (2) 3:1 4:1
	presumption (4)	33:10,11 34:10,13,14	114:16	
plop (1) 95:25	41:15 42:11,11 43:3	34:22	putting (3)	ramping (1) 70:17
	pretty (6)	proper (11)	16:16 17:25 68:5	
plunger (2) 120:23 124:7	8:16 9:25 10:1 47:17	29:10 40:19 41:4,12	10.10 17.25 08.5	ramps (5) 59:15,16 66:19 67:3,5
point (37)	56:2 90:16	41:22 42:21 53:9	0	
15:1 29:20 33:6 37:1	previous (7)	54:14 82:11 90:2	qualification (1)	range (1) 93:16
	10:9 26:5 55:9 56:16	130:4	107:3	
39:20 51:8,12,19	73:3 110:16 125:13		qualified (1)	rare (1) 120:18
52:5,12 53:4,18		properly (2)	108:13	
54:11 55:4 60:4,13	previously (3)	26:12 42:15		RDR (3)
60:22 61:10,15,24	47:25 60:15 62:3	proposal (1)	qualifier (1)	1:24 2:13 133:18
63:2,7,12 64:14	prior (37)	22:20	112:7	re-optimize (1)
65:13 67:15,25	8:9,13,21 9:21 10:2	propose (1)	qualify (1)	26:18
68:17 69:6 70:25	10:17 11:8,19 12:10	105:3	36:24	reaching (7)
98:24 104:7 113:7	12:17,23 13:8,14,16	proposed (14)	quantity (2)	72:24 73:11,25 74:21
113:23 115:13	14:2 103:18 104:16	21:22 28:9,15,18 29:3	32:8 37:18	75:12 77:16 78:4
119:1,14	106:23 115:10,12	46:13 47:3 48:12	question (80)	read (14)
portion (10)	115:13 116:3,11	49:8,23 51:20 53:16	11:5 13:14 17:7,12,17	10:13 20:14,25 43:17
39:19 60:2,3 64:20	117:15 118:1,4	128:10,13	18:24 19:13,19,20	67:2 75:1,5 88:5
65:14,15 69:23 70:2	119:1,14 122:16	proposing (2)	20:1 21:5 22:16	89:1 95:17 99:1
70:6,7	125:6 128:24	42:25 47:6	24:24 25:16,18	101:25 106:9 134:5
portions (1)	129:13 130:16,19	prototype (1)	26:13 29:19,21 30:2	reading (3)
	131:1,20,25	55:19	30:7 31:23,24 39:10	40:15 41:3 75:7
99:5			40:25 42:25 45:14	Deads (1)
pose (1)	privilege (1)	prove (1)		Reads (1)
pose (1) 65:9	105:23	52:19	45:22 47:16,19	134:5
pose (1)	105:23 privileged (2)	52:19 provide (1)	45:22 47:16,19 49:19 52:14 53:7	134:5 real (1)
pose (1) 65:9	105:23 privileged (2) 10:22 118:8	52:19 provide (1) 71:12	45:22 47:16,19 49:19 52:14 53:7 55:8 64:18 73:10,23	134:5
pose (1) 65:9 position (7)	105:23 privileged (2) 10:22 118:8 probably (13)	52:19 provide (1) 71:12 provides (1)	45:22 47:16,19 49:19 52:14 53:7 55:8 64:18 73:10,23 73:24 74:12,20 75:8	134:5 real (1) 23:16 really (12)
pose (1) 65:9 position (7) 72:20 102:6,14 103:1	105:23 privileged (2) 10:22 118:8	52:19 provide (1) 71:12	45:22 47:16,19 49:19 52:14 53:7 55:8 64:18 73:10,23	134:5 real (1) 23:16

5412.34 558.89:5 103:19 relia (1) 93.9 94:10 result (1) 61:17 819 10:7 222.2 519.412 46:7 rely (1) 72.12 72.2 72.21 relia (1) 73:6 95.23 96.23.24 rely (1) 75.13.24 77.11.25 result (1) rely (1) 75.13.24 77.11.25 result (1) rely (1) 75.13.24 77.11.25 relia (2) relia (1)		1	1	1	_
61:17 81:9 110:7referring (13)108:13required (28)col 14 1/28:15129:2422:25:19.4312.44rely (1)72:25 7312 74:12result (1)73:695:23 96:23.24rewing (1)73:53.24 77.11.25result (1)72:85 7312 74:1295:23 96:23.24remember (5)82:17 84.23 85:7reset(2)24:24 73:10,23 97:19126:20remember (5)82:17 84.23 85:7reset(2)108:12 17.7refine (1)refine (1)removed (1)94:2337:15.21128:25 1345115:766.4requirement (6)73:24128:22 1345115:766.4requirement (6)73:24128:22 1345129:252:15 133:1393:20 95:8refurspective (1)124:24 52:8 81:9129:252:15 133:1393:20 95:8refurspective (1)124:22 8:1911:12.1662:4 74:20 75:10requirement (6)79:910:12 11:12 13:2585:1614:16,18 17:18 19:1916:17 32:25 61:1813:12 60:611:8:2177:2220:1979:22 70:1010:23.10:13,15.2512:5271:1079:22 72:10requirement (6)return (6)13:22 0:1regules (7)79:23.17 50:22 92:6regulatory (1)replate (1)7:3372:272:1079:2210:24.6result (1)7:2270:1029:2210:24.6result (1)7:3272:2571:1079:2210:24.677:1413:5271:1079:2270:1477:1477:37:33 <t< td=""><td>54:13,24 55:8 59:5</td><td>103:19</td><td>relied (1)</td><td>93:9 94:10</td><td>resulted (3)</td></t<>	54:13,24 55:8 59:5	103:19	relied (1)	93:9 94:10	resulted (3)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					-
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{rease} (4) & 105.19 125.11 & 78.16 & 78.625 79.4.12 & 87.7 & 78.7 & 78.16 & 78.625 79.4.12 & 87.7 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.72 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 38.1 & 78.612 87.3 89.7,14 & 37.7 & 78.11 & 77.612 87.8 81.12 97.7 & 76.12 87.8 81.12 97.7 & 76.12 78.2 81.18 & 13.12 60.6 & returns (6) & 76.12 78.2 81.18 & 13.12 60.6 & returns (1) & 76.12 78.2 81.18 & 13.12 60.6 & returns (1) & 77.9 23.17 50.22 92.6 & 71.10 & 29.22 & 72.1 102.19 & 36.9 & returns (1) & 79.23.17 50.22 92.6 & 71.10 & 29.22 & 72.1 102.19 & 36.9 & returns (1) & 77.4 & 72.2 & 71.10 & 79.25 80.14 81.19 & repacting (1) & 72.2 & 71.10 & 79.25 80.14 81.19 & repacting (1) & 77.7 & 73.3 & 77.7 & 72.2 & 72.1 02.19 & 75.16 21.28 & 34.3,4 & 75.5 16 121.8 & 34.3,4 & 75.5 16 121.8 & 34.3,4 & 75.5 16 121.8 & 34.3,4 & 75.5 16 121.8 & 34.3,4 & 75.5 16 122.8 & 77.8 & $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{reasons (7)} & \mbox{refers (2)} \\ 14:12,2027:12 \\ 14:12,222:13:45 \\ 108:12:117:7 \\ 128:25:13:45 \\ 128:25:13:45 \\ 128:25:13:45 \\ 128:25:13:45 \\ 128:25:13:45 \\ 128:25:13:45 \\ 129:25 \\ 128:25:13:45 \\ 129:21 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:129:14 \\ 129:124 \\ 121:15 \\ 110:21 \\ 129:22 \\ 129:25 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:110:1 \\ 129:124 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:14 \\ 129:110:1 \\ 129:124 \\ 129$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			-		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
receive (1)regardless (7)76:12 78:2 81:18 $13:12 60:6'$ returns (1)118:2137:21 60:1 61:6 67:2583:2 97:1 102:19requiring (1)102:47:92:58:14 81:19114:636:9reusable (1)102:47:92:58:14 81:19114:6reservoir (2)32:127:52:671:1029:22102:4,6revaildate (1)recommendation (1)reject (1)replaced (1)resized (1)37:77:372:220:1996:6reverification (1)7:52:672:1629:22resources (2)37:4recommendation (2)relate (1)replicates (2)resources (2)52:1,24 7:24 8:8 9:1135:20,2556:1851:61:29:17 21:1518:19 64:10 67:1810:44,51:18 12:9,1527:22:769:18 55:23 103:2512:22 13:15,2312:22 13:15,237:23:796:516:17,21/24 17:1118:16 41:10 67:1610:45 11:8 12:9,1527:24:769:18 55:23 103:2515:15 22:1 71:21reviewed (11)11:12:22 13:15,237:25:77:21 66:2512:41:41 22:1312:65:21 28:9,12,14reviewed (11)7:26:77:21 66:52 373:2,14reported (2)resprectful (1)81:13 8:21 9:217:21:9:10:1559:16 68:23 73:2,14reported (3)respond (1)11:61:37:21:9:10:1559:16 68:23 73:2,14reporter (2)respond (1)11:61:37:21:9:11:1510:51:18:1910:3211:61:1311:61:137:22:9:6:10:2699:12:9:19:13:1571:3310:9:910:22:22:					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			20.22		
7.372:2 $20:19$ $96:6$ reverification (1)recommendation (1)relate (2)relate (2)replicates (2) $35:24$ reverification (1) $35:24$ $55:16$ $121:8$ $34:3,4$ resources (2) $37:4$ recommendations (2)related (1) $56:16$ $29:1721:15$ $18:19$ $64:10$ $67:18$ $10:4,5$ $35:20,25$ relates (7) $22:9,13$ $10:41$ $10:77$ $69:185:23$ $10:42$ $10:45$ $11:82.29$ recommended (1)relates (7) $22:9,13$ $10:41$ $10:77$ $69:185:23$ $10:22$ $12:22$ $12:22$ $23:25$ $14:12,20$ $18:72$ $12:72$ $10:10$ $12:10$ $12:22$ $12:15,23$ recomer (2)relating (1)report (12) $11:10$ $11:19$ $12:12.14,118$ $12:25$ $13:3:1$ $12:15$ $10:5:18,19$ $11:25$ $12:22$ $12:14,118$ $12:15$ relative (21) $10:15:18,22$ $10:12:10$ $23:23$ $46:20$ $11:19$ $21:10,16$ $32:24$ $75:15,19$ $11:32$ $12:15:72$ $12:10$ $23:22$ $23:24$ $32:23$ $46:20$ $10:10:15$ $76:13$ $81:10$ $82:18$ $82:17:19$ $13:21$ $12:12,29:12$ $10:41$ $10:4:17,20,20$ $10:12:10$ $10:22$ $10:22$ $10:22$ $10:29:10$ $10:11:19$ $12:22:23:25:29:14:10:10:1110:15relativel (1)10:22:12:13:12:1510:9:10:10:10:1912:22:23:12:8,9:12:10:12:10:13:11:1010$					
recommendation (1)relate (2)replicates (2)resources (2)37:435:2455:16 121:834:3,455:127:18review (16)recommendations (2)related (1)related (1)reply (13)respect (12)35:20,2556:1822:9,13 104:1 107:769:1 85:23 103:2512:22 13:15,2323:2514:12,20 18:7 28:19107:8 120:11,12110:10 121:1015:15 22:1 71:21record (7)64:7,12 66:25124:14 128:13126:22 128:9,12,14reviewed (11)9:6 92:1,2,5 126:10relating (1)report (12)respectful (1)8:13,21 9:21,24 11:11126:25 133:799:516:17,21,24 17:1118:1611:19 21:14,18redirect (2)relative (21)13:21 115:771:3,138:15 86:21 105:2127:13 130:13121:15105:18,19 112:552:12 56:14 57:14reviewing (4)reduced (3)74:3,5,24 75:15,191:23 127:19 133:5109:9Rhoades (25)42:10,16 43:276:13 81:10 82:18Reporter (2)respond (1)116:13reduces (1)83:4,10,19 86:121:14 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)reporter's (2)response (7)95:5 96:14 104:1198:22 104:2371:2371:23reporte (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9110:15release (1)10:69:113:15response (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:2371:23reporte (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9110:15release (1)10:69:113:15 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>20.10</td><td></td><td></td></t<>			20.10		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
recommendations (2) 35:20,25related (1) 5:618reply (13) 5:16 12:9,17 21:15respect (12) 18:19 64:10 67:18 $5:21,24 7:24 8:8 9:11$ 10:4,5 11:8 12:9,15recommended (1) 23:25relates (7) 64:7,12 66:2522:9,13 104:1 107:7 12:11 1210:10 121:10 15:15 22:1 71:2110:4,5 11:8 12:9,15 12:22 13:15,23record (7) 9:6 4:7,12 66:2564:7,12 66:25 124:14 128:13126:22 128:9,12,14 respectful (1)reviewed (1) 8:13,21 9:21,24 11:11 11:8:16redirect (2) reduce (2) reduce (3)relating (1) relative (21)report (12) 10:15:18,19 112:5respiratory (5) 52:12 56:14 57:14 respond (1)23:23 46:20 101:12 11:25reduced (3) 42:10,16 43:276:13 81:10 82:18 76:13 81:10 82:18reported (3) report (2)respond (1) 11:23 127:19 133:5109:9reduction (1) 103:12 refer (7) 11:21105:5,14 reporter (2)respond (1) respond (1)116:13reduction (1) 103:12 refer (7) 11:21105:5,14 reporter (2)reports (2) response (7) respond (1)28:22,24 35:2 55:2 25:2 96:14 104:11 104:17,20,20103:12 refer (7) 110:15 refease (1) 100:51 11:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5 120:14100:10,10:19 120:22,23 12:8,9 120:14124:6,7 121:10,13,16,18,19 120:22,23 12:8,9110:15 reference (7) 102:2relaxes (1) 106:9 113:15 responses (1)124:6,7 124:6,714:19 18:14 20:4 124:6,7110:12 reference (7) 102:2102:2,17 123:4100:9 113:15 120:14response (1) 124:6,7124:6,8 139:58:17 101:22 102:1 referen					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			<i>,</i>		
recommended (1)relates (7)22:9,13 104:1 107:769:1 85:23 103:2512:22 13:15,2323:2514:12,20 18:7 28:19107:8 120:11,12110:10 121:1015:15 22:1 71:21record (7)64:7,12 66:25124:14 128:13126:22 128:9,12,1411:199:6 92:1,2,5 126:10relating (1)99:516:17,21,24 17:1118:1611:19 21:14,18redirect (2)relative (21)19:15,16 50:6respiratory (5)23:23 46:20 101:12reduce (2)relative (21)105:18,19 112:552:12 56:14 57:148:15 86:21 105:240:5 100:1559:16 68:23 73:2,14reported (3)resport (12)respord (1)reduce (3)74:3,5,24 75:15,191:23 127:19 133:5109:9Rhoades (25)42:10,16 43:276:13 81:10 82:18Reporter (2)respondel (1)28:22,24 53:2 55:2reduces (1)83:4,10,19 86:12:14 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)40:24 89:25 90:1response (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23represent (4)55:9rib (1)110:15release (1)40:24 89:25 90:1rest (2)39:5reference (7)102:2reporesented (2)rest (2)39:510:15release (1)40:24 89:25 90:1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1reference (11)66:13 71:19 72:4re					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-				
record (7) $64:7,12\ 66:25$ $124:14\ 128:13$ $126:22\ 128:9,12,14$ reviewed (11) $9:6\ 92:1,2,5\ 126:10$ $relating (1)$ $report (12)$ $respectful (1)$ $8:13,21\ 9:21,24\ 11:11$ $126:25\ 133:7$ $99:5$ $relationship (1)$ $16:17,21,24\ 17:1$ $118:16$ $11:19\ 21:14,18$ $redirect (2)$ $relationship (1)$ $19:15,16\ 50:6$ $23:23\ 46:20\ 101:12$ $23:23\ 46:20\ 101:12$ $127:13\ 130:13$ $121:15$ $105:18,19\ 112:5$ $52:12\ 56:14\ 57:14$ $reviewed (1)$ $reduced (3)$ $74:3,5,24\ 75:15,19$ $12:3\ 127:19\ 133:5$ $109:9$ $Rhoades (25)$ $42:10,16\ 43:2$ $76:13\ 81:10\ 82:18$ $reporter (2)$ $responde (1)$ $28:22,24\ 53:2\ 55:2$ $reduces (1)$ $83:4,10,19\ 86:1$ $2:14\ 133:2$ $127:22$ $72:19\ 95:14,23,24$ $70:25$ $91:22\ 99:6\ 102:6$ $reporter's (2)$ $response (7)$ $95:25\ 96:14\ 104:11$ $reduction (1)$ $105:5,14$ $6:4\ 133:13$ $5:16,20\ 9:10\ 30:4$ $104:17,20,20$ $103:12$ $relatively (1)$ $reports\ (6)$ $109:10\ 110:19$ $120:22,23\ 12:8,9$ $refer (7)$ $71:23$ $represent (4)$ $55:9$ $rib\ (1)$ $98:22\ 104:23$ $71:23$ $represent (4)$ $55:9$ $rib\ (1)$ $110:15$ $release\ (1)$ $40:24\ 89:25\ 90:1$ $rest\ (2)$ $39:5$ $reference\ (7)$ $15:27\ 12:8:18\ 110:7$ $120:9$ $124:6,7$ $8:17\ 101:22\ 102:2$ $71:23$ $represent\ (2)$ $rest\ (2)$ $39:5$ $referenc$					
9:6 92:1,2,5 126:10 126:25 133:7relating (1) 99:5report (12) 16:17,21,24 17:1respectful (1) 118:16 $8:13,21 9:21,24 11:11$ 111:19 21:14,18redirect (2) relative (2)relationship (1) 121:1519:15,16 50:6 105:18,19 112:5respiratory (5) 52:12 56:14 57:14 $23:23 46:20 101:12$ reving (4)40:5 100:15 reduced (3)74:3,5,24 75:15,19 74:3,5,24 75:15,1911:23 127:19 133:5 12:14 13:21respond (1) 12:21 27:19 133:5 $8:15 86:21 105:2$ 109:942:10,16 43:2 reduces (1) 70:2576:13 81:10 82:18 91:22 99:6 102:6Reporter (2) responded (1)responded (1) 28:22,24 53:2 55:2reduction (1) 105:5,14105:5,14 reportes (6)6:4 133:13 13:15 $5:16,20 9:10 30:4$ 109:10 110:19 $104:17,20,20$ 122:29 9:61 4 104:11 104:17,20,20103:12 refer (7) 35:6 56:16 58:3 98:10 110:15release (1) release (1) release (1) $106:9 113:15$ represent (4) $109:10 110:19$ 120:122, 122:1110:15 reference (7) 8:17 101:22 102:1release (1) release (1) $102:2, 55$ right (32) restate (1) $12:16, 77$ right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1 25:6 35:11 43:5 $115:17 117:18$ 115:17 117:18 25:6 35:11 43:5 $115:17 117:18$ request (1) $2:223$ restate (1)77:18:25 20:2 22:5 25:6 35:11 43:5 $115:17 117:18$ 115:17 117:18 115:17 117:18 $16:17$ request (1) $109:12,21 114:23$ 116:18131:6relevant (1) requert (6) $20:20 27:14 30:9,20$ $8:3 32:5 98:11,15$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
redirect (2)relationship (1)19:15,16 50:6respiratory (5)23:23 46:20 101:12127:13 130:13121:15105:18,19 112:552:12 56:14 57:14reviewing (4)reduce (2)relative (21)113:21 115:771:3,138:15 86:21 105:240:5 100:1559:16 68:23 73:2,14reported (3)74:3,5,24 75:15,191:23 127:19 133:5109:9Rhoades (25)reduce (1)76:13 81:10 82:18Reporter (2)responde (1)28:22,24 53:2 55:228:22,24 53:2 55:2reduces (1)83:4,10,19 86:1reporter's (2)response (7)95:25 96:14 104:11reduction (1)105:5,146:4 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)40:24 89:25 90:1responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:23r102:2represent (4)55:9rib (1)110:15releases (1)120:2,11120:2,55right (32)reference (7)102:2represent (2)restate (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1reference (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:771:8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
reduce (2)relative (21)113:21 115:771:3,138:15 86:21 105:240:5 100:1559:16 68:23 73:2,14reported (3)74:3,5,24 75:15,191:23 127:19 133:5109:9116:1342:10,16 43:276:13 81:10 82:18Reporter (2)responde (1)28:22,24 53:2 55:2reduces (1)83:4,10,19 86:12:14 133:2127:2272:19 95:14,23,2470:2591:22 99:6 102:6reporter's (2)response (7)95:25 96:14 104:11reduction (1)105:5,146:4 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23represent (4)55:9rib (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23represent (4)55:9right (32)reference (7)102:2120:9102:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1relevance (14)represented (2)restate (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:771:8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:7request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2225:6:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,2113:16relevant (1) </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
reduced (3)74:3,5,24 75:15,191:23 127:19 133:5109:9Rhoades (25)42:10,16 43:276:13 81:10 82:18Reporter (2)28:22,24 53:2 55:2reduces (1)83:4,10,19 86:12:14 133:2127:2272:19 95:14,23,2470:2591:22 99:6 102:6reporter's (2)response (7)51:6,20 9:10 30:495:25 96:14 104:11103:12relatively (1)6:4 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9110:15release (1)17:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23represent (4)55:9rib (1)110:15release (1)100:9 113:15rest (2)39:5reference (7)102:2represent (2)120:9102:5,5rib (1)110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1reference (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:771: 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2336:15,17 40:20 41:771: 8:25 20:2 19 8:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,2156:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)84:3 92:5 98:11,15					
42:10,16 43:276:13 81:10 82:18Reporter (2)responded (1)28:22,24 53:2 55:2reduces (1)83:4,10,19 86:12:14 133:2responded (1)28:22,24 53:2 55:270:2591:22 99:6 102:62:14 133:2responter's (2)response (7)95:25 96:14 104:11reduction (1)105:5,146:4 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)55:9rib (1)98:22 104:2371:23release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)55:9rib (1)110:15releases (1)40:24 89:25 90:1120:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:116:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:23restet (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:27 46:8 58:11request (2)restiction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:771: 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25result (7)82:8 83:8,13,2156:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17reguire (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
reduces (1)83:4,10,19 86:12:14 133:2127:2272:19 95:14,23,2470:2591:22 99:6 102:6reporter's (2)response (7)95:25 96:14 104:11103:12relatively (1)105:5,146:4 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23represent (4)55:9rib (1)110:15release (1)40:24 89:25 90:1rest (2)39:5reference (7)102:2120:9102:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1relevance (14)represented (2)restate (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
70:2591:22 99:6 102:6reporter's (2)response (7)95:25 96:14 104:11reduction (1)105:5,146:4 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23represent (4)55:9rib (1)110:15releases (1)40:24 89:25 90:1rest (2)39:5reference (7)102:2120:9102:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1relevance (14)represented (2)restate (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
reduction (1)105:5,146:4 133:135:16,20 9:10 30:4104:17,20,20103:12relatively (1)111:21reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1998:22 104:2371:23release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23releases (1)40:24 89:25 90:1102:5,5rib (1)110:15releases (1)102:2120:939:539:5reference (7)102:2120:9102:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:116:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2339:5referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
103:12relatively (1)reports (6)109:10 110:19120:22,23 121:8,9refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23release (1)40:24 89:25 90:1responses (1)124:6,7110:15releases (1)40:24 89:25 90:1rest (2)39:5reference (7)102:2represent (4)rest (2)39:58:17 101:22 102:1relevance (14)represented (2)restate (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
refer (7)111:2117:14,25 18:18 19:5120:14121:10,13,16,18,1935:6 56:16 58:3 98:10release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,798:22 104:2371:23release (1)106:9 113:15responses (1)124:6,7110:15releases (1)40:24 89:25 90:1102:5,5rib (1)8:17 101:22 102:1102:2120:9102:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1relevance (14)120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
35:6 56:16 58:3 98:10 98:22 104:23release (1) 71:23106:9 113:15 represent (4)responses (1) 55:9124:6,7 rib (1)110:15 reference (7)71:23 102:240:24 89:25 90:1 102:255:9 rest (2)39:5 right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1 110:21 123:2,20,24relevance (14) 16:22 46:8 58:11 66:13 71:19 72:4represented (2) request (2)restate (1) 22:2314:19 18:14 20:4 22:237:1 8:25 20:2 22:5 25:6 35:11 43:592:4 110:13 111:7 115:17 117:186:4 29:25 request (1)109:12,21 114:23 16:1743:13 46:22 50:19 51:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4 131:6119:6,19 120:13 requert (1)16:17 require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
98:22 104:2371:23represent (4)55:9rib (1)110:15releases (1)40:24 89:25 90:139:5reference (7)102:2120:9102:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1relevance (14)represented (2)restate (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15			,		
110:15 reference (7)releases (1) 102:240:24 89:25 90:1 120:9rest (2) 102:5,539:58:17 101:22 102:1 110:21 123:2,20,24relevance (14) 16:22 46:8 58:11represented (2) 120:8,11restate (1) 22:2314:19 18:14 20:4 22:23referenced (11) 7:1 8:25 20:2 22:566:13 71:19 72:4 92:4 110:13 111:7request (2) 6:4 29:25restriction (4) 109:12,21 114:2336:15,17 40:20 41:7 43:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5 56:24 61:21 98:4115:17 117:18 115:17 117:18request (1) 16:17116:8 result (7) 20:20 27:14 30:9,2051:8 70:14 72:22 84:3 92:5 98:11,15					,
reference (7)102:2120:9102:5,5right (32)8:17 101:22 102:1relevance (14)represented (2)restate (1)14:19 18:14 20:4110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18request (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15			L ()		
8:17 101:22 102:1 110:21 123:2,20,24relevance (14) 16:22 46:8 58:11represented (2) 120:8,11restate (1) 22:2314:19 18:14 20:4 28:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11) 7:1 8:25 20:2 22:566:13 71:19 72:4 92:4 110:13 111:7request (2) 6:4 29:25restriction (4) 109:12,21 114:2336:15,17 40:20 41:7 43:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5 56:24 61:21 98:4 131:6115:17 117:18 119:6,19 120:13request (1) 16:17116:8 result (7) 20:20 27:14 30:9,2051:8 70:14 72:22 84:3 92:5 98:11,15					
110:21 123:2,20,2416:22 46:8 58:11120:8,1122:2328:22 34:4 35:1referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18requests (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15				-	
referenced (11)66:13 71:19 72:4request (2)restriction (4)36:15,17 40:20 41:77:1 8:25 20:2 22:592:4 110:13 111:76:4 29:25109:12,21 114:2343:13 46:22 50:1925:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18requests (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
7:1 8:25 20:2 22:5 25:6 35:11 43:592:4 110:13 111:7 115:17 117:186:4 29:25 requests (1)109:12,21 114:23 116:843:13 46:22 50:19 51:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4 131:6119:6,19 120:13 relevant (1)16:17 require (6)109:12,21 114:23 116:843:13 46:22 50:19 51:8 70:14 72:2220:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15			-		
25:6 35:11 43:5 56:24 61:21 98:4115:17 117:18 119:6,19 120:13requests (1) 16:17 require (6)116:8 result (7)51:8 70:14 72:22 82:8 83:8,13,21 20:20 27:14 30:9,20				restriction (4)	36:15,17 40:20 41:7
25:6 35:11 43:5115:17 117:18requests (1)116:851:8 70:14 72:2256:24 61:21 98:4119:6,19 120:1316:17result (7)82:8 83:8,13,21131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15	7:1 8:25 20:2 22:5	92:4 110:13 111:7	6:4 29:25		43:13 46:22 50:19
131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15	25:6 35:11 43:5	115:17 117:18	requests (1)	116:8	51:8 70:14 72:22
131:6relevant (1)require (6)20:20 27:14 30:9,2084:3 92:5 98:11,15					
		,			
			1		
	· · · ·				l

123:11,15 125:4,22	San (4)	97:24 98:1 99:7	shut (1)	Sklar (175)
127:11 132:6	1:15 2:10 6:1 93:1	101:23 102:8,9	17:9	3:5 5:4 6:4,14,14,19
right-hand (1)	Sauter (3)	106:11 110:13	side (3)	7:2,10 9:1 10:14,24
35:19	4:11 6:7,8	122:22	20:16,20 23:13	11:6,24 12:6,14,21
rights (1)	save (1)	seen (9)	signature (7)	13:3,22 14:10,17
24:11	62:4	63:23 74:16 82:12	7:20 8:2 123:6 125:18	15:4,13,20 16:1,9
risk (7)	saying (12)	88:11,23 129:14,18	125:19 127:7	16:18 17:2,11 18:5
54:20 65:3,4,9,18	40:2 41:7 42:14,24	129:19 130:9	134:21	18:10,23 19:12 20:3
72:11,15	54:23,24 68:2 82:3	selected (2)	signed (1)	21:13,20 22:6 23:12
RMR (3)	97:19 99:19 106:11	52:7,8	7:23	23:15,18 24:21 25:7
1:24 2:13 133:18	128:23	sentence (1)	significance (3)	26:7 27:1 28:7
role (1)	says (6)	125:13	45:2 68:12,22	29:17 30:15 32:22
71:17	9:13 41:8 44:23 123:4	sentences (1)	significant (18)	34:7,23 35:8,12
Ron (2)	125:14,23	20:14	49:11 54:16 72:20,24	36:13 38:23 41:10
3:5 6:14	scanned (1)	set (8)	73:11,25 74:21	43:6 45:15 46:1,11
Rosate (4)	100:24	15:16 40:19 43:24	75:12 76:14 77:25	46:23 50:19,23 52:1
1:24 2:13 133:1,18	schematically (2)	44:8 93:19 94:2,4	82:18 84:23 85:24	53:14 55:10 57:1
rotate (40)	100:4 103:7	133:15	86:2 87:11 89:11	58:17 60:10 62:5,13
72:21,25 73:2,12,14	schematics (1)	setting (1)	90:24 95:15	63:5,19 64:9,21
74:1,3,4,14,22,24	100:2	93:17	significantly (3)	65:22 66:3,24 69:3
75:13,15,19,24	SCHWARTZ (1)	seven (16)	79:1,11 90:11	69:12,19 71:8,15,24
76:13 77:25 80:23	3:3	108:18 109:2 112:5	silicone (1)	72:17 75:3 76:15
82:11,14,18 83:4,10	scope (19)	113:4 114:9,20,23	57:23	77:4,9,22 78:12
83:19 84:23 85:7	17:7,8,23 101:7 104:1	115:11,15 117:1,9	similar (7)	79:19 81:12 82:20
86:5,12 87:3,19,22	110:13 111:7 112:3	117:17 118:7,23	29:9 30:6 31:1,1	83:6,20 84:1,13
88:8,14,16,21 89:7	115:18 117:19	119:5,18	48:24 66:16 131:16	85:1,15,18 87:6
89:14 95:15 120:24	119:7,20 121:1,3	seven-page (11)	simple (9)	88:1 89:5,20 90:5
124:8	124:12,14 126:14	107:22 108:3,7	38:9 39:17 40:2 47:7	90:19 91:1,25 92:5
rotated (1)	126:14 127:2	109:15 110:9 111:4	47:8,14 49:18 52:22	93:5,18 94:17 96:12
81:9	scratch (2)	111:22 112:10,23	112:20	96:21 98:5 99:12,21
rotating (12)	34:15 37:25	113:9 116:5	simplest (1)	100:8,17 101:19
76:9,22 82:7,24 83:9	seal (12) 77:12 78:8 79:24	seven-pages (1)	39:1	102:21 103:16
83:14 84:16,16 85:9		113:19	simplified (2)	104:3 105:16 106:3
85:22 91:5,13	80:17 81:22 91:11	shared (1)	98:19 99:3	107:19 108:1,15,23
rotation (2)	96:22,23,24 97:2,12 97:22	21:10 SHAPP (1)	simplistic (1) 106:24	109:13,24 110:6,20
95:14 96:13		SHARP (1)		111:1,10,17 112:6
rotational (3)	seals (2) 97:10,20	1:4 SHEET (1)	simply (6) 48:17 70:19 81:15	112:17 113:5,16,24
75:18 80:16 81:20	-	SHEET (1)	111:8 113:8 129:5	114:17 115:1,22
rotationally (1) 80:1	second (1) 26:8	134:1	sir (1)	116:10 117:6,22
rules (1)	secondary (1)	shift (1) 18:11	98:12	118:11 119:10
13:4	69:14	Shorthand (2)	sitting (6)	120:2,21 121:3
run (1)	section (3)	2:14 133:1	14:11 46:18 77:5	122:2 123:14,18
39:12	18:1 22:2 98:24	show (11)	83:21 84:2,6	124:1,18,22 125:1,3
Ryan (2)	sections (2)	38:13 72:12 88:3	situation (1)	125:16 126:5,15,21
4:4 6:9	10:11,13	98:20 99:3 100:3,5	36:19	127:4,10,17 128:17
4.4 0.9	see (43)	100:9,13,16 104:20	size (1)	129:11,20 130:8,13
S	9:2,16,18 20:6,22	showing (2)	130:2	130:15,23 131:4
$\frac{5}{S(3)}$	22:10,14 26:1 29:19	99:23 106:11	skilled (23)	132:5
3:1 4:1 5:6	35:19,21 42:2,4,9	shown (7)	26:17 27:2,18 32:1	slam (1)
S.A.S (1)	42:15 43:22 44:23	65:6 102:3,11,14	40:4 41:2,8 42:19	70:18
1:7	44:25 53:8 57:21	103:1,7,8	43:24 44:14 48:25	slightly (1)
safe (2)	58:5,23 59:3,24	shows (2)	50:4 54:18,18	101:20
29:11 38:14	63:6 66:16,18 70:2	104:16,18	102:14 103:1,9,14	slot (5)
safety (2)	70:10,11 71:21	shrink (1)	102.14 105.1,9,14	18:15 19:2,22 20:19
37:19 64:7	72:10 73:18 74:18	33:5	128:14 129:3 130:6	21:7 slots (3)
57.15 51.7	/2.10 / J.10 / T.10	55.5	120.17 127.5 150.0	slots (3)

<u> </u>				
10.0 21.24 22.17	(5.21 (0.1 75.9	7(.22 77.12 79.1 9	111.5 22 112.11 24	22.2 24.22 20.20
19:9 21:24 22:17	65:21 69:1 75:8	76:23 77:12 78:1,8	111:5,23 112:11,24	22:3 24:22 29:20
small (6)	76:1,19,19 78:15	79:24,25 80:17 81:4	113:10 122:11	31:25 41:6 45:4,6
33:1 59:3 70:13,13	86:17 89:12 103:11	81:21 82:8,14,19,19	submitting (1)	45:21 54:24 55:13
96:5 130:3	118:21 128:25	82:25 83:9,15 84:17	114:8	56:8 57:19 59:5
Smith (4)	129:14 130:5	85:9 86:6,13 87:3	SUBSCRIBED (1)	60:12,20 62:15
3:22 4:3,9 6:9	specifically (9)	87:23 88:9,21 89:8	134:22	69:17,20 75:11 83:7
snap (7)	40:18 62:21 66:19	89:15 91:5,11,14	substantially (2)	90:24 93:23 95:19
55:18,21 59:19,24	79:12 87:2 99:17	96:25 97:3,12,22	130:2,3	97:18 98:25 102:19
66:23 70:14 71:2	121:10 128:9,12	stems (5)	substituting (1)	104:9 111:19 112:9
snap-fit (20)	specification (3)	82:12,21 83:3 84:22	129:5	surfaces (4)
52:11 53:16 57:18	41:17,25 42:12	87:19	substitution (1)	66:20 67:6 70:23 80:9
59:6,11,13,14 61:9	specifics (1)	step (1)	96:9	suspect (2)
62:12 66:10 67:10	55:16	120:7	subsystem (1)	111:20 131:3
67:10,16 68:1,6,11	speculate (1)	stick (1)	37:12	sustaining (3)
68:21 70:13,16	46:21	30:1	successful (5)	34:17 35:6 36:19
130:24	speculation (1)	stickler (1)	41:19 42:7 44:5 52:19	switch (1)
snap-fits (9)	96:18	29:20	53:1	121:22
55:11,24 56:3,15 69:5	spoken (1)	stop (4)	suddenly (3)	sworn (3)
71:4,25 130:20	131:23	104:18 121:14,15,19	60:16 70:25 129:6	6:17 133:4 134:22
131:1	spring (6)	straightforward (1)	sued (1)	system (2)
snapped (2)	102:3,10,13,15,25	12:8	33:12	32:9 51:17
55:20 70:7	102.3,10,13,13,23	strain (1)	sufficient (4)	32.9 31.17
		63:16	28:11 29:5 30:11,22	T
snapping (3) 58:16 65:14 66:8	square (2) 3:15 51:15		suggested (2)	
		strains (1) 63:17	104:14 105:2	T (1) 5:6
snaps (2)	stamp (1)			
58:9,21	35:18	strategy (1)	suggesting (3) 67:6 68:15 96:8	take (19) 23:15 43:15,15 50:19
software (1) 50:2	stamped (1) 104:21	67:20 STDAUSS (1)		57:2 63:9 66:14
		STRAUSS (1) 3:14	Suite (1) 2:10	
solutions (3)	standard (7)			74:6,10 91:25 95:24
61:1,4 103:11	52:2,3,5 94:22 97:8	stream (1)	supplement (1)	98:16,16 100:20
sorry (16)	97:13,16	33:8	122:10	106:9 114:14
7:12 10:24 16:8,14	standpoint (1)	Street (1)	supplemental (2)	116:11 124:20
25:14 41:9 77:20	91:23	3:15	12:15 122:23	125:1
82:22 94:3 100:22	start (3)	stress (3)	supplying (1)	taken (7)
102:18 109:16	6:7,23 94:22	51:7,7 60:8	33:14	2:10 23:17 50:22 79:7
111:8 118:3 126:18	start-up (1)	strike (7)	support (29)	92:6 125:2 126:7
129:21	33:12	37:25 46:24 78:3	5:20,23 7:6,16 9:10	talk (2)
sort (8)	starts (1)	87:20 102:23 118:3	10:3,16 11:20 12:10	18:12 72:18
24:23 52:2 57:17 63:6		128:10	12:16,18,24,24	talked (3)
68:10 94:22 101:2	state (4)	stroke (9)	13:17,17 14:3 15:17	90:9 115:5,6
109:11	51:6 95:13 125:21	72:22 73:1,13 74:2,23	77:17 78:5 84:7,19	talking (14)
sound (7)	133:2	75:14,25 86:6	85:12 100:6 101:8	28:15 49:10 51:2 67:4
59:19 66:23 70:14,15	stated (3)	121:17	105:20 107:8	69:17 73:9,19 77:23
70:17,22 71:2	19:9 42:11 121:11	studying (1)	120:12 122:6	78:21 80:11 88:3
sounds (2)	statement (7)	91:17	124:14	95:19 98:11 112:18
50:21 70:14	8:1 20:24 95:22 99:9	stuff (1)	sur-replies (1)	task (1)
speak (2)	125:25 126:6,23	25:24	105:20	30:13
131:11,19	States (4)	subject (1)	sur-reply (21)	technical (2)
speaking (2)	1:1 5:8,10 125:21	98:14	5:23 7:6,16 10:3,16	7:9 72:10
26:7 27:10	stating (4)	submit (7)	11:21 12:11,18,25	teeth (2)
spec (1)	23:25 36:12 52:18,24	107:21 108:2,7,18	13:18 14:3 15:17	104:11,25
38:20	stationary (2)	109:2 110:1 118:2	77:18 78:5 84:7,19	teleconference (4)
special (1)	105:5,10	submitted (16)	85:12 101:9 122:6	3:5,17 4:4,12
20:20	stem (41)	11:25 12:16 14:3 84:6	124:15,16	tell (4)
specific (18)	25:19 73:2,14 74:3,14	85:12 101:8 105:20	sure (33)	55:1 88:19 116:14
37:8 46:25 47:20 48:5	74:24 75:15 76:10	109:16,17 110:10	8:20 12:7 17:17 18:13	118:12
1	I	I	I	I

tells (1)	29:19 30:2 32:13	27:22 46:12 47:2,22	15:1 38:5 47:18 49:19	32:2 45:2,11 54:25
48:9	36:17 37:1 44:15	49:11	50:12 85:15 91:16	61:20 68:9,12 86:1
ten (2)	47:14 52:6 58:19	tooling (11)	106:25 117:14	93:24 96:7 98:11,13
56:13 77:24	73:8,17 94:8 97:17	20:16 22:20 47:12	118:24 119:13	99:19 103:17
term (2)	97:19 101:5,15	48:8 49:13,17 50:1	128:1	104:17,23,25 107:2
45:7 60:8	103:22 104:6 108:5	50:9,9 127:22,23	trying (15)	104.17,25,25 107.2
terminology (2)	108:21 110:24			117:24
22:24 51:11		tools (15) 26:23 27:3,5,19 37:23	17:3,19 46:21 68:3,9	
	111:9 112:14	38:1,4,16 39:11	68:11 69:21 85:4	understanding (8)
terms (13)	117:12,12 118:1		89:4 96:20 97:6	8:20 32:2 86:23 95:1
13:4 19:15 24:12	thinkable (1)	40:1 48:14,16 49:15	107:2,17 110:23	113:18 114:19
27:10 33:20 34:20	129:8	50:10 127:23	117:10	119:4,17
39:10 48:18 55:20	thinking (2)	top (9)	Tuesday (5)	understood (1)
65:9,11,12 106:21	45:4 129:4	8:10 44:20 55:15	1:16 2:4,12 6:1 93:1	49:4
test (17)	third (1)	57:20 69:16 81:2	turn (8)	undesirable (2)
30:23 31:13 37:8,10	26:10	87:8 101:14 104:6	7:19 9:14 20:12 38:10	51:7 128:19
37:10,11 50:3 63:17	thought (7)	topic (2)	101:21 121:23	unique (6)
78:15,18 86:1,4,8,8	81:24 108:25 109:8	27:23 28:14	125:17,18	31:7 34:5 42:1 52:6,9
87:2,5,12	111:2,16,21 116:15	topics (3)	two (11)	53:25
tested (1)	thoughts (2)	11:13 115:6,8	3:15 15:12 20:14	unit (1)
37:12	11:15 118:22	torque (2)	28:18 59:9,18 75:19	51:18
testified (5)	thousands (1)	91:6,15	101:14 109:17	United (4)
6:17 76:18 87:18,22	67:10	total (2)	110:11 114:8	1:1 5:8,10 125:21
127:16	three (2)	56:3 108:18	type (7)	units (2)
testifying (1)	71:4 101:15	totally (2)	62:8 63:21 65:10,12	51:11,14
28:14	throw (1)	68:19 81:13	68:6 96:22 97:2	unsafe (1)
testimony (16)	39:23	TRADEMARK (1)	types (1)	72:1
10:9 21:17 26:6 42:18	thrown (1)	1:1	71:9	unsatisfactory (1)
42:18 54:23,23	61:16	transcribed (1)	typical (1)	38:3
61:21 76:7 77:24	time (36)	133:5	72:6	unsealing (1)
87:15,18,21 89:6	6:20 13:10 18:25 24:4	transcript (6)	typically (4)	133:12
123:9 133:4	24:9,14 26:8,10,13	5:14 25:10 26:9 74:7	17:13 18:2 59:14 87:1	upstream (2)
testing (2)	26:22 27:2 29:23,25	88:5 133:13		32:24 33:4
75:22 86:11	32:13 54:19 62:4	transcription (1)	U	use (19)
tests (17)	73:4,6,16,20 75:22	133:6	U.S (4)	27:3,5,19 37:23 38:1
28:8 29:2 30:8,19	76:3,8 78:17,19,21	transitional (1)	5:21,24 43:9 98:8	38:16 40:1 52:3
31:1 38:12 49:6,21	79:18 84:18 90:17	45:7	Uh-huh (4)	69:21 72:1 76:6
52:10 78:16 79:9	90:18 116:2,14	travels (1)	9:13 106:4 122:13,19	91:2,9,12 93:9
86:9,11,15,23 89:9	119:1,14 128:24	39:20	ultimately (2)	94:10 96:22 97:2
91:16	130:7	trends (1)	33:9,11	130:24
Texas (2)	times (3)	90:18	umbrella (2)	user (4)
3:23 4:4	23:22 87:13 119:24	TRIAL (1)	32:15 35:6	78:13 79:5 93:20
thank (12)	timing (1)	1:2	unable (1)	102:2
22:4 23:13,20 50:25	11:16	Tricia (4)	76:25	usually (5)
56:19,20 58:18 70:1	today (22)	1:24 2:13 133:1,18	unbinding (1)	18:1 32:12 51:18
75:7 93:7 125:5	8:6 14:11 19:16 46:18	tried (1)	133:12	71:20 120:20
129:12		97:17	unclear (2)	
	69:20 79:1,9,11 02:12 100:18	true (18)	42:17 73:8	utilize (5) 76:2 89:19 91:6,16
Thanks (1)	93:13 109:18	8:4 9:23 18:6 59:24		96:3
100:24 theoretical (1)	110:11 111:25	60:11 70:16,21	uncommon (1) 61:14	
theoretical (1) 95:2	112:12,25 113:11	80:20 93:13 100:5		utilized (3)
	114:9 118:5 119:3		undercut (6)	55:11 61:16 91:15
things (13)	119:16 121:7 123:5	113:4 123:11,13	18:14,19 19:1,11,21	utilizing (1)
11:16 32:5 33:4 37:11	129:14	125:22 126:8,24	21:6	94:15
39:8 45:24 49:17	told (4)	132:4 133:7	understand (32)	V
62:2 64:8 72:11,14	118:13,14 119:23,24	truly (1)	11:25 12:3 17:3,19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
87:1 96:9	tool (9)	54:2	19:16 24:22 27:6	vague (3)
think (26)	21:21,24 22:17,25	try (12)	28:18 29:14 31:24	12:4 13:1,6
	I	1	I	1

	1	1	1	
validated (1)	want (23)	124:16	17:15 24:13 31:12,20	47:3,23 48:21 49:8
38:13	8:19 24:22 29:24	whereof (1)	32:17 55:12,19 56:1	49:23 50:7 51:21
validation (1)	36:21 47:18 54:25	133:15	56:4,8,15 63:23	52:13 53:3 55:3
37:10	55:18 62:3 65:23	witness (134)	82:16 115:5 131:14	100:19 101:1 102:7
valve (57)	67:1 72:18 80:14	5:2 10:10 11:4,23	working (15)	103:4 104:24
73:2,14 74:3,15,24	83:7 84:14 92:2	12:5,13,20 13:20	16:17 17:13 32:9	127:20
75:15,16 76:10,22	97:18 105:11 112:8	14:5,16,24 15:10,19	34:13 36:18 48:7	1:16 (2)
77:12 78:1,8 79:24	114:2 118:17 121:5	15:24 16:8,14,23	73:4 84:18 85:10	92:6 93:2
79:24,25 80:16,22	124:20 127:6	17:24 18:9,18 19:4	86:16,19 110:4,18	10 (1)
80:23 81:1,4,7,21	wanted (2)	19:25 21:9,18 23:10	114:13 131:15	74:11
82:8,12,14,19,21,25	35:5 85:25	24:20 25:4 26:21	world (1)	10:02 (1)
83:3,9,15 84:17,22	wanting (1)	27:22 29:7 30:13	83:18	23:17
85:9 86:6,13,25,25	23:4	32:19 34:1,12 35:3	wouldn't (14)	10:09 (1) 23:17
87:3,19,23 88:10,22	wasn't (8) 17:17 18:24 29:19	36:11 38:7 41:6	27:12 37:6,7 44:4	100 (1)
89:8,15 91:5,11,14 91:17,22 96:25 97:3	47:16 49:19 76:16	42:24 45:20 46:5,17	46:17 63:10 70:21	56:6
97:12,22,25 98:1	108:24 118:24	51:23 53:7 55:7	72:8 86:8 91:20 93:19 94:1 96:4,20	1001 (3)
101:17	watch (2)	58:13 60:6 62:1,11 63:4,15 64:4,17	written (3)	5:8 43:5,8
valves (11)	91:6,15	65:17 66:2,14 68:19	11:13 19:5 21:10	1001.2 (3)
73:16,20,21 74:4 76:6	way (14)	69:11,16 71:7,12,20	11.15 19.5 21.10	5:10 98:4,7
80:21 82:3 83:17	20:1 25:22 33:5 39:1	72:5 75:1 76:12,25	X	1013 (3)
86:21 97:5 101:11	50:3 68:15 71:25	77:8,20 78:10 79:15	X (2)	5:11 35:10,11
variables (3)	76:7,20 88:16 94:16	80:19 82:16 83:2,17	5:1,6	1057 (4)
46:19,20 48:1	108:13 113:17	84:10,22 85:16 87:5	-	5:14 25:6,9 74:6
variance (3)	133:10	89:1,17,25 90:14,23	Y	1071 (10)
97:23,24 98:1	ways (3)	93:12 94:13 96:2,16	yeah (15)	56:23,24 62:8 63:21
variation (1)	40:4,7 68:4	99:17 100:2,13	9:13 34:6 62:24 63:24	66:11 71:4,25 92:3
34:4	we'll (5)	101:10 102:18	68:14 70:15 88:13	129:10,17
various (4)	23:16 30:2 74:11	103:6 105:9 106:1	94:16 95:5,19 105:2	1075 (3)
55:22 60:25 61:1 99:5	118:24 121:23	107:12,24 108:9,21	122:3 124:2 125:11	5:16 22:5,8
vary (1)	we're (20)	109:5,21 110:3,15	125:12	10891 (4)
51:16	18:11,20 27:23 29:23	110:23 111:8,15	years (4)	1:24 2:13 133:3,19
velocity (1) 39:15	31:6 32:6 49:10	112:2,14 113:2,13	24:14 44:11 48:9 129:3	11:03 (1) 50:22
verification (2)	59:6 62:6 69:17 73:20 78:21 80:11	113:21 114:11,22 115:19 116:7,20	Yep (2)	11:15 (1)
37:10,11	83:12 88:3 95:19	117:3,20 119:8,21	35:17 122:22	50:22
versus (1)	109:18 111:19	120:14 122:1	yield (29)	119 (1)
80:23	112:9 122:3	123:13,23 125:11	51:8,12,19 52:5,11	25:14
vertical (4)	we've (15)	126:4,19 128:18	53:4,18 54:11 55:4	12 (1)
59:16,19 66:20 67:5	6:20 9:22 11:9 31:2	129:21 130:9,22	60:4,13,22 61:10,15	9:15
vessel (3)	32:3 43:12 51:3	131:3 132:4 133:15	61:24 63:1,7,9,12	12:32 (1)
39:2,3,7	62:21 71:4 77:23	witness's (2)	64:1,14 65:13 67:15	92:6
visual (1)	96:24 110:11	10:9 21:17	67:18,25 68:17,23	127 (1)
129:25	113:10 119:3,16	word (3)	69:2,6	5:5
visualize (3)	Weil (3)	27:9 45:3 117:25		13 (5)
15:2 106:8 107:14	3:16 6:11,11	wording (1)		8:2 115:13 116:4,12
void (1)	welcome (5)	24:23	zero (1)	122:20
133:14	23:19 50:24 93:6	words (9)	109:7	130 (1) 5:4
vs (1) 1:6	124:21 125:4	27:8 43:22 45:8 53:1	0	5:4 15 (1)
1.0	well-organized (1) 14:6	89:1 98:16,23 124:2		122:17
W	went (1)	124:4 work (7)	1	122.17 155 (1)
Wacker (1)	125:12	34:8 41:15 68:23	1 (27)	3:4
3:4	West (1)	81:10 103:14	28:22 29:3 31:3 43:16	16 (5)
walls (2)	2:10	106:15 107:15	43:18,20 44:23	1:16 2:4,12 6:1 93:1
59:16,20	whatsoever (1)	worked (15)	45:10,17 46:2,14	163986 (1)
		l , , ,		l

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
17 (1) 2018-010554 (1) 5 (6) 101:21 9:12 9:15 10:5 95:18 98:22 177 (33) 2019 (19) 1:16 2:4,12 5:14 6:1 28:19 40:8,18 41:1,3 1:16 2:4,12 5:14 6:1 50 (2) 41:12,21,24 42:21 8:2 25:11 74:8 44:10 56:10
101:21 9:12 9:15 10:5 95:18 98:22 177 (33) 2019 (19) 101:22 102:1 28:19 40:8,18 41:1,3 1:16 2:4,12 5:14 6:1 50 (2) 41:12,21,24 42:21 8:2 25:11 74:8 50 (2) 42:12 16 (15 47.4) 72 21 87.15 21 02.1 44:10 56:10
177 (33) 2019 (19) 101:22 102:1 28:19 40:8,18 41:1,3 1:16 2:4,12 5:14 6:1 101:22 102:1 41:12,21,24 42:21 8:2 25:11 74:8 50 (2) 42:12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
28:19 40:8,18 41:1,3 1:16 2:4,12 5:14 6:1 50 (2) 41:12,21,24 42:21 8:2 25:11 74:8 44:10 56:10
41:12,21,24 42:21 8:2 25:11 74:8 44:10 56:10 42:12 16 46:15 47:4 79:21 87:15 21 82:1
42.12.17 46.15.47.4 79.21.97.15.21.02.1
47:23 49:8,23 50:8 115:13 116:4,12 2:10
51:3,21 52:13 72:19 122:20,23 133:16
78:6 84:8,19 85:12 134:23 6
95:13 105:21 202 (2) 6 (3)
121:24,25 122:6 74:10 88:7 5:4 22:12 35:19
127:20 128:10,14 2021 (7) 60606 (1)
18 (1) 8:24 122:21 123:19 3:4
133:16 126:8,11,19,23 631 (10)
19 (1) 2021.1 (15) 361 (10) 99:13,24
25:13 5:19 8:25 9:5,7,9,15 100:11 101:1 103:4
19103 (1) 10:6 11:18 12:1 10:14 10:1101010101010000000000
3:16 16:3,6,11,24 17:5
17:21 7
49:23 50:8 51:21 126:23 127:8 3:23 4:4 52:13 53:3 55:3 2023.1 (18) 3:23 4:4
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
122:9 127:20 8:14 9:22 11:10,20 8 (4) 14:12 21 15:22 18:7
2:06 (1) 14:13,21 15:22 18:7 5:19 35:22 100:19
125:2 51:3 77:17 95:12 101:1 216 (1) 122 4 125 7
2:16 (1) 122:4 125:7 8,936,177 (5)
125:2 2032 (1) 1:6 5:8,21,24 43:9
2:27 (4) 7:12 800 (1)
2:12 6:2 93:2 132:8 22 (1) 2:10
20 (1) 5:16
5:18 24 (5) <u>9</u>
20-page (1) 5:14 25:11 74:8 87:15 9 (3)
118:2 87:21 43:17 95:18.22
2000 (1) 25 (1) 9,370,631 (2)
87:13 5:14 5:10 98:8
2001 (1) 9:18 (3)
3:15 3 2:5,11 6:2
2003 (21) 3 (3) 93 (1)
23:24 24:7 26:18 27:3 98:22 122:15 125:12 5:4
27:18 34:24 35:16 30 (2) 38 (1)
48:25 76:8,21 79:1 48:9 102:3 5:10
20.12
2005 (2) 5:11 87:14 122:18 2M (1)
87:14 122:18 3M (1)
2018 (5) 1:4
5:18 20:2,5,13 122:18
$2018-01054(4) \qquad \frac{4}{12(4)}$
7:6,17 10:4 22:9 43 (1)
2018-01055 (1) 5:8