

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- X  
:  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, STATE OF NEW YORK, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, STATE OF OHIO, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, STATE OF ILLINOIS, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, and COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,  
:  
Plaintiffs,  
:  
-v-  
:  
VYERA PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC, AND PHOENIXUS AG, MARTIN SHKRELI, individually, as an owner and former director of Phoenixus AG and a former executive of Vyera Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and KEVIN MULLEADY, individually, as an owner and former director of Phoenixus AG and a former executive of Vyera Pharmaceuticals, LLC,  
:  
Defendants.  
:  
----- X

20cv00706 (DLC)

OPINION AND ORDER

APPEARANCES:

For plaintiff Federal Trade Commission:

James H. Weingarten  
Markus H. Meier  
Bradley S. Albert  
Amanda Triplett  
Armine Black  
Daniel W. Butrymowicz  
J. Maren Schmidt  
Lauren Peay  
Leah Hubinger  
Matthew B. Weprin  
Neal J. Perlman  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20580

For plaintiff State of New York:

Amy E. McFarlane  
Jeremy R. Kasha  
Elinor R. Hoffman  
Saami Zain  
Office of the New York Attorney General  
Antitrust Bureau  
28 Liberty Street, 20th Floor  
New York, NY 10005

Bryan Lewis Bloom  
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer US LLP  
700 13th St. NW 10th fl.  
Washington, DC 20005

For plaintiff State of California:  
Michael D. Battaglia  
Office of the Attorney General of California  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102

For plaintiff State of Ohio:  
Beth Finnerty  
Office of the Ohio Attorney General  
150 E. Gay Street, 22nd Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215

For plaintiff Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:  
Joseph Betsko  
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General  
Strawberry Square, 14th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

For plaintiff State of Illinois:  
Richard S. Schultz  
Office of the Attorney General of Illinois  
100 W. Randolph Street, 11th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60601

For plaintiff State of North Carolina:  
K.D. Sturgis  
Jessica V. Sutton  
North Carolina Dept. of Justice  
Consumer Protection Division  
114 West Edenton Street  
Raleigh, NC 27603

For plaintiff Commonwealth of Virginia:

Sarah Oxenham Allen  
Tyler T. Henry  
Office of the Attorney General of Virginia  
202 North Ninth Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

For defendants Vyera Pharmaceuticals, LLC and Phoenixus AG:  
Stacey Anne Mahoney  
Sarah E. Hsu Wilbur  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178

Scott A. Stempel  
William Cravens  
Melina R. Dimattio  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Steven A. Reed  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
1701 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Noah J. Kaufman  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
One Federal Street  
Boston, MA 02210

Michael M. Elliott  
Rachel J. Rodriguez  
Phillips Nizer LLP  
485 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10017

Michael L. Weiner  
Dechert LLP (NYC)  
1095 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-6797

For defendant Martin Shkreli:  
Christopher H. Casey  
Andrew J. Rudowitz  
Jeffrey S. Pollack  
Sarah O'Laughlin Kulik  
Duane Morris LLP

30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Sarah Fehm Stewart  
Duane Morris, LLP (NJ)  
One Riverfront Plaza, Suite 1800  
Newark, NJ 07102-3889

For defendant Kevin Mulleady:  
Kenneth R. David  
Albert Shemtov Mishaan  
Nicholas Anthony Rendino  
Kasowitz, Benson, Torres LLP (NYC)  
1633 Broadway  
New York, NY 10019

DENISE COTE, District Judge:

Trial in this antitrust action is scheduled to begin on December 14, 2021. This Opinion addresses the motion of plaintiffs the United States Federal Trade Commission and seven States (collectively, "Plaintiffs") to exclude expert testimony to be offered at trial on behalf of defendants Vyera Pharmaceuticals, LLC, its parent company Phoenixus AG (together, "Vyera"), Martin Shkreli, and Kevin Mulleady (collectively, "Defendants") by Justin McLean. The motion is granted.

#### **Background**

Justin McLean is the Managing Principal of Analysis Group, Inc. He describes the areas of his expertise as including damages estimation, applied finance theory, and valuation.

McLean's affidavit of October 20, 2021 constitutes his direct testimony at trial.<sup>1</sup> In that affidavit, McLean opines that the corporate Defendants "do not project to have enough liquid assets (or assets that can become liquid in time) to pay" in the first quarter of 2022 the judgment that the Plaintiffs seek through this trial, that is, a judgment of between \$53.1 and \$64.6 million. He adds that requiring the payment of this sum in the first quarter of 2022 "may" compromise these Defendants' ability to continue operating as a going concern.

#### **Discussion**

There are several reasons that this testimony is inadmissible.<sup>2</sup> First and foremost, this testimony is not helpful to the trier of fact. Should the Defendants be found liable at trial, equitable monetary relief in the form of disgorgement may be awarded pursuant to the state law claims. See Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Vyera Pharms., LLC, No. 20CV00706 (DLC), 2021 WL 4392481, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 24, 2021). Disgorgement is "a remedy tethered to a wrongdoer's net unlawful profits." Liu v.

---

<sup>1</sup> An Order of May 19, 2021 denied the Plaintiffs' request to strike McClean's expert report as untimely. That Order did not rule on the admissibility of McClean's testimony at trial, and the Defendants' suggestion to the contrary is rejected.

<sup>2</sup> The Defendants suggest that the Court may defer a decision on this motion. To the extent the Defendants suggest that the award of disgorgement will occur after a separate proceeding, they are in error. There has been no bifurcation at trial of the issues of liability and damages.

Sec. & Exch. Comm'n, 140 S. Ct. 1936, 1943 (2020). The amount of disgorgement ordered may not “exceed the gains made upon any business or investment, when both the receipts and payments are taken into the account.” Id. at 1949-50 (quoting Rubber Co. v. Goodyear, 76 U.S. 788, 804 (1869)). “The district court has broad discretion not only in determining whether or not to order disgorgement but also in calculating the amount to be disgorged.” Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Contorinis, 743 F.3d 296, 301 (2d Cir. 2014) (citation omitted).

The Second Circuit applies a two-step framework for calculating equitable monetary relief. A plaintiff must first show that its calculations reasonably approximate the amount of the defendants’ unjust gains, and then the defendants may show that those figures are inaccurate. Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Moses, 913 F.3d 297, 310 (2d Cir. 2019) (citation omitted). “If the disgorgement amount is generally reasonable, any risk of uncertainty about the amount falls on the wrongdoer whose illegal conduct created that uncertainty.” Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Fowler, 6 F.4th 255, 267 (2d Cir. 2021) (citation omitted).

Here, the Defendants do not contest the accuracy of the Plaintiffs’ calculation of Vyera’s net profits.<sup>3</sup> Even if it were appropriate to consider Vyera’s ability to pay in determining

---

<sup>3</sup> The Defendants do challenge, however, the reliability of certain assumptions on which those calculations rest.

the amount of disgorgement, McLean's testimony does not address that issue. He opines at most on its financial condition and ability to pay the judgment sought by the Plaintiffs in a single quarter of a single year. McLean does not opine on how much Vyera can pay in that quarter or at any other time.


Moreover, even if a defendant's ability to pay were properly considered, for instance, in setting a post-verdict schedule for any payment of disgorgement, that inquiry would not be limited to the first quarter of 2022. Therefore, even in that scenario McLean's testimony is both premature and of limited relevance.

Finally, as the Plaintiffs point out, McLean's testimony must be stricken in any event to the extent it presents opinions not described in his expert report. These include testimony about the monetization of a Ketamine asset.

**Conclusion**

The Plaintiffs' October 20, 2021 motion to exclude the testimony of Justin Mclean is granted.

Dated: New York, New York  
November 15, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DENISE COTE  
United States District Judge