

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 REPLY POST-TRIAL BRIEF ON INVALIDITY

Of Counsel:

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

Dated: October 23, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. The Asserted Claims Are Invalid as Obvious.....	1
A. Hospira Cannot Avoid Inherency of the Claimed 2% Limitation by Rewriting the Law and Trial Record.....	1
1. Hospira Misstates the Law of Inherency Applicable to the Unrebutted Experimental Evidence.....	2
2. Hospira Misrepresents the Record in Asserting That There Was No Supporting Expert Testimony or That There Were Contrary Examples.....	3
3. Hospira Cannot Avoid Its Interrogatory Admission of Inherency.....	5
B. The Claimed 4 µg/mL Dex and Normal Saline in a Sealed Glass Container Was Obvious.....	7
1. The Sealed Glass Container Was Obvious, Regardless of What the Examiner Found.....	7
2. Hospira Urges the Court to Blindly Accept the Inventor’s Self- Serving Testimony Over the Expert Evidence.....	9
3. The Trial Record Contradicts Hospira’s “Hindsight” Argument.....	10
C. Hospira Has No Response to the Lack of Probative Commercial Success.....	12
II. The 2% Limitation of the ’106 Patent Is Indefinite.....	12
III. Conclusion.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac & Ugine</i> , 344 F.3d 1234 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	14
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	1, 7
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. et al.</i> , No. 15-cv-1455, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Oct. 16, 2017).....	12
<i>Hercules, Inc. v. Exxon Corp.</i> , 434 F. Supp. 136 (D. Del. 1977)	6
<i>In re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.</i> , 301 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	3
<i>In re Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	1, 7
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	1, 7
<i>King Pharm., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	1, 7
<i>Knauf Insulation, Inc. v. Rockwool Int’l A/S</i> , 680 F. App’x 956 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	5
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	8
<i>Life Techs., Inc. v. Contech Labs., Inc.</i> , 224 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	9, 10
<i>Medicines Co. v. Mylan, Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	14, 15
<i>Merck & Cie v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 822 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>Millennium Pharm., Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	3

Novo Nordisk A/S v. Caraco Pharm. Labs., Ltd.,
719 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....8

Omeprazole Patent Litig.,
583 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....7

Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs.,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....11

Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 2, 11

Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.,
120 F. Supp. 3d 468 (D. Md. 2015) 1, 2, 4, 5

Par Pharm. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 1, 10

Reckitt Benckiser Pharms. Inc. v. Watson Labs., Inc.,
Nos. 13-1674-RGA, 14-4222-RGA, 2016 WL 3186659 (D. Del. June 3, 2016) (Andrews, J).10

Sciele Pharma Inc. v. Lupin Ltd.,
684 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....8

Toro Co. v. Deere & Co.,
355 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....3

Federal Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 336

I. The Asserted Claims Are Invalid as Obvious.

Hospira's brief leads with the usual declamations against hindsight and for deference to the examiner. (*See* D.I. 106 at 1–11.) Amneal addresses these below, *infra* at 7–11. But first, Amneal addresses the specific obviousness issue on which the Court asked the parties to focus—that is, the inherency of the '106 patent's “no more than about 2% decrease” in the concentration of dexmedetomidine (“dex”) at five months. (Tr. 1178:6–11.)

A. Hospira Cannot Avoid Inherency of the Claimed 2% Limitation by Rewriting the Law and Trial Record.

Amneal showed that the trial record clearly and convincingly proves the factual issue of inherency, beginning with Hospira's own admission, and Dr. Yaman's testimony on the unrebutted and undisputed experimental evidence all showing less than about 2% decrease after at least five months. (D.I. 100 at 9–19.)

Unable to refute any of this dispositive evidence under existing law, Hospira tries to create new law. Hospira generally asserts that the experimental evidence and interrogatory response should be dismissed because they come from the inventors and the patent themselves. (D.I. 106 at 14–22.) Hospira's assertion contradicts the numerous Federal Circuit decisions cited by Amneal. These decisions confirm that evidence from the inventors' work reflected in the patents is not only relevant, but often *dispositive* proof of inherency. (D.I. 100 at 10–14 (citing *In re Kubin*, 561 F.3d 1351, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2009); *In re Kao*, 639 F.3d 1057, 1070 (Fed. Cir. 2011); *Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.*, 687 F.3d 1362, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *King Pharm., Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc.*, 616 F.3d 1267, 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2010)).) Moreover, the few legal authorities on inherency that Hospira does acknowledge—including the *Par v. TWi* decisions—unmistakably counter Hospira's argument about the relevance of the patentee's work here. (*See* D.I. 106 at 16 (citing *Par Pharm. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1186, 1194–96 (Fed. Cir. 2014) and *Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharm., Inc.*, 120 F. Supp. 3d 468, 475 (D. Md. 2015), *aff'd*, 624 F. App'x 756 (Fed. Cir. 2015)).)

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.