

LETTER OPINION

VIA CM/ECF

All counsel of record

Re: *Randy Smith v. Antares Pharma, Inc., et al.*,
Civil Action No. 17-8945 (MAS) (DEA)

Dear Counsel:

This matter comes before the Court upon Defendants Antares Pharma, Inc.'s ("Antares" or the "Company"), Robert Apple, Fred Powell, and Leonard Jacob's (collectively, "Defendants") Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Third Amended Class Action Complaint. (ECF No. 72.) Lead Plaintiff Serghei Lungu ("Plaintiff") opposed (ECF No. 76) and Defendants replied (ECF No. 78). The Court has carefully considered the parties' submissions and decides the matter without oral argument pursuant to Local Civil Rule 78.1. For the reasons set forth herein, Defendants' Motion is granted.

I. Background

The parties are familiar with the factual and procedural history of this matter, and therefore the Court only recites those facts necessary to resolve the instant motion. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class of persons who purchased Antares common stock between December 21, 2016 and October 12, 2017, both dates inclusive (the "Class Period"). (Cons. Third Am. Class Action Compl. ("TAC") ¶ 1, ECF No. 66.) Antares is a company that develops, manufactures, and commercializes therapeutic products using drug delivery systems. (*Id.* ¶¶ 2-3.) The non-Company Defendants were executives at Antares during the Class Period. (*See id.* ¶¶ 27-29, 122.)

This action principally arises from statements that Defendants allegedly made during the Class Period. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants misled investors by downplaying and misstating the incidence of certain adverse events¹—hypertension, suicidality, and depression—observed in two Phase 3 clinical studies² of Antares's lead product, QuickShot Testosterone ("QST"). (*Id.*

¹ "Adverse event means any untoward medical occurrence associated with the use of a drug in humans, whether or not considered drug related." 21 C.F.R. § 312.32.

² Phase 3 studies "are performed after preliminary evidence suggesting effectiveness of the drug has been obtained and are intended to gather the additional information about effectiveness and

pressure (i.e., hypertension); and (b) the instance of suicidality [and] depression.” (*Id.* ¶ 97.) Defendants allegedly knew of QST’s hypertension risk, “yet consciously sought to downplay its significance instead of disclosing the direct link between QST and elevated blood pressure that the FDA would ultimately force the Company to acknowledge.” (*Id.* ¶ 102.) Defendants are also alleged to have inaccurately reported the instances of suicide and depression. (*Id.* ¶ 105.) Plaintiff alleges that Antares, accordingly, “overstated the approval prospects for [QST],” (*id.* ¶¶ 136, 139, 143, 145, 147, 150, 156), and artificially inflated Antares share prices (*id.* ¶¶ 25, 188, 192-93).

In a previous complaint, Plaintiff challenged eight instances in which Defendants allegedly made false or misleading statements in violation of Rule 10b-5 and Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”). *Smith v. Antares Pharma, Inc.*, No. 17-8945, 2020 WL 2041752, at *4 (D.N.J. Apr. 28, 2020). These included: (1) a press release dated December 21, 2016; (2) a press release dated February 27, 2017; (3) a form 10-K dated March 14, 2017; (4) a press release dated April 3, 2017; (5) a conference call on May 9, 2017; (6) a form 10-Q dated May 9, 2017; (7) a conference call on August 8, 2017; and (8) a form 10-Q dated August 8, 2017. *Id.*

After considering the Second Amended Complaint’s (“SAC”) allegations regarding these statements, the Court found that Plaintiff’s Section 10(b) claims failed for a variety of reasons. For example, the Court found that Plaintiff “fail[ed] to plead economic loss and loss causation. It is not enough to allege an ‘artificially inflated purchase price’ as an economic loss.” *Id.* at *10 (quoting *Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336, 347 (2005)). The Court also found that Plaintiff failed to plead facts that gave rise to a strong inference of scienter with respect to the foregoing statements. *Id.* at *8-9. Additionally, the Court found that for all but one of these statements, Plaintiff failed to adequately plead facts showing that they were false or misleading for the purposes of Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 liability. *Id.* at *5-7.³ Nevertheless, the Court found that even if Plaintiff had adequately alleged that any of these statements were false or misleading, Plaintiff had failed to plead facts showing that these statements were material. (*Id.* at *7-8.) Finally, the April 28, 2020 Opinion also dismissed Plaintiff’s Section 20(a) claims because

safety that is needed to evaluate the overall benefit-risk relationship of the drug and to provide an adequate basis for physician labeling.” 21 C.F.R. § 312.21(c).

³ The SAC cited “Apple’s statement during the August 8, 2017 conference call that ‘anyone who is diagnosed with testosterone deficiency, we believe, is the perfect candidate for Xyosted.’” *Id.* at *7 (quoting SAC ¶ 145, ECF No. 46) “Apple also stated, ‘I think that there isn’t any particular patient population that has testosterone deficiency that we’re excluding or that we think is a better candidate.’” *Id.* (quoting SAC ¶ 146). The Court found “that these statements could be misleading considering hypersensitive patients are excluded from” one of the relevant studies. *Id.*

The Third Amended Complaint does, however, add new allegations relating to the scienter element of Plaintiff's Section 10(b) claim. According to Plaintiff, a confidential witness, CW2, who was the director of Quality Assurance for Antares from November 2012 to June 2017, alleges that "everyone at the Company knew about the safety issues with Xyosted because they had to postpone the launch and do an additional safety study (QST-15-005)." (TAC ¶ 121.) According to CW2, "[t]here were only twenty-five (25) to thirty (30) employees at the Ewing headquarters, making it so it would have been impossible for CEO Apple and CFO Powell[] not to know about the safety issues that ultimately resulted in boxed warning." (*Id.*) Furthermore, CW2 alleges that "when company employees started hearing about Phase 3 clinical trial-patients having elevated blood pressure, committing suicide, and exacerbating depression, they discussed those issues at the regular, weekly meetings" held by CW2's team. (*Id.* ¶¶ 129-30.) Plaintiff also alleges that "for the second, six-month study (QST-15-005), monitoring devices for blood pressure were used so if someone tested high, they were not allowed into the study, and questions about depression [were] included in the questionnaire to exclude anyone with a history of depression." (*Id.* ¶ 132.)

Moreover, although the SAC previously challenged certain statements in the December 21, 2016 and February 27, 2017 press releases, (*see* SAC ¶¶ 128, 131), the TAC takes issue with additional statements contained within these documents. In the now-operative TAC, Plaintiff asserts that in the December 21, 2016 press release, "Defendant Apple further claimed that another 'benefit to patients is a virtually painless treatment experience as demonstrated by the pain data collected in our phase 3 program.'" (TAC ¶ 134). "We will work closely with the FDA during the regulatory review process towards a potential approval with the goal of bringing this new treatment option to men diagnosed with hypogonadism." (*Id.*) With respect to the February 27, 2017 press release, "[t]he company further stated that 'the study data also showed patients had a virtually painless treatment experience using the device. We will work closely with the FDA during the regulatory review process toward a potential approval.'" (*Id.* ¶ 137).

II. Legal Standard

A district court must conduct a three-part analysis when considering a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *See Malleus v. George*, 641 F.3d 560, 563 (3d Cir. 2011). The Court must take note of the elements a plaintiff must plead to state a claim; review the complaint to strike conclusory allegations; and accept as true all of the plaintiff's well-pled factual allegations while "constru[ing] the complaint in the light most favorable to the

⁴ The Second Amended Complaint was itself filed after the Court dismissed an even earlier complaint that failed to adequately plead securities fraud. *See Smith v. Antares Pharma, Inc.*, No. 17-8945, 2019 WL 2785600, at *11 (D.N.J. July 2, 2019).

constituting fraud or mistake. Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”) also imposes a heightened standard “to curb frivolous, lawyer-driven litigation, while preserving investors’ ability to recover on meritorious claims.” *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, 551 U.S. 308, 322 (2007).

III. Discussion

A plaintiff bringing an action under Section 10(b) and Rule 10b–5 must plead: “(1) a material misrepresentation or omission by the defendant; (2) scienter; (3) a connection between the misrepresentation or omission and the purchase or sale of a security; (4) reliance upon the misrepresentation or omission; (5) economic loss; and (6) loss causation.” *Matrixx, Initiatives, Inc. v. Siracusano*, 563 U.S. 27, 37-38 (2011) (quoting *Stoneridge Inv. Partners, LLC v. ScientificAtlanta, Inc.*, 552 U.S. 148, 157 (2008)). “[T]he PSLRA imposes greater particularity requirements concerning alleged material misrepresentations and scienter.” *Fan v. StoneMor Partners LP*, 927 F.3d 710, 714 (3d Cir. 2019).

A. The TAC’s New Factual Assertions Relating to Falsity and Materiality

The Court finds that Plaintiff’s new factual assertions regarding QST’s “virtually painless treatment experience” fail to support the falsity or materiality elements of Section 10(b) liability.

“[Section] 10(b) and Rule 10b–5(b) do not create an affirmative duty to disclose any and all material information. Disclosure is required . . . only when necessary ‘to make . . . statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.’” *Matrixx*, 563 U.S. at 44 (quoting 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b–5(b)). “[Defendants’] statements are only actionable if, when read in light of all the information then available to the market or a failure to disclose particular information, [Defendants] conveyed a false or misleading impression.” *Fan*, 927 F.3d at 715 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). Under the PSLRA, a complaint must “specify each statement alleged to have been misleading, the reason or reasons why the statement is misleading, and, if an allegation . . . is made on information and belief, . . . state with particularity all facts on which that belief is formed.” *City of Edinburgh Council v. Pfizer, Inc.*, 754 F.3d 159, 166 (3d Cir. 2014) (quoting 15 U.S.C. § 78u–4(b)(1)(B)).

“Interpretations of clinical trial data are considered opinions. Opinions are only actionable under the securities laws if they are not honestly believed and lack a reasonable basis.” *Edinburgh*, 754 F.3d at 170 (internal citations omitted). A company’s press release releasing “positive” study results is not misleading where the plaintiff fails to allege that the opinion lacked a reasonable basis. *See, e.g., Biondolillo v. Roche Holding Ag.*, No. 17-4056, 2018 WL 4562464, at *5 (D.N.J. Sept. 24, 2018); *cf. In re Merck & Co., Sec., Derivative, & ERISA Litig.*, 2011 WL 3444199, at

Basic Inc. v. Levinson, 485 U.S. 224, 231-32 (1988) (citing *ISC Indus., Inc. v. Northway, Inc.*, 426 U.S. 438, 449 (1976)) (internal quotation marks omitted); *In re Aetna, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 617 F.3d 272, 283 (3d Cir. 2010).

“Assessing the materiality of adverse event reports is a fact-specific inquiry that requires consideration of the source, content, and context of the reports.” *Matrixx*, 563 U.S. at 43 (internal citation and quotation marks omitted). Nevertheless, “complaints alleging securities fraud often contain claims of omissions or misstatements that are obviously so unimportant that courts can rule them immaterial as a matter of law at the pleading stage.” *In re Burlington Coat Factory Sec. Litig.*, 114 F.3d 1410, 1426 (3d Cir. 1997). Relatedly, “[m]aterial representations must be contrasted with statements of subjective analysis or extrapolations, such as opinions, motives[,] and intentions, or general statements of optimism[.]” *Aetna*, 617 F.3d at 283 (citation omitted). “[V]ague and general statements of optimism . . . are not material [because] a reasonable investor would not base decisions on such statements.” *Fan*, 927 F.3d at 716.

Just as the SAC challenged statements in the December 21, 2016 and February 27, 2017 press releases, the TAC again challenges statements in these documents. *See Smith*, 2020 WL 2041752, at *5. In the now-operative TAC, Plaintiff asserts that in the December 21, 2016 press release, “Defendant Apple further claimed that another ‘benefit to patients is a virtually painless treatment experience as demonstrated by the pain data collected in our phase 3 program.” (TAC ¶ 134). Similarly, with respect to the February 27, 2017 press release, “[t]he company further stated that ‘the study data also showed patients had a virtually painless treatment experience using the device.’” (*Id.* ¶ 137).

Plaintiff argues that these statements reporting study results were false or misleading in light of Defendants’ knowledge of adverse events related to hypertension and suicide. Here, the press releases offer interpretations of the clinical trial data and are considered opinions. *See Edinburgh*, 754 F.3d at 170. But because Plaintiff fails to plead facts that show that Defendants did not have a reasonable basis for their opinions that QST was “virtually painless,” Plaintiff has not demonstrated that these statements are actionable. With respect to materiality, as Defendants persuasively argue, “[a]ny reasonable investor would understand this statement to be a commentary on injection pain—not safety or adverse events.” (Defs.’ Moving Br. 25, ECF No. 71-1 (citations omitted).)

B. The TAC’s New Factual Assertions Relating to Scienter

CW2’s allegations do not establish that any of the Defendants’ challenged statements were made with the scienter necessary to establish Section 10(b) violations. Scienter is “a mental state embracing intent to deceive, manipulate, or defraud,” *Matrixx*, 563 U.S. at 48 (citing *Tellabs*, 551

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.