


**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS	)	Case No. 1:18-cv-12029-ADB
INTERNATIONAL GMBH and	)	
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	Leave to File Granted on
v.	)	Feb. 22, 2022 (ECF No. 272)
	)	
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY,	)	Leave to File Under Seal Granted on
	)	Mar. 28, 2022 (ECF No. 285)
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**DEFENDANT ELI LILLY AND COMPANY'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS  
MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF  
NO WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS ..... 3

    A. Lilly’s Lengthy Development of the First and Only Biologic Available for Both Treatment of Migraine and Episodic Cluster Headache ..... 3

    B. Allegations Related to Willfulness in Teva’s Complaint ..... 5

    C. Lilly’s Continuous Good-Faith Belief that No Valid or Enforceable Claim of the Patents-in-Suit Was Infringed..... 6

III. LEGAL STANDARDS ..... 7

    A. Summary Judgment ..... 7

    B. Willful Infringement ..... 8

IV. NO REASONABLE JUROR COULD FIND WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT ON THE EVIDENCE OF RECORD ..... 9

    A. Lilly’s Post-Suit Activities Do Not Create a Genuine Dispute of Material Fact on Willfulness ..... 9

    B. At the Time of Alleged Infringement, Lilly Subjectively Believed that No Valid or Enforceable Patent Was Infringed ..... 11

    C. The Court Need Not Allow Post-Suit Willfulness to Reach the Jury When There Is No Evidence Supporting Enhanced Damages ..... 13

V. CONCLUSION..... 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Aoki v. Gilbert</i> , No. 211CV02797TLNCKD, 2020 WL 6741693 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2020) .....	14
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	2, 12
<i>Bayer Healthcare LLC v. Baxalta, Inc.</i> , 989 F.3d 964 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	9, 10, 11
<i>Biedermann Techs., GmbH &amp; Co. KG v. K2M, Inc.</i> , 528 F. Supp. 3d 407 (E.D. Va. 2021) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>bioMérieux, S.A. v. Hologic, Inc.</i> , No. 18-21-LPS, 2020 WL 759546 (D. Del. Feb. 7, 2020).....	8, 14
<i>Bioverativ Inc. v. CSL Behring LLC</i> , No. 17-914-RGA, 2020 WL 1332921 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2020) .....	9
<i>Carmona v. Toledo</i> , 215 F.3d 124 (1st Cir. 2000).....	7
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	7, 8
<i>Cochran v. Quest Software, Inc.</i> , 328 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2003).....	8
<i>CTB, Inc. v. Hog Slat, Inc.</i> , 954 F.3d 647 (4th Cir. 2020) .....	11
<i>Eko Brands, LLC v Adrian Rivera Maynez Enters., Inc.</i> , 946 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	8, 9
<i>Evolved Wireless, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. CV-15-542-JFB-SRF, 2019 WL 8128550 (D. Del. Feb. 19, 2019).....	10
<i>Griggs-Ryan v. Smith</i> , 904 F.2d 112 (1st Cir. 1990).....	8
<i>Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.</i> , 579 U.S. 93 (2016).....	<i>passim</i>

*Hannon v. Beard*,  
645 F.3d 45 (1st Cir. 2011).....8

*Juno Therapeutics, Inc. v. Kite Pharma, Inc.*,  
No. 2:17-cv-07639, 2020 WL 2844410 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2020).....9, 11

*Medina-Munoz v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*,  
896 F.2d 5 (1st Cir. 1990).....8

*Ocasio-Hernandez v. Fortuño-Burset*,  
777 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2015).....7

*ProBatter Sports, LLC v. Sports Tutor, Inc.*,  
No. 05-cv-1975-VLB, 2022 WL 503982 (D. Conn. Feb. 18, 2022) .....14

*Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
119 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....2, 12

*Simplivity Corp. v. Springpath, Inc.*,  
No. CV 4:15-13345-TSH, 2016 WL 5388951 (D. Mass. July 15, 2016).....14

*SiOnyx, LLC v. Hamamatsu Photonics K.K.*,  
330 F. Supp. 3d 574 (D. Mass. 2018) .....10, 13, 14

*SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*,  
14 F.4th 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....9

*Wrinkl, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
No. 20-cv-1345-RGA, 2021 WL 4477022 (D. Del. Sept. 30, 2021).....2, 9, 11

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 112.....12

35 U.S.C. § 284.....8, 13

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) .....7

## I. INTRODUCTION

Teva's patent infringement assertions against Lilly's Emgality<sup>®</sup> (galcanezumab) antibody therapy for treatment of migraine and episodic cluster headache have evolved over the last four and a half years. After two false start complaints that this Court dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and after six of the nine patents initially asserted in Teva's operative complaint were invalidated by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("PTAB"), only three method of treatment patents remain in this case (the "patents-in-suit"). But what has not evolved over the years are Teva's allegations of willful infringement. Consisting of the same language and form as the day they were filed, Teva's willfulness claims constitute little more than boilerplate legal conclusions even after fact and expert discovery have closed. The Federal Circuit has clarified twice since this litigation began that a proper willfulness inquiry revolves around the infringer's subjective beliefs and specific intent to infringe a valid patent. Even as the law of willfulness itself has evolved, Teva has never amended or supplemented its pleadings to keep up with the law and to carry its burden of proof.

A review of the facts of record in this case shows that there are no genuine factual disputes for a jury to resolve regarding willfulness. Teva has not alleged "pre-suit" willful infringement. Indeed, the facts demonstrate that [REDACTED] before the earliest patent-in-suit here was filed (July 11, 2011), and Lilly began clinical trials before Teva. Teva's patents had no impact whatsoever on Lilly's independent research and development of an anti-CGRP antibody for preventive treatment of migraine and episodic cluster headache. At most, the existence of the single full-length humanized antibody disclosed in the patents-in-suit ("Antibody G1") served to confirm how significantly *different* Lilly's antibody was from Antibody G1. As for "post-suit" willfulness, which many courts have concluded does not exist as a legal doctrine (*see infra* §IV.A), Lilly is merely selling an accused product, Emgality<sup>®</sup>, [REDACTED]

# 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.