Exhibit B

1   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
           NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
2   EASTERN DIVISION

3

4   HOSPIRA, INC.,   )
)
5   Plaintiff,   )   Docket No. 16 C 651
)
6   vs.   )
)
7   FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC,   )   Chicago, Illinois
)   September 19, 2017
8   Defendant.   )   9:04 a.m.

9
                    TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Status
10   BEFORE THE HONORABLE REBECCA R. PALLMEYER

11
     APPEARANCES:
12

13   For the Plaintiff: JENNER & BLOCK LLP
                                BY: MR. YUSUF ESAT
14   353 North Clark Street
                                Chicago, Illinois 60654
15

16   For the Defendant: SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
                                BY: MR. JOEL M. WALLACE
17   233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 6600
                                Chicago, Illinois 60606
18

19

20

21

22

23   Court Reporter: FRANCES WARD, CSR, RPR, RMR, FCRR
                                Official Court Reporter
24   219 S. Dearborn Street, Suite 2144D
                                Chicago, Illinois 60604
25   (312) 435-5561
                                frances_ward@ilnd.uscourts.gov

1   THE CLERK: 16 C 651, Hospira versus Fresenius Kabi

2   for status.

3   MR. ESAT: Good morning, your Honor.

4   Yusuf Esat for plaintiff, Hospira.

5   THE COURT: Good morning.

6   MR. WALLACE: Joel Wallace for defendant, Fresenius

7   Kabi USA.

8   THE COURT: Good morning.

9   I'm sorry about the delay on the claims

10   construction. I got a passel of patent cases lined up for

11   ruling right now. I do expect it to be probably in October.

12   But you had something else to report, you said.

13   MR. ESAT: Yes, your Honor.

14   On a separate topic, just as sort of set forth in

15   the parties' motion, there is a second related case. As your

16   Honor may recall, it's against Amneal in the District of

17   Delaware. It's the same four patents-in-suit.

18   The trial was complete last month. The parties are

19   going through posttrial briefing at the moment. And the

20   court indicated there that it should issue a ruling by the

21   end of the year.

22   THE COURT: Okay. Will that ruling relate to any

23   claims construction issues, to your knowledge?

24   MR. ESAT: Yes, it likely will. There is overlap.

25   We had a claim construction ruling earlier in the

1   case, but it did not address two of the terms that we

2   litigated before your Honor: "ready to use" and "sealed."

3   THE COURT: Okay. Did the Delaware judge rule on

4   other claims?

5   MR. ESAT: On other claim terms, yes.

6   THE COURT: As of when?

7   MR. ESAT: I believe that was in June of last year.

8   MR. WALLACE: 2016.

9   THE COURT: Oh, June of 2016?

10   MR. ESAT: Yes.

11   THE COURT: Okay. All right. That's fine.

12   Again, I expect that you will get -- I won't be

13   waiting for the Delaware ruling in order to complete the

14   claims construction work, so I will do that. All right.

15   MR. WALLACE: And then relatedly, depending on the

16   outcome of the claim construction ruling, we may request the

17   additional 42-day period to reopen fact discovery based on,

18   they have got the new transcripts from the trial, they have

19   got the posttrial briefing. So we may want additional

20   written discovery. A lot of it depends on the claim

21   construction ruling because we may also need to amend our

22   contentions based on that. So we are just apprising you --

23   THE COURT: What I will do is set a status right

24   after the claims construction ruling. You can tell me what

25   additional proceedings we need to schedule at that time.

1   All right.

2   MR. WALLACE: Thank you.

3   THE COURT: Thank you.

4   *   *   *   *   *

5   I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the
    record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

6

7   /s/ Frances Ward_____January 16, 2018.___
    Official Court Reporter

8   F

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25