

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

HELSINN HEALTHCARE S.A. and)	
ROCHE PALO ALTO LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. _____
)	
HOSPIRA, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiffs Helsinn Healthcare S.A. (“Helsinn”) and Roche Palo Alto LLC (“Roche”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), for their Complaint against Defendant Hospira, Inc. (“Hospira”) hereby allege as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Helsinn is a Swiss corporation having its principal place of business at Via Pian Scairolo, 9, CH-6912 Lugano-Pazzallo, Switzerland.
2. Roche is a company, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place of business at One DNA Way, South San Francisco, California 94080-4990.
3. Upon information and belief, Defendant Hospira is an entity organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with a principal place of business at 275 North Field Drive, Lake Forest, Illinois. Upon information and belief, Defendant Hospira manufactures, markets, and/or sells various generic drug products for sale and use in the State of Delaware and throughout the United States.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

4. This is a civil action concerning the infringement of United States Patent No. 7,947,724 (“the ’724 patent”), United States Patent No. 7,947,725 (“the ’725 patent”), United States Patent No. 7,960,424 (“the ’424 patent”), United States Patent No. 8,598,219 (“the ’219 patent”), and United States Patent No. 8,729,094 (“the ’094 patent”). This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 *et seq.*, as well as the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02.

6. This Court may declare the rights and other legal relations of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02 because this case is an actual controversy within the Court’s jurisdiction.

7. Venue is proper in this Court as to Defendant Hospira pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), (c), and/or (d), and 1400(b).

8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Hospira by virtue of the fact that, *inter alia*, Defendant Hospira has committed, aided, abetted, contributed to, and/or participated in the commission of a tortious act of patent infringement that has led to foreseeable harm and injury to Plaintiffs. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Hospira for the additional reasons set forth below, and for other reasons that will be presented to the Court if such jurisdiction is challenged.

9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Hospira by virtue of the fact that, *inter alia*, it: (1) is incorporated in Delaware; (2) engages in persistent conduct within Delaware, including, upon information and belief, the preparation and submission of

ANDA No. 207005; (3) has purposely availed itself of the privilege of doing business in this Judicial District; and (4) maintains extensive systematic contacts with the State of Delaware, including the marketing, distribution, and/or sale of generic pharmaceutical drugs to Delaware residents.

THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT

10. On May 24, 2011, the '724 patent, titled "Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulations of Palonosetron," was duly and legally issued to Plaintiffs as assignees. A copy of the '724 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

11. On May 24, 2011, the '725 patent, titled "Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulations of Palonosetron," was duly and legally issued to Plaintiffs as assignees. A copy of the '725 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

12. On June 14, 2011, the '424 patent, titled "Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulations of Palonosetron," was duly and legally issued to Plaintiffs as assignees. A copy of the '424 patent is attached as Exhibit C.

13. On December 3, 2013, the '219 patent, titled "Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulations of Palonosetron," was duly and legally issued to Plaintiffs as assignees. A copy of the '219 patent is attached as Exhibit D.

14. On May 20, 2014, the '094 patent, titled "Liquid Pharmaceutical Formulations of Palonosetron," was duly and legally issued to Plaintiffs as assignees. A copy of the '094 patent is attached as Exhibit E.

15. Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(b)(1), the '724 patent, the '725 patent, the '424 patent, the '219 patent, and the '094 patent are listed in the United States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") publication titled Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic

Equivalence Evaluations (also known as the “Orange Book”) as covering Helsinn’s Aloxi® brand palonosetron hydrochloride intravenous solutions.

ACTS GIVING RISE TO THIS ACTION

COUNT I – INFRINGEMENT OF THE ’724 PATENT

16. Plaintiffs reallege paragraphs 1-15 as if fully set forth herein.

17. Upon information and belief, Defendant Hospira submitted ANDA No. 207005 to the FDA under § 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)). ANDA No. 207005 seeks the FDA approval necessary to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of generic 0.25 mg / 5 mL palonosetron hydrochloride intravenous solutions prior to the expiration of certain of Plaintiffs’ Orange Book listed patents that have the same expiration date as the ’724 patent. ANDA No. 207005 specifically seeks FDA approval to market a generic version of Helsinn’s Aloxi® brand 0.25 mg / 5 mL palonosetron hydrochloride intravenous solutions prior to the expiration of the ’724 patent.

18. Upon information and belief, ANDA No. 207005 includes a certification under § 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act that the claims of the ’724 patent are invalid. Defendant Hospira notified Plaintiffs of its certification and provided a detailed statement of the alleged basis for the certification, but did not allege noninfringement of any claim of the ’724 patent, separate and apart from its assertions that those claims are allegedly invalid.

19. Defendant Hospira’s submission to the FDA of ANDA No. 207005, including the § 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) allegations, constitutes infringement of the ’724 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

20. Defendant Hospira's active and knowing participation in, contribution to, aiding, abetting, and/or inducement of the submission to the FDA of ANDA No. 207005 and the § 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) certification constitutes infringement of the '724 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (e)(2)(A).

21. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that, if Defendant Hospira commercially manufactures, uses, offers for sale, or sells its proposed generic versions of Helsinn's Aloxi® brand products within the United States, imports its proposed generic versions of Helsinn's Aloxi® brand products into the United States, and/or induces or contributes to such conduct, Defendant Hospira will infringe the '724 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), and/or (c).

22. Plaintiffs will be irreparably harmed by Defendant Hospira's infringing activities unless those activities are enjoined by this Court. Plaintiffs do not have an adequate remedy at law.

COUNT II – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '725 PATENT

23. Plaintiffs reallege paragraphs 1-22 as if fully set forth herein.

24. Upon information and belief, Defendant Hospira submitted ANDA No. 207005 to the FDA under § 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)). ANDA No. 207005 seeks the FDA approval necessary to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of generic 0.25 mg / 5 mL palonosetron hydrochloride intravenous solutions prior to the expiration of certain of Plaintiffs' Orange Book listed patents that have the same expiration date as the '725 patent. ANDA No. 207005 specifically seeks FDA approval to market a generic version of Helsinn's Aloxi® brand 0.25 mg / 5 mL palonosetron hydrochloride intravenous solutions prior to the expiration of the '725 patent.

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.