

**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

**FILED UNDER SEAL  
LEAVE TO FILE GRANTED  
05/06/2022 (ECF NO. 340)**

**LEAVE TO FILE EXCESS  
PAGES GRANTED 02/22/2022  
(ECF NO. 272)**

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO ELI LILLY AND COMPANY'S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY FOR LACK OF WRITTEN DESCRIPTION**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 1

    A. The claimed inventions and the asserted claims ..... 1

    B. The specification, viewed by a POSA ..... 3

    C. The IPR proceedings..... 8

III. LEGAL STANDARDS ..... 10

    A. Summary judgment..... 10

    B. Written description..... 10

IV. ARGUMENT ..... 12

    A. Lilly’s motion papers violate Local Rule 56.1..... 13

    B. Lilly’s species-genus argument fails, because the patents claim *methods* of using anti-CGRP antagonist antibodies to treat headache, not the *antibodies themselves*. ..... 15

    C. The record contains ample evidence allowing a factfinder to conclude that the specification describes the genus of antibodies used in the claimed methods..... 18

        1. The parties dispute whether the disclosed species are representative of the claimed genus.18

        2. The parties dispute whether the specification disclosed structural features common to members of the genus. 24

    D. Neither reduction to practice nor clinical results are required to satisfy the written description requirement and the parties dispute whether the named inventors reduced the inventions to practice..... 25

    E. The parties dispute whether the specification describes the claimed methods... 27

    F. Lilly’s Motion does not show that summary judgment is appropriate for the dependent claims and the claims of the ’907 and ’908 patents..... 30

V. CONCLUSION..... 30

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott GmbH &amp; Co. v. Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc.</i> , 870 F. Supp. 2d 206 (D. Mass. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>AbbVie Deutschland GmbH v. Janssen Biotech, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	20, 23
<i>Acantha LLC v. DePuy Orthopaedics Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 2431852 (E.D. Wis. 2018).....	14
<i>Alcon Rsch. Ltd. v. Barr Lab'ys, Inc.</i> , 745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	28
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 796 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	25, 26
<i>Alsina-Ortiz v. Laboy</i> , 400 F.3d 77 (1st Cir. 2005).....	14
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	10
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Boston Sci. Corp. v. Johnson &amp; Johnson</i> , 647 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10, 11, 24
<i>In re Brana</i> , 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	26
<i>Brown v. Armstrong</i> , 957 F. Supp. 1293 (D. Mass. 1997), <i>aff'd</i> 129 F.3d 1252 (1st Cir. 1997).....	13
<i>Camona v. Toledo</i> , 215 F.3d 124 (1st Cir. 2000).....	15
<i>Capon v. Eshhar</i> , 418 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	19
<i>CMI Capital Market Inv., LLC v. González-Toro</i> , 520 F.3d 58 (1st Cir. 2008).....	13

<i>Cortes-Irizarry v. Corporacion Insular de Serguros</i> , 111 F.3d 184 (1st Cir. 1997).....	14
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , 2020 WL 1540364 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2020), <i>aff'd</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	9
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , 2020 WL 806932 (PTAB Feb. 18, 2020) .....	8, 9
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , 2020 WL 808240 (PTAB Feb. 18, 2020) .....	8, 9
<i>In re Engers v. AT&amp;T</i> , 2005 WL 6460846 (D.N.J. Sept. 9, 2005) .....	14
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 2016 WL 6138124 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 21, 2016) ( <i>UroPep I</i> ).....	15, 16
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 276 F. Supp. 3d 629 (E.D. Tex. 2017), <i>aff'd</i> , 739 F. App'x 643 (Fed. Cir. 2018) ( <i>UroPep II</i> ) .....	16, 21
<i>Feliciano v. Rhode Island</i> , 160 F.3d 780 (1st Cir. 1998).....	10, 14
<i>In re Herschler</i> , 591 F.2d 693 (C.C.P.A. 1979) .....	16, 17, 18
<i>In re Hogan</i> , 559 F.2d 595 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	22
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs., Inc.</i> , 429 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	18
<i>Juno Therapeutics, Inc. v. Kite Pharma, Inc.</i> , 10 F.4th 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	23, 24
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	29
<i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme Corp. v. Genentech</i> , PGR2021-00036, Paper 10 (July 24, 2021) .....	17
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P'ship</i> , 564 U.S. 91 (2011).....	30



*Motfort-Rodriguez v. Rey-Hernandez*,  
504 F.3d 221 (1st Cir. 2007).....10

*Noelle v. Lederman*,  
355 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....24

*Resolution Trust Corp. v. Fidelity & Deposit Co.*,  
1998 WL 2030798 (D.N.J. 1998) .....14

*Rosco, Inc. v. Mirror Lite Co.*,  
304 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....30

*S3 Inc. v. NVIDIA Corp.*,  
259 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....11

*Sandt Tech., Ltd. v. Resco Metal & Plastics Corp.*,  
264 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....30

*Teva Pharms. Int’l GmbH v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
8 F.4th 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....9

*Trustees of the Univ. of Pa. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
2021 WL 7918978 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 19, 2021) (*Penn.*).....17, 22

*In re Varrasso*,  
37 F.3d 760 (1st Cir. 1994).....10

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 112.....1, 3

**Other Authorities**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c) .....10

Fed. R. Evid. 801 .....14

Local Rule 56.1 .....13, 14

# 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.