

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

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL GMBH and
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS
USA, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY,
Defendant.

Civil Action No.
1:18-cv-12029-ADB

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**PLAINTIFFS TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL GMBH
AND TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
REGARDING INEQUITABLE CONDUCT AND UNCLEAN HANDS**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 3

 A. [REDACTED] (Count XXI) 3

 1. [REDACTED] prior art discussing non-C-terminal binding antibodies 3

 2. [REDACTED] 4

 B. Unintentional delay filings (Count XIX) 5

III. LEGAL STANDARDS 5

 A. To survive summary judgment, Lilly must identify facts that would support a finding, by clear and convincing evidence, of inequitable conduct. 5

 B. Inequitable conduct requires proof that a specific individual knowingly and deliberately withheld material information with the intent to deceive the PTO. 6

IV. ARGUMENT 7

 A. The record does not support a finding, by clear and convincing evidence, that [REDACTED] committed inequitable conduct (Count XXI) 7

 1. There is no genuine issue of material fact as to the materiality of the information. 7

 a. Materiality requires proof that a claim would not have issued but for the omitted information. 7

 b. The record contains no evidence of the but-for materiality of any of the alleged omissions. 9

 2. The record does not support a finding that either [REDACTED] [REDACTED] intended to deceive the Patent Office. 13

 a. Lilly must establish that the single most reasonable inference from the evidence is that a specific individual made a deliberate decision to withhold material information with the specific intent to deceive the Patent Office. 13

 b. No reasonable factfinder could conclude, on this record, that the only reasonable inference is that [REDACTED] withheld material information with the intent to deceive the PTO. 15

 B. The record does not support a finding of inequitable conduct based on the unintentional delay filings (Count XIX). 19

V. CONCLUSION 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ist Media, LLC v. Elec. Arts, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	14, 16, 19
<i>California Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.</i> , 25 F.4th 976 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	8
<i>Crown Operations Int'l, Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	5
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Kaz USA, Inc.</i> , 120 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D. Mass. 2015)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	6
<i>Fiskars, Inc. v. Hunt Mfg. Co.</i> , 221 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	11, 18
<i>Golden Blount, Inc. v. Robert H. Peterson Co.</i> , 438 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	17
<i>Hospira, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 1587688 (D.N.J. May 4, 2012)	14
<i>Impax Lab 'ys, Inc. v. Aventis Pharms. Inc.</i> , 468 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	13
<i>KFx Med., LLC v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 2019 WL 2012977 (S.D. Cal. May 7, 2019).....	18
<i>Knorr-Bremse Systeme Fuer Nutzfahrzeuge GmbH v. Dana Corp.</i> , 383 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (en banc).....	17
<i>Lexington Luminance LLC v. Osram Sylvania Inc.</i> , 972 F. Supp. 2d 88 (D. Mass. 2013)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Metris U.S.A., Inc. v. Faro Techs., Inc.</i> , 882 F. Supp. 2d 160 (D. Mass. 2011)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Navico Inc. v. Garmin Int'l, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 3701189 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2017)	15, 17



Semiconductor Energy Lab’y Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
749 F. Supp. 2d 892 (W.D. Wis. 2010)18

Signify N. Am. Corp. v. Reggiani Lighting USA, Inc.,
2020 WL 1331919 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 23, 2020)8, 9, 10

Symbol Techs., Inc. v. Aruba Networks, Inc.,
609 F. Supp. 2d 353 (D. Del. 2009).....12, 18

Therasense, Inc. v. Benton, Dickinson & Co.,
649 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc)..... *passim*

Virginia Innovation Sciences, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.,
11 F. Supp. 3d 622 (E.D. Va. 2014)14

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 120.....3, 5

Other Authorities

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)5

MPEP § 609.05(b)12

Nicole Murphy, *Inequitable-Conduct Doctrine Reform: Is the Death Penalty for Patents Still Appropriate?*, 93 Minn. L. Rev. 2274 (2009)6

Robert D. Swanson, *The Exergen & Therasense Effects*, 66 Stan. L. Rev. 695 (2014).....1

I. INTRODUCTION

Federal Circuit precedent has significantly limited the doctrine of inequitable conduct, ensuring that the “‘atomic bomb’ of patent law” can only be used in truly “egregious circumstances.” *Therasense, Inc. v. Benton, Dickinson & Co.*, 649 F.3d 1279, 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc); *Lexington Luminance LLC v. Osram Sylvania Inc.*, 972 F. Supp. 2d 88, 91 (D. Mass. 2013). Under this “dramatic[ally] constrict[ed]” version of the doctrine, a patent infringer can only avoid the consequences of its wrongful conduct if it can identify clear and convincing evidence that satisfies heightened versions of both the doctrine’s materiality and intent elements. *Metris U.S.A., Inc. v. Faro Techs., Inc.*, 882 F. Supp. 2d 160, 166 (D. Mass. 2011). Making those showings has proven exceptionally difficult: In just the three years following *Therasense*, the Federal Circuit precedent limiting the doctrine more than halved the percentage of adequately-pleaded inequitable conduct claims that ultimately succeed—from nearly a quarter to under ten percent. Robert D. Swanson, *The Exergen & Therasense Effects*, 66 Stan. L. Rev. 695, 696 (2014).

Lilly has failed to adduce evidence sufficient to permit a finding, by clear and convincing evidence, that Lilly satisfied *either* the materiality or the intent element—let alone both. Lilly’s primary inequitable conduct claim is that [REDACTED] of the patents-in-suit (Plaintiffs’ Statement of Undisputed Material Facts (“SUMF”) ¶¶ 1–7)—[REDACTED]—should have but did not disclose to the PTO one prior art reference (“Shaw”) [REDACTED]. Second Supplemental Amended Answer, Dkt. No. 277 (“SSAA”), Count XXI; SUMF ¶¶ 13–14. But there is no evidence that this information was even material, let alone that [REDACTED] affirmatively withheld it from the PTO with the intent to deceive. As to materiality, Lilly offers no testimony that the evidence was material under the *Therasense* standard, which requires a showing that the PTO “would not have allowed a claim” had the information been disclosed, and therefore there is no dispute of fact as to this element. 649

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.