

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| BAYER HEALTHCARE LLC and BAYER |) | |
| HEALTHCARE PHARMACEUTICALS |) | |
| INC., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | |
| |) | C.A. No. 16-1221 (LPS) |
| v. |) | CONSOLIDATED |
| |) | |
| TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., |) | |
| APOTEX INC., and APOTEX CORP., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

**PLAINTIFFS BAYER HEALTHCARE LLC AND
BAYER HEALTHCARE PHARMACEUTICALS INC.’S
OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

OF COUNSEL:

Bruce R. Genderson
Adam L. Perlman
Dov P. Grossman
Jessica B. Rydstrom
Seth R. Bowers
Ben Picozzi
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 434-5000

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Derek J. Fahnestock (#4705)
Anthony D. Raucci (#5948)
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
jblumenfeld@mnat.com
dfahnestock@mnat.com
araucci@mnat.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Bayer HealthCare LLC
and Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc.*

June 13, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 1

III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 4

IV. ARGUMENT 6

 A. The Court Should Adopt Bayer’s Construction of “an effective amount” 6

 1. Bayer’s Construction Is Consistent with the Express Definition in
 the Specification and the Claim Language 6

 2. Teva’s Construction Is Unsupported 7

 B. The Court Should Adopt Bayer’s Construction of the Phrase “a subject
 who has been treated with imatinib” 10

 1. The Phrase “a subject who has been treated with imatinib”
 Requires No Further Construction 10

 2. The Court Should Reject Teva’s Construction of “a subject who
 has been treated with imatinib” 11

V. CONCLUSION..... 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abbott Labs. v. Baxter Pharm. Prods., Inc.,
334 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 10

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 11

Carotek, Inc. v. Kobayashi Ventures, LLC,
C.A. No. 08-5706-NRB, 2011 WL 4056746 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 8, 2011) 10

CyberFone Sys., LLC v. Cellco P’ship,
885 F. Supp. 2d 710 (D. Del. 2012)..... 10

Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber,
674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 9

Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.,
569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 7

Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.,
599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 12

Geneva Pharm., Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC,
349 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 10

In re Gardner,
480 F.2d 879 (C.C.P.A. 1973) 13

Martek Biosciences Corp. v. Nutrinova, Inc.,
579 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 6

Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Xellia Pharm. ApS,
C.A. No. 14-199-RGA, 2015 WL 82386 (D. Del. Jan. 6, 2015) 10

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)..... 6, 8, 9, 14

Sanofi v. Glenmark Pharm. Inc.,
C.A. No. 14-264-RGA, 2015 WL 5092631 (D. Del. Aug. 28, 2015)..... 10

Sanofi v. Lupin Atlantis Holdings S.A.,
C.A. No. 15-415-RGA, 2016 WL 5842327 (D. Del. Oct. 3, 2016)..... 10

Semcon Tech, LLC v. Micron Tech., Inc.,
C.A. No. 12-532-RGA, 2014 WL 4447017 (D. Del. Sept. 9, 2014) 10

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Sipnet EU S.R.O.</i> , 806 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 12 |
| <i>Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 11 |
| <i>Trading Techs. Int’l, Inc. v. eSpeed, Inc.</i> , 595 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... | 7 |
| <i>U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.</i> , 103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... | 10 |

I. INTRODUCTION

This claim-construction dispute involves two claim terms—“an effective amount” and “a subject who has been treated with imatinib”—recited in U.S. Patent No. 8,680,124 (“the ’124 patent”). The ’124 patent is one of four patents asserted by Plaintiffs Bayer HealthCare LLC and Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc. (collectively, “Plaintiffs” or “Bayer”) against Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (“Teva”) and relates to certain methods of using regorafenib, the active pharmaceutical ingredient in Bayer’s Stivarga® drug product.

Neither disputed claim term requires elaborate construction. The specification expressly defines “effective amount” to mean “the amount of [regorafenib] which is effective to treat any symptom or aspect of the cancer.” The claim language also makes clear that “an effective amount” can be used to treat a “malignant” or “benign” gastrointestinal stromal tumor. Bayer therefore proposes that the phrase “an effective amount” should be construed to mean “an amount which is effective to treat any symptom or aspect of the cancer *or the tumor*.” As for the phrase “a subject who has been treated with imatinib,” the claim language and specification confirm that it means exactly what it says. It therefore does not require further construction.

Despite the straightforward nature of the claim-construction exercise here, Teva (1) proposes a lengthy, complex, and unsupported construction for “an effective amount,” and (2) imports a limitation into “a subject who has been treated with imatinib” that improperly restricts the meaning of that phrase to circumstances where the subject’s cancer has developed resistance to imatinib. Neither construction is warranted. Accordingly, this Court should adopt Bayer’s proposed constructions.

II. BACKGROUND

This Hatch-Waxman Act case concerns Bayer’s Stivarga® drug product. As set forth in more detail in the FDA-approved labeling, Stivarga® is an anti-cancer drug approved to treat

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.