UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

| | | CIVILLEUV | ER SHEET | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself) Valeant Pharmaceuticals International | | | DEFENDANTS Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary of U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Services; Andrew C. von Eschenbach, M.D., Commissioner of the | | |
| (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (Except in U.S. Plaintiff Cases): Orange County, California | | | Food and Drug Administration County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (InU.S. Plaintiff Cases Only): | | |
| yourself, provide same.) | address and Telephone Number. In P., 1999 Avenue of the Stars, S | | Attorneys (If Known) | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| II. BASIS OF JURISDICTIO | N (Place an X in foreign colly) | | SINGOF PRINCIPALIPER X in one box for plaintiff and | | 2562008 Page 1 of |
| □ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff | ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party | | PTI | F DEF | |
| ☑ 2 U.S. Government Defendar | nt 🗆 4 Diversity (Indicate Citiz of Parties in Item III) | zenship Citizen of Ano | ther State 2 | ☐ 2 Incorporated an of Business in A | d Principal Place □ 5 □ 5 Another State |
| | | Citizen or Subj | ject of a Foreign Country 2 3 | ☐ 3 Foreign Nation | □6 □6 |
| IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or | ne box only.) | | | | |
| ▼ 1 Original □ 2 Remov Proceeding State C | ed from | ☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ Reopened | 5 Transferred from another di | Dist | Iti- ☐ 7 Appeal to District trict Judge from gation Magistrate Judge |
| Challenge to the FDA's 500, et al. VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Plant of Suit (Plant)) OTHER STATUTES: 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 0rganizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities /Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Act 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Info. Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal | CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits | TORTS PERSONAL INJUR 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel Slander 330 Fed. Employer Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Med Malpracti 365 Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability | TORES Y PERSONAL PROPERTY act 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending Truth in Lending Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTCY at 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 at USC 158 at USC 157 at USC 158 at USC 157 at USC 158 at USC 157 at USC 158 at USC 158 | PRISONER PETITIONS 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus 530 General 535 Death Penalty Cither 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition FORFEITURE/ PENALTY 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug Cither Food & Drug Related Seizure of | Disclosure Act □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 750 Other Labor □ 751 Empl. Ret. Inc. |
| | Has this action been previously | filed and dismissed, ren | nanded or closed? M No 🖂 | Yes | |
| If yes, list case number(s): | SACTION O | 0040 AC (ACT | Dw\ | | |
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Case Number: SACV08-0 | 10447 AG (AG) | (X) | | |

CV-71 (07/05)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

| VIII(b). RELATED CASES: | Have any cases been n | previously filed that are related to the present case? No Yes |
|---|--|--|
| If yes, list case number(s): | | 163 |
| ָב ב | ☐ A. Arise from the sar☐ B. Call for determina☐ C. For other reasons | tase and the present case: me or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or ation of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present. |
| IX. VENUE: List the California ☐ Check here if the U.S. goven Orange County, California | a County, or State if off nment, its agencies of e ia | ner than California in which EACH pared plaintiff resides (Use amadditional sheet of 4,525,42008 Page 2 of minoyees is a named plaintiff. |
| List the California County, or S Check here if the U.S. gove Michael O. Leavitt - Was Andrew C. von Eschenba | mment, its agencies or a shington, D.C. | ernia, in which EACH named defendant resides. (Use an additional sheet if necessary). employees is a named defendant. |
| List the California County, or Note: In land condemnation cas Maryland | State if other than Cali es, use the location of t | ifornia, in which EACH claim arose. (Use an additional sheet if necessary) he tract of land involved. |
| or other papers as required | The CV-71 (JS-44) C | Date April 24, 2008 Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings roved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not surpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions |
| Key to Statistical codes relating | to Social Security Case | ς: |
| Nature of Suit Co | • | Substantive Statement of Cause of Action |
| 861 | НІА | All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b)) |
| 862 | BL | All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 169. (30 U.S.C. 923) |
| 863 | DIWC | All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g)) |
| 863 | DIWW | All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g)) |
| 864 | SSID | All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16of the Social Security Act, as amended. |
| 865 | RSI | All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g)) |
| | | |

| Richard de Bodo (State Bar No. 128199) . Drew Diamond (State Bar No. 205028) | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| David G. Chang (State Bar No. 241923) HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP | | | | | |
| 999 Avenue of the Stars, #1400 | | | | | |
| os Angeles, CA 90067 h: 310-785-4600; Fax: 310-785-4601 | | | | | |
| AMail: rdebodo@hhlaw.com | | | | | |
| UNITED STATES | | | | | |
| CENTRAL DISTRIC | CASEN | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| Case 8:08-cvPIOOMTIGFASG | | DoSAGY(18+00449)AGC(4)QB20 | 08 Page 3 of 1 | | |
| V. IICHAEL O. LEAVITT, in his official capacity as ecretary of the U.S. Department of Health and | | | | | |
| Human Services; and ANDREW C. VON ESCHENBACH, M.D., in his official capacity as Commissioner of the DEFENDANT(S) | | SUMMONS | | | |
| ood and Drug Administration | | | —————————————————————————————————————— | | |
| TO: DEFENDANT(S): MICHAEL O. LEAVITT; and | d ANDRI | EW C. VON ESCHENBACH, M.D. | | | |
| A lawsuit has been filed against you. | | | A | | |
| Within 60 days after service of this summon must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ☼ counterclaim □ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 12 or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, How 1999 Avenue of the Stars, #1400, Los Angeles judgment by default will be entered against you for the region your answer or motion with the court. | complain 2 of the OGAN & , CA 90 | ret amended comprehent | plaint The answer se address is fail to do so, | | |
| | Cler | k, U.S. District Court | E COTTON | | |
| APR 2 5 2008 Dated: | By: | ROLLS ROYCE PASCH | | | |
| | | Deputy Clerk | n o out | | |
| | | (Seal of the Court) | 144 | | |
| [Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)]. | s agency, c | or is an officer or employee of the United S | States. Allowed | | |
| CV-01A (12/07) SUMM | IONS | | | | |

| 1 | Richard de Bodo (State Bar No. 128199 J. Drew Diamond (State Bar No. 20502 David G. Chang (State Bar No. 241923 HOGAN & HARTSON LLP | 9) 28) | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | David G. Chang (State Bar No. 241923 HOGAN & HARTSON LLP | | | | | |
| 3 | HOGAN & HARTSON LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 785-4600 Facsimile: (310) 785-4601 E-mail: rdebodo@hhlaw.com ddiamond@hhlaw.com dgchang@hhlaw.com | ; * | | | | |
| 4 | Facsimile: (310) 785-4600 | | | | | |
| 5 | E-mail: rdebodo@hhlaw.com ddiamond@hhlaw.com | G-AGR Document 1 Filed 04/25/2008 Page | | | | |
| 6 | dgchang@hhlaw.com | TACK Document Tried 04/25/2500 Tage | | | | |
| · 7 8 | Attorneys for Plaintiff | G-AGR Document 1 Filed 04/25/2008 Page | | | | |
| 9 | VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 | | | | | |
| 10 | UNITED STATE | ES DISTRICT COURT \ | | | | |
| 11 | CENTRAL DISTR | RICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 12 | , SOUTHE | ERN DIVISION | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | |
| 14 | VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL | Case No. SACV08-00449 AG (AGRx) | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | |
| 16 | Plaintiff v. | VALEANT'S VERIFIED COMPLAINT | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | |
| 18 | MICHAEL O. LEAVITT, in his official capacity as | | | | | |
| 19 | Secretary of the U.S. Department of | | | | | |
| 20 | Health and Human Services, | | | | | |
| 21 | and | | | | | |
| 22 | ANDREW C. VON ESCHENBACH, | | | | | |
| 23 | M.D., in his official capacity as | | | | | |
| 24 | Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, | | | | | |
| 25 | Drug Hammistration, | | | | | |
| 26 | Defendants. | UFY | | | | |
| 27 | | <u>.</u> | | | | |
| 28 | | Voleont's Varified Complaint | | | | |

\\\LA - 086689/000039 - 384455 v1

Plaintiff Valeant Pharmaceuticals ("Valeant"), by its undersigned counsel, hereby brings this Verified Complaint against Defendants Michael O. Leavitt, in his official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS") and Andrew C. von Eschenbach, M.D., in his official capacity as Commissioner of the United States Acord and Drug Administration ("FDA"), and alleges as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 1. This action is brought by Valeant under the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") to hold unlawful as arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion, and to set aside, the FDA's final approval of Spear Pharmaceutical's ("Spear's") generic version of Valeant's pioneer drug product, EFUDEX® (fluorouracil) 5% Cream ("Efudex Cream").
- 2. Valeant's Efudex Cream is the top-selling topical treatment for patients with a form of skin cancer called "superficial basal cell carcinoma" ("sBCC"), having achieved a 93% success rate in clinical trials for sBCC and having earned the confidence of dermatologists throughout the United States. Efudex Cream is also approved to treat a form of sun-damaged skin called "actinic keratosis" ("AK").
- 3. On April 11, 2008, the FDA approved Abbreviated New Drug Application No. 77-524 ("ANDA") for a 5% fluorouracil cream sponsored by Spear and sought to be promoted as a generic version of Efudex Cream (ANDA No. 77-5224). As an ANDA-approved generic, Spear may now promote its cream to treat *both* actinic keratoses and superficial basal cell carcinoma this despite the fact that Spear's cream has never been studied in a single cancer patient.

17.

4. On or about April 23, 2008, Spear listed its generic product with one or more of the privately administered drug pricing compendia, indicating that Spear intends to begin marketing its product imminently.

5. The FDA, in approving Spear's ANDA, engaged in arbitrary and capricious conduct, abused its discretion, and failed to engage in reasoned decision-making as demonstrated by at Peast the following reasons: 1(1) The PDA5/4802 ted fage 6 of 13 own rules; (2) the FDA relied on false and contradictory assertions; and (3) the FDA failed to consider or address relevant evidence.

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff Valeant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at One Enterprise, Aliso Viejo, California, 92656. Valeant is a specialty pharmaceutical company that develops a broad range of products to treat neurological, dermatological, and infectious diseases and disorders.
- 7. Defendant Michael O. Leavitt is the Secretary of the HHS and is responsible for administering and enforcing the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. § 321, et seq. ("FDCA"). He is being sued in his official capacity. Defendant Leavitt maintains an office at 200 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C., 20201.
- 8. Defendant Andrew C. von Eschenbach, M.D. is the Commissioner of the FDA, an administrative agency within HHS, and is responsible for supervising the its activities. He is being sued in his official capacity. Defendant von Eschenbach has been delegated the authority to administer the drug approval provisions of the FDCA. He maintains offices at 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857, and at 200 C Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20204.

8

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

27

28

26

Jurisdiction in this Court is based on 28 U.S.C. § 1331 in that this is a 9. civil action arising under the laws of the United States; the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 551 et seq. in which Valeant is seeking judicial review of an agency action from which it has suffered a legal wrong, has been adversely affected, and has been aggrieved; 28 U.S.C. § 1361 in That this as an addition to Compensation of the White and the content of 13 perform his duty; and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202 (declaratory judgment) in that there exists between Valeant and the Defendants an actual, justiciable controversy as to which Valeant requires a declaration of its rights by this Court, as well as temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief to prohibit the Defendants from violating laws and regulations.

10. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), as Valeant resides in this judicial district.

BACKGROUND

- 11. Valeant manufactures and markets Efudex Cream, an FDA-approved "innovator" drug (sometimes referred to as a "pioneer," "brand-name" or "branded" drug). The active ingredient in Efudex is fluorouracil, a chemotherapy agent.
- Efudex Cream is used to treat superficial basal cell carcinoma, among 12. the most common forms of cancer in humans. Ineffectively treated, sBCC could lead to further growth into other parts of the skin, and in some instances, metastasize to nearby parts of the body. Efudex Cream is also used to topically treat multiple actinic keratoses, which are scalings or crustings of the skin caused primarily by overexposure to the sun.
- 13. Efudex Cream was first approved by the FDA over 30 years ago for the treatment of sBCC. To this day, Efudex Cream remains the only topical fluorouracil

product on the market that has been demonstrated to be safe and effective for the treatment of this condition.

- 14. On December 22, 2004, Spear, a drug company primarily producing generic dermatological products, filed its ANDA seeking approval of a generic version of Valeant's Efudex Cream. Under relevant portions of the FDCA, parties are permitted to PRE-ANDAS-POA permission to Practice and distributed generous 8 of 13 of FDA-approved innovator drugs, such as Efudex Cream.
- 15. In order for the FDA to approve an ANDA, the applicant must prove that its generic is "bioequivalent" to the innovator drug. Clinical testing on which bioequivalence is established shall be conducted "using the most accurate, sensitive, and reproducible approach available." 21 C.F.R. § 320.24(a).
- 16. The FDA remarkably concluded that as between AK (sun-damaged skin) and sBCC (cancer), clinical testing in AK provided the "most accurate, sensitive, and reproducible approach available" to determine the bioequivalence of Spear's product to Valeant's Efudex cream for the treatment of sBCC.
- 17. In 2004, Valeant filed a Citizen's Petition ("Petition") urging the FDA to require that any proposed Efudex generic should first be tested on cancer patients, as success of the drug in treating sun-damaged skin does not provide evidence that the cream delivers the requisite amount of active ingredient to cancerous skin cells. Valeant submitted scientific evidence showing, among other things, that it is impossible to determine the bioequivalence of such a product based simply upon its effect on sun-damaged skin. In the years that followed, Valeant supplemented its Petition with statements from several experts, as well as other scientific and medical evidence supporting its position.
- 18. The FDA approved Spear's ANDA on April 11, 2008. On the same date, the FDA denied Valeant's Petition and approved Spear's ANDA to market a generic version of Efudex Cream as a treatment for sBCC and AK. In doing so, the

FDA completely ignored the statements of Valeant's three medical experts and offered a decision that reflects a lack of reasoned decision-making and is filled with internal contradictions.

- 19. The FDA's approval of Spear's generic product required a determination that Spear's product was "bioequivalent" to Valeant's Efudex Cream.
- 20. The PDA Conceded that Spear was required to prove the FDA's own rules require that clinical testing on which bioequivalence is established must be conducted "using the most accurate, sensitive, and reproducible approach available."
- 21. The FDA concluded that, as between tests on cancer (sBCC) patients and tests on individuals with sun-damaged skin (AK), clinical testing on individuals with sun-damaged skin (AK) provided the "most accurate, sensitive, and reproducible approach available" to determine the bioequivalence of Spear's product to Valeant's Efudex Cream for the treating cancer.
- 22. Several statements offered by the FDA as the basis for its decision to focus on AK testing, and for denying Valeant's petition, are either false or contradict other statements made by the FDA.
- 23. In addition to making contradictory statements in its Response to Valeant's Petition, the FDA failed to consider significant and relevant information and expert statements bearing on the accuracy, sensitivity, and reproducibility of the bioequivalence testing that it relied upon in connection with Spear's ANDA.
- 24. Specifically, the FDA failed to acknowledge or consider any of the following important and relevant information provided by Valeant's experts:
- 25. Howard Maibach, M.D., a world renowned academic dermatologist and professor at University of California San Francisco School of Medicine, showed that AK clinical studies are extremely variable and subjective, depend almost entirely on

VVI.A - 086689/000039 - 384455 v1

physician observation, and "appear to be unreliable." Dr. Maibach further concluded that such a comparative clinical study carried out on AK patients could not support a finding of bioequivalence in another indication such as sBCC.

- 26. Khanh P. Tran, M.D., a Board-certified dermatopathologist, showed, using histopathologic slides, that AK and sBCC differ significantly in the cells they first affect, the manner who while free the control of 13 into.
- 27. Dennis M. Fisher, M.D., an expert statistician, as well as a physician, showed in statistical terms the difficulty of using information about a topical drug's performance on individuals with sun-damaged skin to predict its effectiveness in treating patients with skin cancer.

CAUSE OF ACTION

(Administrative Procedure Act: Violation of the FDCA and Applicable Regulations)

- 28. Valeant realleges, reasserts, and incorporates by reference herein each of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 27 of the Complaint, as though set forth fully herein.
- 29. The FDA's approval of the ANDA for the generic Efudex Cream was unlawful and in violation of the FDCA and the agency's own regulations.
- 30. The FDA's approval of the ANDA constitutes final agency action for which Valeant has no other adequate remedy within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.
- 31. The FDA's approval of the ANDA was not in accordance with federal law and therefore violates 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).
- 32. The FDA's approval of the ANDA constitutes agency action in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right, in violation of 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(C).

- 33. Valeant will be irreparably harmed if the Defendants are not required to suspend the FDA's approval of the ANDA because the purported generic was approved in violation of federal law.
- 34. There is no mechanism by which Valeant can be made whole for the injury that would result from the FDA's approval of the ANDA if the approval is not suspended. Valeant's without an Cadequate Pented of at law block of the Sunique nature of the harm.
- 35. The intent of Congress will be served by an Order directing the FDA to suspend its approval of the ANDA. In addition, the public interest will be served by such an Order.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Valeant requests that this Court enter the following:

- A. A declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) in Valeant's favor and against the Defendants, by:
 - (i) Declaring that the FDA's action, findings, and conclusion to approve ANDA No. 77-524 were unlawful and in violation of the FDCA;
 - (ii) Declaring that the FDA's action, findings, and conclusion to approve ANDA No. 77-524 were arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of the FDA's discretion;
 - (iii) Declaring that the FDA's approval of ANDA No. 77-524 is invalid;

11 of 13

| I | l |
|--------|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 8 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| ~ ~ | |

- В. An Order granting Valeant a temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunction that requires the FDA to suspend its approval of ANDA No. 77-524;
 - C. An award to Valeant of its costs, fees, and expenses; and
 - An award of such other and further relief as justice and its cause require. D.

Dated: April 23 2008:08-cv-00449-AG-AGR Document 1 Filed 04/25/2008 Page 2 of 13 Respectfully submitted,

Richard de Bodo (State Bar No. 128799)
J. Drew Diamond (State Bar No. 205028)
David G. Chang (State Bar No. 241923)
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 785-4600 Facsimile: (310) 785-4601 E-mail: rdebodo@hhlaw.com ddiamond@hhlaw.com dgchang@hhlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL

VERIFICATION OF COMPLAINT

By:

I, Alexandra Coles, citizen of Canada, resident of Orange County, California, and General Manager of Global Dermatology at Valeant Pharmaceuticals Case 8:08-cv-00449-AG-AGR Document 1 Filed 04/25/2008 International ("Valeant"), verify (i) that I am authorized to make and sign the Verified Complaint as set forth on behalf of Valeant in Valeant's Verified Complaint; (ii) that the facts and matters set forth therein have been generated and assembled by authorized employees, counsel, and experts of Valeant; and (iii) that I am informed and believe that the facts and matters set forth therein are true.

I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

Executed on April 23, 2008 in Milan, Italy.

Alexandra Coles General Manager of Global Dermatology Valeant Pharmaceuticals International

VERIFICATION

Page 13 of 13