

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

---

**JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
A. Hospira's Introduction.....	1
B. Amneal's Introduction.....	1
1. Dexmedetomidine is not a new Drug.....	1
2. The Patents-in-Suit.....	2
3. Legal Principles .....	2
II. Agreed-Upon Constructions .....	4
III. Disputed Constructions.....	4
A. "dexmedetomidine" (all asserted claims).....	4
1. Hospira's Opening Position.....	4
2. Amneal's Answering Position.....	8
a. Intrinsic Evidence makes clear that "dexmedetomidine" refers to the free base form.....	8
b. Plaintiff's Proposed Construction of "demedetomidine" is Not Supported by the Specification or Prosecution History .....	12
3. Hospira's Reply Position.....	15
4. Amneal's Sur-Reply Position .....	18
B. "no more than about 2% decrease in the concentration of dexmedetomidine" ('106 patent, Claim 1).....	23
1. Hospira's Opening Position.....	23
2. Amneal's Answering Position.....	26
3. Hospira's Reply Position.....	30
4. Amneal's Sur-Reply Position .....	34
C. "critically ill" ('527 patent, Claim 10).....	36
1. Hospira's Opening Position.....	36

2. Amneal's Answering Position.....	38
3. Hospira's Reply Position.....	41
4. Amneal's Sur-Reply Position.....	43
D. "intensive care unit" ('527 patent, Claim 8).....	44
1. Hospira's Opening Position.....	45
2. Amneal's Answering Position.....	47
3. Hospira's Reply Position.....	50
4. Amneal's Sur-Reply Position.....	52

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>O1 Communique Lab., Inc. v. Logmein, Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	6, 20
<i>Accentra, Inc. v. Staples, Inc.</i> , 500 F. App'x 922 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	24
<i>AIA Eng'g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Int'l S/A</i> , 657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	16, 19
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., Ltd.</i> , 927 F.2d 1200 (Fed.Cir.1991).....	27, 31, 32
<i>Andrulis Pharm. Corp. v. Celgene Corp.</i> , No. 13-1644(RGA), 2015 WL 3978578 (D. Del. June 26, 2015) .....	44
<i>Arthur A. Collins Inc. v. N. Telecom Ltd.</i> , 216 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	51
<i>Bd. of Regents v. BENQ Am. Corp.</i> , 533 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	19
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	19
<i>BJ Servs. Co. v. Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc.</i> , 338 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	passim
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 388 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2004 ).....	48
<i>Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb–Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	52
<i>Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.</i> , 543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	24, 25
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corp.</i> , 561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	25
<i>Corning Optical Commc'ns Wireless, Ltd. v. SOLiD Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 5096472 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2015) .....	37

*Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs. Inc.*,  
138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....48

*dunnhumby USA, LLC v. emnos USA Corp.*,  
2015 WL 1542365 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 1, 2015) .....37

*Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.*,  
582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....7, 20

*Exxon Research & Eng’g Co. v. United States*,  
265 F.3d 1371 (Fed Cir. 2001).....27, 38, 39

*Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*,  
535 U.S. 722 (2002).....3

*Hospira, Inc. v. Eurohealth Int’l Sarl*,  
2015 WL 6697257 (D. Del. Nov. 3, 2015) ..... passim

*In re Imes*,  
778 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....15

*In re Rasmussen*,  
650 F.2d 1212 (C.C.P.A. 1981) .....48

*Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.*,  
766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....36, 40, 42

*Kustom Signals, Inc. v. Applied Concepts, Inc.*,  
264 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....8, 19

*Linear Tech. Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*,  
566 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....15

*Laitram Corp. v. Cambridge Wire Cloth Co.*,  
863 F.2d 855 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....48

*LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.*,  
424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....3

*Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.*,  
525 F.3d 1200 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....20, 52

*Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*,  
517 U.S. 370 (1996).....2

*Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*,  
52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), *aff’d*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996) .....3

# 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.