

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS
CORPORATION and NOVARTIS AG,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRECKENRIDGE PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 14-1043-RGA

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS
CORPORATION and NOVARTIS AG,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 14-1289-RGA
C.A. No. 14-1494-RGA
C.A. No. 15-78-RGA

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS
CORPORATION and NOVARTIS AG,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WEST-WARD PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 14-1196-RGA
C.A. No. 14-1508-RGA
C.A. No. 15-128-RGA

NOVARTIS'S OPENING BRIEF ON ESTOPPEL UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page:
I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	1
II. ARGUMENT	4
1. Defendants Are Estopped Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2) From Maintaining Their § 103 Invalidity Challenge Against '772 Patent Claims 1-3 And 8-10.....	4
2. Breckenridge's Arguments For Why Estoppel Should Not Apply Here Lack Merit	6
3. This Court Need Not Consider Whether Estoppel Applies to Claim 7, But Regardless, Breckenridge and Par Are Estopped Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2) From Maintaining Their § 103 Invalidity Challenge	9
III. CONCLUSION.....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Am. Tech. Ceramics Corp. v. Presidio Components, Inc.</i> , No. 14-6544 (KAM)(GRB), 2019 WL 365709 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 30, 2019)	7
<i>Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. 10x Genomics, Inc.</i> , 322 F. Supp. 3d 537 (D. Del. 2018).....	5, 7
<i>Biscotti Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-01015-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 2526231 (E.D. Tex. May 11, 2017) adopted by 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 143675 (E.D. Tex. June 2, 2017)	7
<i>Cobalt Boats, LLC v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15cv21, 2017 WL 2605977 (E.D. Va. June 5, 2017).....	7
<i>Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Meyer Prods. LLC</i> , No. 14-cv-886-jdp, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58773 (W.D. Wis. Apr. 18, 2017).....	7
<i>Ilife Techs., Inc. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , No. 3:13-cv-4987-M, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 87769 (N.D. Tex. May 30, 2017)	8
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Toshiba Corp.</i> , 221 F. Supp. 3d 534 (D. Del. 2016).....	9
<i>Milwaukee Electric Tool Corp. v. Snap-On Inc.</i> , 271 F. Supp. 3d 990 (E.D. Wisc. 2017).....	7
<i>Network-1 Techs., Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc.</i> , No. 6:11-cv-00492-RWS, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 178857 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 27, 2017)	7
<i>Oil-Dri Corp. of Am. v. Nestlé Purina Petcare Co.</i> , No. 15-cv-1067, 2017 WL 3278915 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 2, 2017)	6, 7
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. Novartis AG</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00084, 2018 WL 389192 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 11, 2018).....	3, 4
<i>Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC v. IBM Corp.</i> , No. 13-2072 (KAJ), 2017 WL 1045912 (D. Del. Feb. 22, 2017).....	6, 7

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103.....1, 5, 9

35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2)..... *passim*

Other Authorities

157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl).....8

Pursuant to this Court’s February 28, 2019, order (C.A. No. 14-1043, D.I. 206), Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation and Novartis AG (collectively “Novartis”) file this brief explaining why the three Defendants¹ are estopped under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2) from asserting their sole remaining invalidity defense against claims 1-3, 7 and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 5,665,772 (“the ’772 patent”).² That 35 U.S.C. § 103 defense is based on prior art that Defendants knew about and “raised or reasonably could have raised during” the ’772 patent IPR proceedings for which there is a final written decision (claims 1-3 and 8-10³) and *de facto* final written decision (claim 7) upholding patentability. Because Defendants are estopped, judgment for Novartis should be entered, disposing of the above-captioned litigations. Thus, this Court need not evaluate Defendants’ substantive § 103 defense.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Novartis sued Defendants for ’772 patent infringement based on their generic versions of Novartis’s Zortress® and Afinitor® products in multiple litigations.⁴ The parties agreed that the

¹ Breckenridge Pharmaceutical, Inc. (“Breckenridge”), Par Pharmaceutical Inc. (“Par”) and West-Ward Pharmaceuticals International-Limited (f/k/a Roxane Laboratories, Inc., n/k/a Hikma Pharmaceuticals International Limited) (“West-Ward”) (collectively “Defendants”).

² Unlike Par and Breckenridge who filed counterclaims, West-Ward can only challenge claim 10 of the ’772 patent as Novartis withdrew its infringement contentions against claims 1-3 at trial, and against claim 7 after trial. *See* C.A. No. 14-1043, D.I. 162 at 1 n.1, D.I. 205 at 2.

³ Although claims 8 and 9 are discussed in this brief as they were included in the ’772 patent IPRs and estoppel applies to those claims, no party presented evidence on claims 8 or 9 at the ’772 patent trial and this Court need not address whether estoppel applies to those claims.

⁴ The first ’772 patent suits were filed in August 2014 (Breckenridge, C.A. No. 14-1043), September 2014 (West-Ward, C.A. No. 14-1196), and October 2014 (Par, C.A. No. 14-1289) (collectively, “the Zortress® litigations”). Six additional suits were subsequently filed, C.A. Nos. 14-1494 and 15-0078 (Par); 14-1508 and 15-0128 (West-Ward); and C.A. Nos. 16-0431-RGA and 17-00420 (Breckenridge) (collectively, “the Afinitor® litigations”). The Breckenridge Afinitor® litigations were dismissed in August 2018. *See* C.A. No. 16-431, D.I. 99, 108.



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.