



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 3

    A. The Functionally Defined Genus of Antibodies Used in Teva’s Asserted Claims Is Extremely Broad..... 3

    B. The Prior Art Disclosed No Human or Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibodies..... 3

    C. In the Antibody IPRs, the PTAB Found That It Would Have Been Obvious to Make One Humanized Anti-CGRP Antagonist Antibody ..... 4

    D. In the Antibody Method of Treatment IPRs, Teva Successfully Established That Prior Art Anti-CGRP Antibodies and Methods Would Not Have Led to Successful Treatment of Migraine..... 5

III. LEGAL STANDARDS ..... 6

IV. ARGUMENT..... 7

    A. Teva’s Motion Should Be Denied for Failing to Prove Judicial Estoppel..... 7

        1. Teva Failed to Address the Different Legal Contexts Between Proceedings and Thus Cannot Establish Mutual Exclusivity ..... 7

        2. Teva Failed to Address Differences in Claim Scope Between Proceedings and Thus Cannot Establish Mutual Exclusivity ..... 10

        3. Each of Teva’s Five Requests for Relief Is Deficient..... 11

            a. Judicial Estoppel Does Not Support Teva’s Request No. 1..... 11

            b. Judicial Estoppel Does Not Support Teva’s Request No. 2..... 14

            c. Judicial Estoppel Does Not Support Teva’s Request Nos. 3 and 4 .... 16

            d. Judicial Estoppel Does Not Support Teva’s Request No. 5..... 17

        4. The Only Party Seeking an Unfair Advantage Is Teva..... 18

            a. Judicial Estoppel Cannot Remedy Teva’s Deficient Specification .... 18

            b. Teva’s Requested Relief Would Only Serve to Confuse the Relevant Facts and Law ..... 18

            c. Teva Identifies No Unfair Advantage to Lilly ..... 19

B. Teva’s Motion May Also Be Denied for Failing to Comply with Rule 56 ..... 20

V. Conclusion ..... 20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott GmbH &amp; Co. v. Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc.</i> , 971 F. Supp. 2d 171 (D. Mass. 2013), <i>aff'd</i> 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Alt. Sys. Concepts, Inc. v. Synopsys, Inc.</i> , 374 F.3d 23 (1st Cir. 2004).....	6
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , 872 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	18, 19
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd.</i> , 581 F. Supp. 2d 160 (D. Mass. 2008).....	12
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , No. 14-cv-1317, 2019 WL 259099 (D. Del. Jan. 18, 2019) .....	6, 9, 12, 15
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	13, 14, 15, 19
<i>Asarco, LLC v. Noranda Mining, Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 1201 (10th Cir. 2017) .....	6
<i>Bos. Sci. Corp. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson</i> , 647 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	8, 12
<i>Cleveland v. Policy Mgmt. Corp.</i> , 526 U.S. 795 (1999).....	2, 6
<i>Cross Med. Prod., Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	10
<i>Duggan v. Martello</i> , No. 18-cv-12277, 2021 WL 4295828 (D. Mass. Sept. 21, 2021).....	7
<i>Egenera, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 972 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	7, 10, 13, 16
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	6
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , IPR2018-01422, 2020 WL 806932 (PTAB Feb. 18, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>

...

<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , IPR2018-01710, 2020 WL 1540364 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2020) .....	5, 6
<i>Juno Therapeutics, Inc. v. Kite Pharma, Inc.</i> , 10 F.4th 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	8
<i>Lampi Corp. v. Am. Power Prods., Inc.</i> , 228 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	6
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	1, 6, 7, 19
<i>Paper, Allied-Indus., Chem. &amp; Energy Workers Int'l Union, AFL-CIO, CLC v. Allied Textile Cos.</i> , 235 F. Supp. 2d 8 (D. Me. 2002) .....	7, 12, 15
<i>Pariseau v. Capt. John Boats</i> , No. 09-cv-10624, 2011 WL 1560975 (D. Mass. Apr. 25, 2011).....	20
<i>Pernix Ireland Pain DAC v. Alvogen Malta Operations Ltd.</i> , 323 F. Supp. 3d 566 (D. Del. 2018), <i>aff'd</i> 945 F.3d 1184 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	9
<i>RFF Family P'ship, LP v. Ross</i> , 814 F.3d 520 (1st Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>Selkow v. 7-Eleven, Inc.</i> , No. 8:11-cv-456, 2012 WL 2054872 (M.D. Fla. June 7, 2012) .....	20
<i>Sexual Minorities Uganda v. Lively</i> , 899 F.3d 28 (1st Cir. 2018).....	6, 7, 10, 18
<i>Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 8 F.4th 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	3
<i>United States v. Diebold, Inc.</i> , 369 U.S. 654 (1962).....	6
<i>United States v. Tailwind Sport Corp.</i> , 234 F. Supp. 3d 180 (D.D.C. 2017).....	20
<i>Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle &amp; Co.</i> , 358 F.3d 916 (Fed. Cir 2004).....	1
<i>Wyeth &amp; Cordis Corp. v. Abbott Lab'ys</i> , 720 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	8, 15, 18
<b>Federal Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102.....	12

# 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.