

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

BAXTER HEALTHCARE )  
CORPORATION, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 ) C.A. No. 18-303-RGA  
v. )  
 )  
HOSPIRA, INC. and ORION CORP., )  
 )  
Defendants. )

**DEFENDANTS' BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR  
MOTION TO DISMISS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO STAY  
COUNTS III-IX OF BAXTER'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

*Of Counsel:*

Bradford P. Lyerla  
Sara T. Horton  
Yusuf Esat  
Ren-How Harn  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
353 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60654-3456  
Telephone: 312 222-9350  
Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
blyerla@jenner.com  
shorton@jenner.com  
yesat@jenner.com  
rharn@jenner.com

CONNOLLY GALLAGHER LLP  
Arthur G. Connolly, III (#2667)  
Ryan P. Newell (#4744)  
The Brandywine Building  
1000 West Street, Suite 1400  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 757-7300  
aconnolly@connollygallagher.com  
rnewell@connollygallagher.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Hospira, Inc. and  
Orion Corp.*

Dated: November 14, 2018

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	NATURE AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS .....	2
III.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
IV.	STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	5
A.	Baxter’s Antitrust Allegations .....	6
B.	The ‘867 Patent Had No Effect On The Timing Of Baxter’s FDA Approval .....	6
1.	A patent addressed by a section viii statement will not serve as a barrier to ANDA approval .....	7
2.	Baxter’s ANDA addresses the ‘867 patent with a section viii statement, but submits Paragraph IV certifications for the Glass Patents .....	8
3.	Baxter’s allegations regarding a first applicant for the ‘867 patent.....	10
V.	ARGUMENT.....	11
A.	Governing Law .....	11
B.	Baxter’s Antitrust Claims Fail To Plausibly Allege That Any Act Of Defendants Caused Any Harm To Baxter .....	13
1.	The ‘867 patent did not delay Baxter’s approval because Baxter submitted a section viii carve-out for the patent.....	14
2.	The ‘867 patent did not delay Baxter’s approval because the first-filer did not maintain a Paragraph IV challenge to the patent .....	15
C.	Baxter’s Antitrust Claims Fail To Allege Antitrust Injury .....	16
1.	Baxter’s alleged injury was a barrier controlled by a third party competitor that affected which of two competitors could launch first .....	18
2.	Any delay in FDA approval of Baxter’s ANDA did not flow from the existence of any 180-day exclusivity due to the ‘867 patent, even if such exclusivity existed .....	19

3.	None of the alleged antitrust violations that occurred within the four-year period of the statute of limitations caused any delay in FDA approval of Baxter's ANDA .....	19
D.	Counts Three And Nine Should Be Dismissed Because Baxter Fails To Adequately Plead Deceptive Intent.....	21
E.	In The Alternative, Counts Four-Nine Should Be Stayed Because They May Become Moot .....	24
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	26

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Ist Media, LLC v. Elec. Arts</i> , 694 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	23
<i>Apotex, Inc. v. Senju Pharm. Co.</i> , 921 F. Supp. 2d 308 (D. Del. 2013).....	26
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	11, 12
<i>AstraZeneca Pharm. LP v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 669 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	11, 12, 13
<i>Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, Inc.</i> , 429 U.S. 477 (1977).....	4, 17, 19
<i>Cumberland Pharm. Inc. v. Sagent Agila LLC</i> , No. CV 12-825-LPS, 2013 WL 5913742 (D. Del. 2013).....	13
<i>Eon Labs Mfg. Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.</i> , 164 F. Supp. 2d 350 (S.D.N.Y. 2001).....	15
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	21, 22, 23, 24
<i>Frederico v. Home Depot</i> , 507 F.3d 188 (3d Cir. 2007).....	12
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , No. CIV.A. 09-4591 MLC, 2012 WL 1587688 (D.N.J. May 4, 2012), <i>vacated</i> , No. CIV.A. 09-4591 MLC, 2014 WL 794589 (D.N.J. Feb. 27, 2014).....	22
<i>In re Burlington Coat Factory Sec. Litig.</i> , 114 F.3d 1410 (3d Cir. 1997).....	12
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	13
<i>Mariana v. Fisher</i> , 338 F.3d 189 (3d Cir. 2003).....	13, 15

*Masimo Corp. v. Philips Elecs. N. Am. Corp.*,  
 No. CIV.A 09-80-JJF-MPT, 2010 WL 925864 (D. Del. Mar. 11, 2010).....24, 25

*Orthophoenix, LLC v. Dfine, Inc.*,  
 No. CV 13-1003-LPS, 2015 WL 1938702 (D. Del. Apr. 28, 2015).....25, 26

*Philadelphia Taxi Ass’n, Inc v. Uber Techs., Inc.*,  
 886 F.3d 332 (3d Cir. 2018), *cert. denied sub nom. Philadelphia Taxi Ass’n,  
 Inc. v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 2018 WL 3306879 (Oct. 1, 2018) .....13

*Pressure Prods. Med. Supplies, Inc. v. Greatbatch Ltd.*,  
 599 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....21

*Princo Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*,  
 616 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....13

*Prof’l Real Estate Inv’rs, Inc. v. Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc.*,  
 508 U.S. 49 (1993).....25

*TCA Bldg. Co. v. Northwestern Res. Co.*,  
 861 F. Supp. 1366 (S.D. Tex. 1994).....5, 20

*Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sebelius*,  
 595 F.3d 1303 (D.C. Cir. 2010).....14, 20

*Umland v. PLANCO Fin. Serv., Inc.*,  
 542 F.3d 59 (3d Cir. 2008).....12

*Westlake Services, LLC v. Credit Acceptance Corp.*,  
 No. 15-cv-07490, 2017 WL 8948263 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 28, 2017).....20

*Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.*,  
 401 U.S. 321 (1971).....19

**STATUTES**

21 U.S.C. § 355 (j)(5)(C).....18

21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(viii).....8

21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(5)(B)(iv) .....14

21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(5)(B)(iv)(II)(bb) .....7, 11, 16

21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(5)(D).....9

35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(5).....18

# 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.