

**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
06/06/2022 (ECF NO. 385)**

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
REGARDING INEQUITABLE CONDUCT AND UNCLEAN HANDS**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ARGUMENT 2

 A. Lilly’s opposition ignores the impact of *Therasense*. 2

 B. The record does not support a finding that [REDACTED] committed
 inequitable conduct. 4

 1. Lilly’s theory based on [REDACTED] fails as a matter of law. 4

 2. Lilly’s theory based on Shaw fails as a matter of law. 7

 3. Lilly’s theory based on [REDACTED] fails as a matter of law. 8

 C. There is no evidence that Drs. Giering or Cole committed inequitable conduct.... 9

III. CONCLUSION..... 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ist Media, LLC v. Elec. Arts, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Abbott Biotechnology Ltd. v. Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 7330777 (D. Mass. Dec. 19, 2014).....	5
<i>Bal Seal Eng'g, Inc. v. Nelson Prods., Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 4697255 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2018).....	3
<i>Baxter Int'l, Inc. v. CareFusion Corp.</i> , 2022 WL 981115 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022).....	2, 3
<i>Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.</i> , 25 F.4th 976 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	3
<i>Crown Packaging Tech., Inc. v. Belvac Prod. Mach., Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 821441 (W.D. Va. Mar. 17, 2022).....	2
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Brooklands Inc.</i> , 290 F. Supp. 3d 113 (D. Mass. 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Kaz USA, Inc.</i> , 120 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D. Mass. 2015).....	3, 8, 9
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Juniper Network, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 4181905 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2018)	10
<i>Fiskars, Inc. v. Hunt Mfg. Co.</i> , 221 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	8
<i>Knorr-Bremse Systeme Fuer Nutzfahrzeuge GmbH v. Dana Corp.</i> , 383 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	6, 7
<i>Lear Corp. v. NHK Seating of Am. Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 876021 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 23, 2022).....	3
<i>Metris U.S.A., Inc. v. Faro Techs., Inc.</i> , 882 F. Supp. 2d 160 (D. Mass. 2011).....	2
<i>Navico Inc. v. Garmin Int'l, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 3701189 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2017).....	3



PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.,
522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....5

Symbol Techs., Inc. v. Opticon, Inc.,
935 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....5

Terves, LLC v. Yueyang Aerospace New Materials Co.,
2022 WL 1092658 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 12, 2022).....2, 8

Therasense, Inc. v. Benton, Dickinson & Co.,
649 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc)..... *passim*

W. Plastics, Inc. v. DuBose Strapping, Inc.,
2022 WL 576218 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 25, 2022).....3

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 1.7810

Fed. R. Evid. 7025

Fed. R. Evid. 7045

I. INTRODUCTION

Lilly's opposition largely ignores the Federal Circuit's decision in *Therasense, Inc. v. Benton, Dickinson & Co.*, 649 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc), which imposed heightened standards for both materiality and intent. No factfinder, on this record, could reasonably conclude that Lilly has satisfied *either* standard, let alone both.

Lilly's primary inequitable conduct claim rests on the lack of disclosure of [REDACTED] and the Shaw prior art reference that *was disclosed* in prosecuting two of the three Patents-in-Suit. As to the materiality of [REDACTED], the examiner already knew that not all antibodies that bind CGRP also antagonize it. Shaw, which the PTO *actually considered* before issuing two of the Patents-in-Suit, also did not disclose anything the examiner did not know. And [REDACTED]. Even Lilly's experts were unable to opine that any of this was particularly important: The best they could muster was that [REDACTED] "could have been relevant" and that [REDACTED] would have been "germane." Neither this tepid expert testimony nor anything else in the record permits the but-for materiality finding that *Therasense* requires.

Lilly's case for specific intent to deceive is even weaker. Knowledge of a reference and its materiality—even if proven—is insufficient to show a specific intent to deceive. *E.g.*, *Therasense*, 649 F.3d at 1290; *1st Media, LLC v. Elec. Arts, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 1367, 1374–75 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Yet Lilly's entire intent case rests on the theory that [REDACTED] knew of Shaw and [REDACTED] and knew they were important. But Lilly offers *no* evidence that [REDACTED] actually considered disclosing this information and chose not to do so. Moreover, an inequitable conduct claim fails if there are "reasonable inferences that may be drawn" *other than* the intent to deceive. *Therasense*, 649 F.3d at 1290–91. Lilly has not adduced evidence from which a factfinder could reject as "unreasonable" the "other inferences that can be drawn from the

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.