

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS	)	
INTERNATIONAL GMBH and	)	
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	Case No. 1:18-cv-12029-ADB
v.	)	
	)	
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**DEFENDANT ELI LILLY AND COMPANY'S MEMORANDUM  
IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO TRANSFER, OR, IF NOT TRANSFERRED,  
THEN TO STAY THIS LITIGATION PENDING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. Preliminary Statement..... 1
- II. Background..... 3
- III. Both the Public and Private Interest Factors Favor Transfer To The Southern District Of Indiana ..... 5
  - A. All the Private Interest Factors Weigh in Favor of Transfer to the Southern District of Indiana..... 5
    - 1. Teva’s Choice of Forum Is Entitled to Little or No Deference Because Teva Has No Substantive Connection to the District of Massachusetts ..... 5
    - 2. The Southern District of Indiana Is More Convenient for the Parties..... 7
    - 3. The Southern District of Indiana Is More Convenient Based on the Location of the Expected Witnesses and Documents ..... 8
    - 4. Teva Fails to Establish a Connection Between the Issues in the Case and Its Choice of Forum..... 11
  - B. Public and State Interests Weigh in Favor of Transfer to the Southern District of Indiana..... 14
  - C. The Southern District of Indiana is a Proper Venue ..... 15
- IV. All Factors Favor Staying This Case Pending *Inter Partes* Review..... 15
  - A. The Early Stage of this Litigation Strongly Favors a Stay ..... 17
  - B. A Stay Will Simplify the Issues in This Case and Promote Judicial Economy ..... 17
  - C. A Stay Will Neither Unduly Prejudice Nor Present a Clear Tactical Disadvantage to Teva..... 19
  - D. In the Alternative, a Modest Stay Pending the Board’s Decision on Institution Is Appropriate ..... 20
- V. Conclusion ..... 20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>ACQIS, LLC v. EMC Corp.</i> , 109 F. Supp. 3d 352 (D. Mass. 2015) .....	passim
<i>Affymetrix, Inc. v. Systemi, Inc.</i> , 28 F. Supp. 2d 192 (D. Del. 1998).....	6
<i>Aplix IP Holdings Corp. v. Sony Comput. Entm't, Inc.</i> , 137 F. Supp. 3d 3 (D. Mass. 2015) .....	17, 19
<i>Audubon Real Estate Assocs., L.L.C. v. Audubon Realty, L.L.C.</i> , No. 3:15-115-SDD-SCR, 2015 WL 4094235 (M.D. La. July 7, 2015).....	7
<i>Avci v. Brennan</i> , 232 F. Supp. 3d 216 (D. Mass. 2017) .....	11
<i>Blackbird Tech LLC v. Cloudflare, Inc.</i> , No. 1:17-cv-00283, 2017 WL 4543783 (D. Del. Oct. 11, 2017).....	12
<i>Boateng v. Gen. Dynamics Corp.</i> , 460 F. Supp. 2d 270 (D. Mass. 2006) .....	8
<i>Bowen v. Elanes N.H. Holdings, LLC</i> , 166 F. Supp. 3d 104 (D. Mass. 2015) .....	14
<i>Brant Point Corp. v. Poetzsch</i> , 671 F. Supp. 2 (D. Mass. 1987) .....	6
<i>Codex Corp. v. Milgo Elec. Corp.</i> , 553 F.2d 735 (1st Cir. 1977).....	5
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg</i> , 849 F.2d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	15
<i>Falafel Republic Mediterranean Foods, Inc. v. Tarazi Specialty Foods, Inc.</i> , No. 1:12-cv-10551-NMG, 2012 WL 12941889 (D. Mass. Sept. 28, 2012) .....	8
<i>Fed. Ins. Co. v. XTRA Intermodal, Inc.</i> , No. 1:14-cv-14010-ADB, 2015 WL 4275181 (D. Mass. July 15, 2015) .....	5, 6
<i>Fisher-Price, Inc. et al v. Dynacraft BSC, Inc.</i> , No. 4:17-cv-03745 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2017) .....	16

..

<i>Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1 v. Intel Corp.</i> , No. 17-00676 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 28, 2012).....	9
<i>Gryphon Networks Corp. v. Contact Ctr. Compliance Corp.</i> , 792 F. Supp. 2d 87 (D. Mass. 2011).....	18
<i>Habitat Wallpaper &amp; Blinds, Inc. v. K.T. Scott Ltd. P'ship</i> , 807 F. Supp. 470 (N.D. Ill. 1992).....	7
<i>Health Diagnostic Lab., Inc. v. Bos. Heart Diagnostics Corp.</i> , No. 3:14-cv-00796 (E.D. Va. Feb. 4, 2015).....	16
<i>In re Acer Am. Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1252 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	12, 13, 14
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	10
<i>In re Hoffman-La Roche Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14
<i>Karmaloop, Inc. v. ODW Logistics, Inc.</i> , 931 F. Supp. 2d 288 (D. Mass. 2013).....	11
<i>Kaufmann v. Prudential Ins. Co.</i> , 667 F. Supp. 2d 205 (D. Mass. 2009).....	7
<i>Landis v. N. Am. Co.</i> , 299 U.S. 248 (1936).....	15
<i>Lando &amp; Anastasi, LLP v. Innovention Toys, L.L.C.</i> , 79 F. Supp. 3d 375 (D. Mass. 2015).....	6
<i>McEvily v. Sunbeam-Oster Co.</i> , 878 F. Supp. 337 (D.R.I. 1994).....	14
<i>Medline Indus., Inc. v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , No. 1:14-cv-03618 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 11, 2015).....	16
<i>Momenta Pharm., Inc. v. Amphastar Pharm., Inc.</i> , 841 F. Supp. 2d 514 (D. Mass. 2012).....	5
<i>Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno</i> , 454 U.S. 235 (1981).....	6
<i>Princess House, Inc. v. Lindsey</i> , 136 F.R.D. 16 (D. Mass. 1991).....	8

...

*Reckitt Benckiser Pharm., Inc. v. Biodelivery Sci. Int’l, Inc.*,  
 No. 3:14-cv-05892-MAS-TJB, 2015 WL 4461511 (D.N.J. July 21, 2015) ..... 11

*Reiser v. RTI Int’l Metals, Inc.*,  
 No. 1:08-cv-0729, 2009 WL 1097250 (S.D. Ohio April 22, 2009)..... 6

*Roche Molecular Sys., Inc. v. Cepheid*,  
 No. 3:14-cv-03228-EDL, 2015 WL 124523 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2015) ..... 16

*Ross v. Institutional Longevity Assets LLC*,  
 No. 1:12-cv-00102-LPS-CJB, 2013 WL 5299171 (D. Del. Sept. 20, 2013)..... 6

*Sec. People, Inc. v. Ojmar US, LLC*,  
 No. 4:14-cv-04968, 2015 WL 3453780 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2015)..... 16

*Stewart Org., Inc. v. Ricoh Corp.*,  
 487 U.S. 22 (1988)..... 5

*Studer Prof’l Audio GmbH v. Calrec Audio Ltd.*,  
 No. 2:12-cv-02278, 2012 WL 3061495 (D.N.J. July 25, 2012) ..... 19

*TAS Energy, Inc. v. San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*,  
 No. 3:12-cv-2777, 2014 WL 794215 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2014)..... 16

*TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Food Group Brands LLC*,  
 137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017)..... 15

*W. Marine Prods., Inc. v. Dolphinite, Inc.*,  
 No. 1:04-cv-10251-PBS, 2005 WL 1000259 (D. Mass. Apr. 6, 2005) ..... 9

*Wonderland NurseryGoods Co. v. Baby Trend, Inc.*,  
 No. 5:14-cv-01153, 2015 WL 1809309 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2015)..... 16

*Zond, Inc. v. Toshiba Am. Elec. Components, Inc.*,  
 No. 1:13-cv-11581 (D. Mass. Sept. 30, 2014)..... 16

**Federal Statutes**

28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) ..... 1, 5, 20

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) ..... 4

35 U.S.C. § 314(b) ..... 19

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11)..... 4

35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 ..... 4, 17

# 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.