

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

GENENTECH, INC. and CITY OF)	
HOPE,)	
)	
Plaintiffs and Counterclaim)	
Defendants,)	
)	C.A. No. 1:19-cv-00638-CFC
v.)	
)	
PFIZER INC.,)	
)	
Defendant and)	
Counterclaim Plaintiff.)	
)	
PFIZER INC.,)	
)	
Counterclaim Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE, INC.,)	
)	
Counterclaim Defendant.)	

**DEFENDANT’S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS AND COUNTERCLAIM
DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS DEFENDANT’S
COUNTERCLAIMS AND TO STRIKE CERTAIN AFFIRMATIVE
DEFENSES**

HEYMAN ENERIO
GATTUSO & HIRZEL LLP
Dominick T. Gattuso (No. 3630)
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
(308) 472-7300
dgattuso@hegh.law

OF COUNSEL:

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER

LLP

Thomas J. Meloro

Michael W. Johnson

Dan Constantinescu

787 Seventh Avenue

New York, NY 10019

(212) 728-8000

*Attorneys for Defendant and
Counterclaim Plaintiff Pfizer Inc.*

Dated: June 3, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
I. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	2
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	4
III. PFIZER’S COUNTERCLAIMS ARE NOT BARRED UNDER THE BPCIA.....	5
A. Pfizer Has Not Violated 42 U.S.C. § 262(l)(2)(A)	6
B. The BPCIA Does Not Bar a Subsection (k) Applicant from Filing Counterclaims for Declaratory Relief.	7
IV. THE BPCIA DOES NOT LIMIT PFIZER’S INFRINGEMENT, INVALIDITY, AND UNENFORCEABILITY THEORIES IN LITIGATION.	13
V. PFIZER ADEQUATELY PLED ITS INEQUITABLE CONDUCT COUNTERCLAIM.....	21
A. The Pleadings Establish that Genentech Made Demonstrably False Statements to the PTO.....	21
B. Pfizer Has Adequately Pled Specific Intent.	23
C. Pfizer Has Adequately Pled But-For Materiality.	25
VI. CONCLUSION.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Abbott Labs. v. Lupin Ltd.,
 2011 WL 1897322 (D. Del. May 19, 2011)20

Aktiebolag v. Kremers Urban Dev. Co.,
 No. 99 Civ. 8928, 2000 WL 257125 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 8, 2000).....20

Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
 Civ. No. 14-4741, 2015 WL 1264756 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2015)
aff'd in part, vacated in part, remanded 794 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2015),
rev 'd in part, vacated in part, 137 S. Ct. 1664 (2017).....10

Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Barr Laboratories., Inc.,
 Civ. No. 05-2308, 2008 WL 628592 (D.N.J. Mar. 3, 2008).....23

Blonder-Tongue Labs. Inc. v. Univ. of Ill. Found.,
 402 U.S. 313 (1971).....5

Bruni v. City of Pittsburgh,
 824 F.3d 353 (3d Cir. 2016)4, 23, 26

Carcieri v. Salazar,
 555 U.S. 379 (2009).....10, 14

Cellectis S. A. v. Precision Biosciences,
 883 F. Supp. 2d 526 (D. Del. 2012)22

Celltrion Healthcare Co. v. Kennedy Trust For Rheumatology Research,
 Civ. No. 14-2256, 2014 WL 6765996 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 1, 2014).....11

Cornell University v. Illumina, Inc.,
 C.A. No. 10-433-LPS-MPT, 2016 WL 3046258
 (D. Del. May 27, 2016).....4, 24, 25, 26

Courtesy Prods. LLC v. Hamilton Beach Brands Inc.,
 C. A. No. 13-2012-SLR-SRF, 2015 WL 6159113 (D. Del. Oct. 20, 2015)..27

Genentech, Inc. v. Amgen Inc.,
 No. 17-1407 (D. Del. Mar. 1, 2019).....19

IBM v. Priceline Grp., Inc.,
 No. 15-cv-00137, 2017 WL 1349175 (D. Del. Apr. 10, 2017).....4

Internet Media Corp. v. Hearst Newspapers, LLC,
 No. 10-cv-00690, 2012 WL 3867165 (D. Del. Sep. 6, 2012).....5

Jonathan H. v. Souderton Area Sch. Dist.,
 562 F.3d 527 (3d Cir. 2009)8, 9

Krisa v. Equitable Life Assurance Society,
 109 F. Supp. 2d 316 (M.D. Pa. 2000).....9

Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co v. Barr Labs., Inc.,
 289 F.3d 775 (Fed. Cir. 2002)20

Moody v. Atl. City Bd. of Educ.,
 870 F.3d 206 (3d Cir. 2017)5

Nat’l Credit Union Admin. v. First Nat’l Bank & Trust Co.,
 522 U.S. 479 (1998).....8

Pac. Biosciences of Cal, Inc. v. Oxford Nanopore Techs., Inc.,
 C.A. No. 17-1353, 2018 WL 1419082 (D. Del. Mar. 22, 2018).....5, 7

Principal Life Ins. Co. v. Lawrence Rucker 2007 Ins. Trust,
 674 F. Supp. 2d 562 (D. Del. 2009)4

Sandoz Inc. v. Amgen Inc.,
 137 S. Ct. 1664 (2017).....7, 11, 15

Senju Pharm. Co. v. Apotex, Inc.,
 921 F. Supp. 2d 297 (D. Del. 2013)5

Separacor Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.,
 No. 09-1302, 2010 WL 2326262 (D.N.J. June 7, 2010)23

Southco, Inc. v. Penn Eng’g & Mfg. Corp.,
 768 F. Supp. 2d 715 (D. Del. 2011)21

Unverferth Mfg. Co. v. Par-Kan Co.,
 No. 3:13-cv-97-TLS, 2014 WL 2206922 (N.D. Ind. May 27, 2014).....27

Wyeth Holdings Corp. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
 No. 09-955-LPS, 2012 WL 600715 (D. Del. Feb. 3, 2012).....21, 24, 25,26

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.