

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.,	)	REDACTED -- PUBLIC VERSION
et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**PLAINTIFFS BAYER HEALTHCARE LLC AND  
BAYER HEALTHCARE PHARMACEUTICALS INC.'S  
ANSWERING 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

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP  
Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)  
Derek J. Fahnestock (#4705)  
Anthony D. Raucci (#5948)  
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.*

Original Filing Date: July 11, 2018  
Redacted Filing Date: July 17, 2018

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. ARGUMENT ..... 2

A. Bayer’s Construction of “an effective amount” Should be Adopted ..... 2

    1. Bayer’s Construction Is Consistent with the Express Definition in the Specification and the Claim Language ..... 2

    2. Teva’s Construction Is Unsupported ..... 2

        a. The Specification Contradicts Teva’s Construction ..... 3

        b. The Express Definition Is Not Ambiguous ..... 5

B. Bayer’s Proposal for “a subject who has been treated with imatinib” Should Be Adopted ..... 7

    1. The Phrase “a subject who has been treated with imatinib” Requires No Further Construction ..... 7

    2. Teva’s Construction Is Unsupported ..... 8

        a. The Claim Language Contradicts Teva’s Construction ..... 8

        b. The Specification and Prosecution History Contradict Teva’s Construction ..... 9

        c. Teva’s Remaining Arguments Are Unavailing ..... 14

    3. Teva’s Non-Infringement Position Is Incorrect ..... 15

III. CONCLUSION ..... 16

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Abbott Labs. v. Baxter Pharm. Prods., Inc.*,  
334 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 5

*Absolute Software, Inc. v. Stealth Signal, Inc.*,  
659 F.3d 1121 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 10

*Acorda Therapeutics v. Alkem Labs. Ltd.*,  
C.A. No. 14-882-LPS, 2016 WL 1045356 (D. Del. Mar. 16, 2016) ..... 6

*ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.*,  
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 8

*Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.*,  
C.A. No. 15-1455-WCB, 2016 WL 7210837 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 13, 2016) ..... 5

*AstraZeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc.*,  
633 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 16

*Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Merck & Co.*,  
C.A. No. 14-1131-GMS (D. Del. June 6, 2016)..... 6

*CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*,  
288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 3

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

*Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.*,  
599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 8

*Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
C.A. No. 15-1202-WCB, 2016 WL 7042234 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 11, 2016)..... 5

*Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equip., Inc.*,  
527 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 3

*Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. ITT Indus.*,  
452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 13

*Imagenetix, Inc. v. Robinson Pharma, Inc.*,  
C.A. No. 15-599-JLS, 2016 WL 6395941 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 14, 2016)..... 5

*In re Mobile Telecomm. Techs., LLC*,  
265 F. Supp. 3d 454 (D. Del. 2017)..... 14

*LifeNet Health v. LifeCell Corp.*,  
837 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 12

*Meds. Co. v. Mylan, Inc.*,  
853 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 13

*Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Xellia Pharm. ApS*,  
C.A. No. 14-199-RGA, 2015 WL 82386 (D. Del. Jan. 6, 2015) ..... 5

*Minn. Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*,  
303 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 5

*Moore U.S.A., Inc. v. Standard Register Co.*,  
229 F.3d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 15

*Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Int’l, Inc.*,  
778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 13

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)..... 3, 7, 10, 12

*Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*,  
182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 14, 15

*Poly-Am., L.P. v. API Indus., Inc.*,  
839 F.3d 1131 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 13

*Purdue Pharm. Prods., L.P. v. Actavis Elizabeth, LLC*,  
C.A. No. 12-5311-JLL, 2014 WL 2624787 (D.N.J. June 11, 2014) ..... 6

*Regents of the Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp.*,  
717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 13

*Retractable Techs., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.*,  
653 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 13

*Sanofi v. Glenmark Pharm. Inc., USA*,  
204 F. Supp. 3d 665 (D. Del. 2016)..... 16

*Script Sec. Sols. LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,  
No. C.A. 15-1030-WCB, 2016 WL 3959804 (E.D. Tex. July 22, 2016) ..... 12, 14

*ScriptPro LLC v. Innovation Assocs., Inc.*,  
833 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 9

*Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,  
802 F.3d 1283, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 7

*Takeda Pharm. Co. v. Mylan Inc.*,  
C.A. No. 13-4001-LHK, 2014 WL 5862134 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 11, 2004)..... 6

*Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.*,  
299 F.3d 1313, 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 9

*Thorner v. Sony Comput. Entm't Am. LLC*,  
669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 3

*U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.*,  
103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 4

*Unwired Planet, LLC v. Apple Inc.*,  
829 F.3d 1353, 1358-60 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 9, 12, 14

*Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.*,  
503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 13

*Voda v. Cordis Corp.*,  
536 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 10

*Wyeth v. Abbott Labs.*,  
C.A. No. 9-4850-JAP, 2011 WL 5873373 (D.N.J. Nov. 22, 2011)..... 6

**Regulations**

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 606.01 ..... 14

# 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.