

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION**

HOSPIRA, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 1:16-cv-00651

C.A. No. 1:17-cv-07903

(Consolidated)

Hon. Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

FRESENIUS KABI'S OPENING POST-TRIAL BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 2

 A. The Farmos Invention and the IND 2

 B. State of the Art As of the Priority Date..... 3

 1. U.S. Patent No. 4,910,214..... 3

 2. Precedex Concentrate Product 3

 3. Dexdomitor 4

 4. Dexmed Chemistry 4

 C. Precedex Line Extension..... 5

 D. Asserted Claims of the '049 and '106 Patents 6

 E. Claim Construction 6

III. THE CLAIMS OF THE ASSERTED PATENTS WERE OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE PUBLISHED PRIOR ART AND POSA KNOWLEDGE 7

 A. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... 8

 B. The Compositions of the Asserted Claims—A Ready-To-Use, Sealed Glass Container, with 4 µg/mL Dexmed—Were Obvious 9

 1. Precedex Concentrate and Knowledge of a POSA 9

 2. Precedex Concentrate and Dexdomitor 13

 C. The pH Limitation of Claim 8 of the '049 Patent Was Obvious 14

 D. The “About 2%” Limitation of Claim 6 of the '106 Patent Was Obvious 15

 1. The “About 2%” Limitation Is an Inherent Property of the Obvious Prior Art Combination..... 16

 2. Reasonable Expectation of Success 19

IV. THE DEXMED IND RENDERS THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OBVIOUS 21

 A. The Dexmed IND Is Prior Art Because of Lack of Inventorship 22

 1. Farmos Conceived of the “Subject Matter Sought to be Patented” 23

 2. The Dexmed IND was communicated to Hospira 25

 B. The IND Is Prior Art Under the On-Sale Bar 25

 1. The Dexmed IND Was Subject to a Commercial Sale 26

 2. The Dexmed IND Product was ready for patenting..... 31

C.	The Dexmed IND and Precedex Concentrate Renders the Asserted Claims Obvious.....	33
1.	The Dexmed IND Renders the pH 2-10 Limitation Obvious to a POSA	34
2.	The Dexmed IND Renders the About 2% Limitation Obvious to a POSA.....	34
V.	HOSPIRA PRESENTED NO EVIDENCE OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS.....	36
VI.	CLAIM 6 OF THE '106 PATENT IS NOT ENABLED.....	37
A.	The Patent Does Not Teach How to Attain the 2% Limitation If That Stability Is Not Inherent for Type I Glass With a Coated Stopper	37
B.	A POSA Would Require Undue Experimentation To Determine The Full Scope Of Claimed Compositions That Achieve The 2% Limitation.....	38
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	39

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.	FINDINGS OF FACT.....	40
A.	Obviousness	40
1.	Level of Skill in the Art	40
2.	Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	40
3.	Differences Between the Prior Art and Claims.....	42
B.	Enablement	42
II.	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	43
A.	Claim Construction	43
B.	Obviousness	43
C.	Enablement	44

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Adaptix, Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent, Inc.</i> , No. 6:12-cv-22, 2015 WL 12712287 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 26, 2015)	25
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	16, 17
<i>Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.</i> , 299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	31
<i>Alloc, Inc. v. Pergo, Inc.</i> , No. 02-cv-736, 2008 WL 1968301 (E.D. Wis. May 1, 2008)	25
<i>ALZA Corp. v. Andrx Pharms.</i> , 603 F.3d 935 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	38, 39
<i>Apotex Corp. v. Istituto Biologico Chemioterapico S.P.A.</i> , No. 02-C-5345, 2003 WL 21780965 (N.D. Ill. July 30, 2003)	28
<i>Apotex, Inc. v. Cephalon, Inc.</i> , No. 06-cv-2768, 2011 WL 6090696 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 7, 2011)	25
<i>Atlanta Attachment Co. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 516 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	30, 31
<i>Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 40 F.3d 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	22
<i>Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	17
<i>Corona Cord Tire Co. v. Dovan Chem. Corp.</i> , 276 U.S. 358 (1928).....	31
<i>Dippin' Dots, Inc. v. Mosey</i> , 476 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2007).	26
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	26
<i>Ferag AG v. Quipp Inc.</i> , 45 F.3d 1562 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	26, 30
<i>Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	22
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	7

...

Helsinn Healthcare S.A. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
855 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 26, 31, 32

Hoosier Energy Rural Elec. Co-op., Inc. v. Amoco Tax Leasing IV Corp.,
34 F.3d 1310 (7th Cir. 1994) 28

Hospira, Inc. v. Amneal Pharm., LLC,
285 F. Supp. 3d 776 (D. Del. 2018)..... 18

Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.,
802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986) 22

In re Carlson,
983 F.2d 1032 (Fed. Cir. 1993) 8

In re Caveney,
761 F.2d 671 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 26

In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC,
793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 8

In re Dybel,
524 F.2d 1393 (C.C.P.A. 1975) 30

In re Hamilton,
882 F.2d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1989) 31

In re Hyatt,
708 F.2d 712 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 38

In re Kao,
639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 17

In re Klein,
987 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1993) 8

In re Kollar,
286 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 29

In re Kubin,
561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 17

In re Wands,
858 F.3d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 38

J.A. LaPorte, Inc. v. Norfolk Dredging Co.,
787 F.2d 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1986) 26

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 7

Law Debenture Tr. Co. of New York v. Maverick Tube Corp.,
595 F.3d 458 (2d Cir. 2010) 28

Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Merad, Inc.,
481 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 39

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.