

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

_____	)	
GENENTECH, INC. and CITY OF HOPE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 18-924-CFC
v.	)	
	)	
AMGEN, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	<b>PUBLIC VERSION FILED: July 19, 2019</b>
_____	)	

**GENENTECH'S COMBINED OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT  
OF ITS EMERGENCY MOTIONS FOR A TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER AND A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	2
A. Herceptin.....	2
B. Genentech’s Patents.....	3
C. Amgen’s Biosimilar Drug.....	4
ARGUMENT.....	5
I. THE COURT SHOULD ENTER A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION. ....	5
A. Genentech Is Likely to Succeed on the Merits.....	5
1. Infringement .....	6
a. Direct infringement .....	6
b. Inducement.....	8
2. Validity.....	9
B. Amgen’s Infringement Will Irreparably Harm Genentech. ....	10
1. Genentech will suffer irreparable harm.....	10
a. Price erosion.....	10
b. Lost market share .....	12
c. Effect on other products.....	13
d. Reputational harm .....	15
2. Genentech’s irreparable harm is connected to Amgen’s infringement. ....	16
C. The Balance of Hardships Favors Genentech. ....	17
D. Granting A Preliminary Injunction Serves The Public Interest. ....	18

II. THE COURT SHOULD ENTER A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER.....19

CONCLUSION.....20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10, 13
<i>Abraxis Bioscience, Inc. v. Navinta, LLC</i> , 640 F. Supp. 2d 553 (D.N.J. 2009) .....	6
<i>ACCO Brands, Inc. v. ABA Locks Mfrs. Co.</i> , 501 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	5
<i>Acumed LLC v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 551 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	17
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 695 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ( <i>Apple I</i> ).....	10
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 809 F.3d 633 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ( <i>Apple II</i> ).....	10, 16, 17
<i>AstraZeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 633 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	8, 9
<i>BioTechnology Gen. Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 80 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	15
<i>Celsis in Vitro, Inc. v. Cellzdirect, Inc.</i> , 664 F.3d 922 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	11, 18
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 2011 WL 1980610 (D. Del. May 20, 2011) .....	19, 20
<i>Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prods. Co.</i> , 717 F.3d 1336 (Fed Cir. 2013).....	16
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Parenteral Meds., Inc.</i> , 845 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	8
<i>Hoffman-La Roche, Inc. v. Cobalt Pharms., Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 4687839 (D.N.J. Nov. 10, 2010) .....	12
<i>Impax Labs. Inc. v. Aventis Pharms, Inc.</i> , 235 F. Supp. 2d 390 (D. Del. 2002).....	17

*Kos Pharms., Inc. v. Andrx Corp.*,  
369 F.3d 700 (3d Cir. 2004) ..... 17

*Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.*,  
848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 18

*Momenta Pharms., Inc. v. Amphastar Pharms.*,  
882 F. Supp. 2d 184 (D. Mass. 2011)..... 12

*Oxford Immunotec Ltd. v. Qiagen, Inc.*,  
271 F. Supp. 3d 358 (D. Mass. 2017)..... 9

*PPG Indus., Inc. v. Guardian Indus. Corp.*,  
75 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 9

*Pappan Enters, Inc. v. Hardee’s Food Sys., Inc.*,  
143 F.3d 800 (3d Cir. 1998) ..... 18

*Pfizer, Inc. v. Teva Pharms., USA, Inc.*,  
429 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 17

*Pozen Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.*,  
800 F. Supp. 2d 789 (E.D. Tex. 2011) ..... 15

*Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Boehringer Ingelheim GMBH*,  
237 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 9, 13

*Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.*,  
659 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 17

*Sanofi v. Glenmark Pharms. Inc., USA*,  
204 F. Supp. 3d 665 (D. Del. 2016) ..... 5

*Sanofi v. Watson Labs, Inc.*,  
875 F.3d 636, 644 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 5, 8

*Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex*,  
470 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 11, 12, 18

*Syntex (USA) LLC v. Apotex Inc.*,  
No. C 01-02214 MJJ, 2006 WL 1390435 (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2006)..... 19

*Tinnus Enterprises, LLC v. Telebrands Corp.*,  
846 F.3d 1190 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 5

*Tootsie Roll Indus., Inc. v. Sathers, Inc.*,  
666 F. Supp. 655 (D. Del. 1987)..... 19

# 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.