

EXHIBIT A

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.,)	
et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**PLAINTIFF BAYER’S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
TEVA’S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION (NOS. 1-89)**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs Bayer HealthCare LLC and Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“Bayer”), by undersigned counsel, hereby object and respond as follows to Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.’s (“Teva”) First Set of Requests for Production (Nos. 1-89). Documents produced in response to these requests (as set forth in detail below) will be produced on a rolling basis and in accordance with the Court’s Scheduling Order, which sets a date of May 15, 2018, for substantial completion of document production. Bayer began its rolling production of documents on December 13, 2017.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

The following General Objections form a part of, and are hereby incorporated into, the response to each and every request set forth below. Nothing in those responses, including any failure to recite a specific objection in response to a particular request, should be construed as a waiver of any of these General Objections.

that it refers to documents and electronically stored information relating to paragraph IV certifications not directed to regorafenib. Bayer construes the term “Notice Letters” to be limited to notice letters directed to regorafenib and will respond accordingly.

27. Bayer objects to Teva’s definitions of “Asserted claim” and “Accused product” to the extent that they seek documents or electronically stored information regarding contentions that Teva has not yet made in this litigation. Bayer will not prematurely produce documents or information that are to be provided during other stages of the litigation, but will only produce such documents and information in accordance with the Court’s schedule for this action.

28. Bayer objects to Teva’s definition of “Prior Art” as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, calling for a legal conclusion, and calling for a subjective determination. Bayer will not search for “prior art,” and neither Bayer’s responses nor any documents or electronically stored information that Bayer produces in response to a request should be construed as an admission that a particular document or thing is prior art to the patents-in-suit.

29. Bayer incorporates by reference all objections set forth in the General Objections of Plaintiffs’ Responses and Objections to Teva’s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-6).

30. Bayer expressly reserves the right to supplement these General Objections.

DEFINITIONS FOR PURPOSES OF BAYER’S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES

1. As used herein, “Named Inventors of the ’834 patent” means Bernd Riedl, Jacques Dumas, Uday Khire, Timothy Lowinger, William Scott, Roger A. Smith, Jill E. Wood, Mary-Katherine Monahan, Reina Natero, Joel Renick, and Robert Sibley.

2. As used herein, “Named Inventors of the ’553 patent” means Stephen Boyer, Jacques Dumas, Bernd Riedl, and Scott Wilhelm.

3. As used herein, “Named Inventors of the ’124 patent” means Scott Wilhelm and Richard W. Gedrich.

4. As used herein, “Named Inventors of the ’107 patent” means Juergen Stiehl, Werner Heilmann, Michael Löggers, Joachim Rehse, Michael Gottfried, and Saskia Wichmann.

5. As used herein, “Mylan Litigation” means *Bayer HealthCare LLC, et al., v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.*, No. 15-cv-114 (LPS) (D. Del.), and *Bayer HealthCare LLC, et al., v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.*, No. 15-cv-1162 (LPS) (D. Del.).

6. As used herein, “Files of the Named Inventors” means: (a) the files of the Named Inventors of the ’834 patent that were produced in the Mylan Litigation; (b) any non-privileged documents dated on or before July 22, 2004, that refer or relate to the research and development of regorafenib for use as a kinase inhibitor, located after a reasonable search of the files of the Named Inventors of the ’553 patent that are reasonably accessible to Bayer; (c) any non-privileged documents dated on or before January 18, 2008, that refer or relate to the use of regorafenib for the treatment of gastrointestinal stromal tumor (GIST), located after a reasonable search of the files of the Named Inventors of the ’124 patent that are reasonably accessible to Bayer; and (4) any non-privileged documents generated on or before April 15, 2010, that refer or relate to anilinic impurities in regorafenib, located after a reasonable search of the files of the Named Inventors of the ’107 patent that are reasonably accessible to Bayer.

7. As used herein, “Research and Development Documents” means copies of (a) the Files of the Named Inventors; (b) the batch records for regorafenib located after a reasonable search of Bayer’s central repository of batch records; (c) any non-privileged reports for regorafenib located after a reasonable search of Bayer’s electronic database containing Bayer’s Pharma reports; (d) relevant excerpts, not to include any confidential patient information, of New Drug Application (“NDA”) No. 203085, Bayer’s communications with FDA regarding NDA No. 203085, and Investigational New Drug Application (“IND”) Nos. 75642 and 113896. For

clarity, “Research and Development Documents” does not include, and specifically excludes, the documents and electronically stored information identified in exclusions from production and limitations on production as set forth in the General Objections.

8. As used herein, “Patent and Prosecution Documents” means copies of (a) each of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,351,834 (the “’834 patent”), 8,637,553 (the “’553 patent”); 8,680,124 (the “’124 patent”); and 9,458,107 (the “’107 patent”), their certified file histories, and any provisional or non-provisional applications to which they claim priority; (b) any agreements concerning the ’834, ’553, ’124, and ’107 patents that have been filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office; (c) any non-privileged documents that refer or relate to any of the ’553, ’124, and ’107 patents, and which are located after a reasonable search of (i) the department files of Bayer’s patent department for each of the ’553, ’124, and ’107 patents, and (ii) the patent prosecution files of Millen, White, Zelano and Branigan P.C. for each of the ’553, ’124, and ’107 patents; (d) documents from the department file(s) of Bayer’s patent department for the ’834 patent that were produced in the Mylan Litigation; and (e) documents from the prosecution file(s) of Millen, White, Zelano and Branigan P.C. for the ’834 patent that were produced in the Mylan Litigation. For clarity, “Patent and Prosecution Documents” does not include, and specifically excludes, the documents and electronically stored information identified in exclusions from production and limitations on production as set forth in the General Objections.

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.