

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

HOSPIRA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action Nos. 1:16-cv-00651

1:17-cv-07903

Hon. Judge Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

HOSPIRA'S RESPONSIVE POST-TRIAL BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. SUMMARY OF THE TRIAL RECORD3

 A. The Patents3

 B. The Farnos Phase I Clinical Studies4

 C. The 1994 License and Supply Agreement (“1994 Agreement”)5

 D. The Precedex Concentrate New Drug Application (“NDA”)7

 E. The Spin-Off7

 F. The Precedex Premix Project8

 G. FK’s Evidence of Inherency10

ARGUMENT11

I. THE 2% LIMITATION RENDERS THE CLAIMS NON-OBVIOUS11

 A. FK failed to show the 2% limitation was inherently present in the prior art11

 1. FK was required to exclude the possibility that an embodiment of claim 6 would fail the 2% limitation12

 2. Inherency cannot be shown by proving only that the inventor’s own work and the infringing product meet the limitation12

 3. The 20 µg/mL samples from the IND disprove inherency13

 B. FK’s new “reasonable expectation of success theory” is legally improper and unsupported by the record14

 1. FK’s RES theory is contrary to the law14

 2. FK failed to prove there was a reasonable expectation of success for the 2% limitation17

 a. The evidence precludes a reasonable expectation of success that the 2% limitation would be met18

 b. FK failed to prove a reasonable expectation of success for the 2% limitation20

 1) Dexmed is not “rock stable”21

 2) Attorney argument is belied by the evidence22

II. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER THE IND23

 A. The IND is not prior art under the on sale bar24

 1. Neither Shafer nor the IND were on sale24

 a. The IND is not an embodiment of Shafer24

 b. The 1994 Agreement did not trigger the on-sale bar25

1)	The IND is licensed ‘Know-How’	26
2)	The FDA letters cannot override the license.....	27
c.	The 2004 Hospira spinoff did not trigger the on-sale bar	28
2.	The IND was used for experimental purposes	30
3.	Shafer did not disclose an invention ready for patenting.....	31
B.	The IND is not prior art under § 102(f)	33
1.	Shafer was not communicated to the inventors	34
2.	Shafer was disclosed as part of a joint research effort.....	35
C.	Shafer and Precedex Concentrate do not render the claims obvious	36
III.	THE CLAIMS OF THE ’106 PATENT ARE ENABLED	37
A.	The ’106 patent teaches a POSA how to make the claimed formulation	37
B.	The ’106 patent is not required to delineate every possible configuration that meets the 2% limitation	39
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	41
	PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	41
I.	FINDINGS OF FACT.....	41
A.	Obviousness	41
B.	Enablement of the ’106 patent	44
II.	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	44
A.	Claim Construction	44
B.	Obviousness	44
C.	Enablement of the ’106 patent	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Adaptix, Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent, Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 12712287 (E.D. Tex. June 26, 2015).....	35
<i>Advanced Fiber Techs. (AFT) Trust v. J&L Fiber Servs., Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 1472015 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2015)	41
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 726 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	16
<i>Allergan Sales, LLC v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 717 F. App'x 991 (Fed. 2017)	16
<i>Alloc, Inc. v. Pergo, Inc.</i> , 2008 WL 1968301 (E.D. Wis. May 1, 2008).....	35
<i>Amneal Pharm. LLC, v. Hospira Inc.</i> , No. IPR2016-0580, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. February 3, 2017).....	4
<i>August Tech. Corp. v. Camtek, Ltd.</i> , 655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	15
<i>Cumberland Pharm. Inc. v. Mylan Institutional LLC</i> , 846 F.3d 1213 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	34
<i>Diodem, LLC v. Lumenis Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 6225364 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2005)	29
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharm., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	30
<i>Endo Pharm. Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , --- F. App'x ---, 2018 WL 2230923 (Fed. Cir. 2018), <i>vacated in unrelated part on other grounds</i> , 729 F. App'x 936 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	16, 40
<i>Endo Pharm. Sols., Inc. v. Custopharm Inc.</i> , 894 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	2, 11, 12
<i>Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	34

Helsinn Healthcare S.A. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
855 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....24, 32, 33

Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. United States,
609 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....15

Hospira, Inc. v. Amneal Pharm., LLC,
285 F. Supp. 3d 776, 799-800 (D. Del. 2018)4, 13

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

In re Kollar,
286 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....25

In re Oelrich,
666 F.2d 578 (C.C.P.A. 1981)11

In re Omeprazole Patent Litig.,
536 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....33

Intelligent Bio-Sys. Inc., v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....14, 15

Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs., Inc.,
429 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....37, 39

Mas-Hamilton Grp. v. LaGard, Inc.,
156 F.3d 1206 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....25

Medicines Co. v. Hospira, Inc.,
827 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....24, 25

Micro-Magnetic Indus., Inc. v. Advance Automatic Sales Co.,
488 F.2d 771 (9th Cir. 1973)29

Millennium Pharm., Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.,
862 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....2, 11, 12

Milwaukee Elec. Tool Corp. v. Snap-On Inc.,
271 F. Supp. 3d 990, 1016 (E.D. Wis. 2017).....34

Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.,
793 F.2d 1261 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....25

New England Braiding Co. v. A.W. Chesterton Co.,
970 F.2d 878 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....34

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.