

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

HOSPIRA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 15-697-RGA

AMNEAL'S OPENING POST-TRIAL BRIEF ON INVALIDITY

Of Counsel:

Steven A. Maddox
Jeremy J. Edwards
Matthew C. Ruedy
Kaveh V. Saba
Maddox Edwards PLLC
1900 K Street N.W., Suite 725
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 830-0707
smaddox@meiplaw.com
jedwards@meiplaw.com
mruedy@meiplaw.com
ksaba@meiplaw.com

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)
Kelly E. Farnan (#4395)
Christine D. Haynes (#4697)
Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.
920 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 651-7700
cottrell@rlf.com
farnan@rlf.com
haynes@rlf.com

*Attorneys for Defendant-Counterclaim Plaintiff
Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. The Asserted Claims Were Obvious Based on the Prior Art Precedex Concentrate Product and Package Insert Alone, and in View of Other Literature on Parenteral Drug Products. 2

 A. The Asserted Claims of the '158, '470, and '527 Patents Are Obvious..... 3

 1. The Prior Art Precedex Concentrate Product and Package Insert Taught Practically Every Element of the Claimed Invention. 3

 2. The Prior Art Precedex Concentrate Product and Package Insert Taught Practically Every Element of the Claimed Invention. 4

 3. A Sealed Glass Container of 4 µg/mL Dex in Saline Was Obvious in Light of the Precedex Concentrate Product and Labeling and What Was Known in the Art. 5

 4. Literature on Ready to Use Parenteral Products Provided Further Motivation to Achieve the Claimed Invention. 7

 5. Hospira Could Not Refute the Reasonable Expectation of Success in Storing the 4 µg/mL Dex Saline Formulation in Glass. 8

 B. The '106 Patent's Additional Element of "No More Than About 2% Decrease" in Concentration at Five Months Is an Inherent Characteristic of the Obvious Composition in a Sealed Glass Container..... 9

 1. Inherency in the Context of Obviousness Is a Question of Fact That Exists When a Limitation Is the Necessary or Natural Result of an Obvious Combination of Elements in the Prior Art..... 10

 2. Hospira's Interrogatory Admission and the '106 Patent Provide Clear and Convincing Evidence of Inherency. 12

 3. The Undisputed Experimental Evidence of Less than About 2% Concentration Decrease After Five Months in a Sealed Glass Container Also Proves Inherency..... 14

 4. Hospira's Arguments Against Inherency Are Not Rooted in Evidence and Are Legally Irrelevant. 16

 C. There Is No Commercial Success Indicative of Non-Obviousness. 19

III. The '106 Patent Is Indefinite Under Section 112. 20

 A. Indefiniteness and the Interpretation of Intrinsic Evidence Is a Question of

Law for the Court, Applying General Principles of Claim Construction.....20

B. The Intrinsic Evidence and Undisputed Facts Render Claim 6 of the '106 Patent Indefinite as a Matter of Law.23

C. Dr. Linhardt's Opinion Is Irrelevant as a Matter of Law.25

D. Even If Not Legally Irrelevant, Dr. Linhardt's Opinion Is Irrelevant as a Matter of Fact.....27

IV. The Proper Construction of "Sealed Glass Container" and "Ready to Use"28

A. "Sealed Glass Container" Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning from the Intrinsic Evidence.28

B. "Ready to Use" Should Be Given Its Straight-Forward Definition in the Patent.....29

V. The Claims Are Anticipated or Obvious Based on Trissel.....30

VI. Conclusion.....30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| Federal Cases | |
| <i>3form, Inc. v. Lumicor, Inc.</i> , 678 F. App'x 1002 (Fed. Cir. 2017) | 11, 16 |
| <i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... | 11, 13 |
| <i>Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... | 19 |
| <i>Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... | 18 |
| <i>Bell Atl. Network Servs. v. Covad Commc'ns Grp.</i> , 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... | 26 |
| <i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 26 |
| <i>Brown v. 3M</i> , 265 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... | 18 |
| <i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , 117 F. Supp. 3d 632 (D.Del. 2015)..... | 23, 26 |
| <i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chem. Corp.</i> , 803 F.3d 620 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 21, 22, 23, 27 |
| <i>Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Tolmar, Inc.</i> , 737 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... | 19 |
| <i>General Elec. Co. v. Joiner</i> , 522 U.S. 136 (1997)..... | 9, 26 |
| <i>Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.</i> , 52 F.3d 1043 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... | 16 |
| <i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... | 11 |
| <i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... | 2, 9, 11, 13 |
| <i>In re O'Farrell</i> , 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... | 2, 9 |

J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co.,
106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....20

King Pharm., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.,
616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....14

Knauf Insulation, Inc. v. Rockwool Int’l A/S,
680 F. App’x 956 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 16, 17

Lighting Ballast Control LLC v. Philips Elecs. N. Am. Corp.,
790 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....26

Martek Biosciences Corp. v. Nutrinova, Inc.,
579 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....29

Merck & Co. v. Teva, Pharm. USA, Inc.,
395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....19

Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Hospira Inc.,
221 F. Supp. 3d 497 (D. Del. 2016) (Andrews, J.).....19

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,
134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014)..... 20, 21

Omeprazole Patent Litig.,
483 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....13

Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.,
120 F. Supp. 3d 468 (D. Md. 2015), *aff’d*, 624 F. App’x 756 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 11, 16, 18

Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....10

Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....2

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)..... 26, 30

Profectus Tech. LLC v. Huawei Tech. Co., Ltd.,
823 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....26

Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.,
694 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....19

Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 21, 22, 23, 25

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.