

**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' OPPOSITION TO ELI LILLY AND COMPANY'S MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 50(B) AND/OR
A NEW TRIAL UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 59**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... 1

 A. Evidence At Trial Relating To Written Description and Enablement 1

 B. Evidence Presented at Trial Concerning Future Lost Profits..... 4

III. ARGUMENT 5

 A. Legal Standard 5

 B. Lilly Bore the Burden on Invalidity Yet Relied on Flawed Expert Opinions 5

 1. Lilly Bore the Burden of Proof by Clear and Convincing Evidence 5

 2. A Reasonable Jury Could Have Discredited Lilly’s Experts’ Opinions..... 6

 C. Lilly Is Not Entitled to JMOL of Invalidity for Lack of Written Description 9

 1. Written Description Is a Case-Specific Fact Question 9

 2. There Is No Legal Rule That Claims to a Class of Functionally-Defined Antibodies Lack Written Description 10

 3. Lilly Failed to Prove That the Claimed Antibody Genus Is “Broad” 11

 4. The Specification Discloses a Representative Number of Species..... 13

 5. Lilly Failed to Carry Its Burden as to Common Structural Features 22

 6. Lilly Failed to Carry Its Burden as to the Treatment Aspects of the Claims 23

 D. Lilly Is Not Entitled to JMOL of Invalidity for Lack of Enablement..... 25

 E. Lilly’s Alternative Argument for a New Trial on Validity Should Be Denied 28

 F. The Jury’s Future Lost Profits Award Was Reasonable 28

IV. CONCLUSION..... 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>AbbVie Deutschland GmbH v. Janssen Biotech, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	10, 12, 16
<i>Ajinomoto Co. v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.</i> , 228 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	25
<i>Ajinomoto Co. v. ITC</i> , 932 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	9, 16
<i>In re Alonso</i> , 545 F.3d 1015 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	14, 15
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Sanofi</i> , 872 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	10, 12, 16
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10, 19, 20, 25
<i>Ascion, LLC v. Ashley Furniture Indus., Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 1197338 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 22, 2022)	10
<i>BASF Plant Science, LP v. CSIRO</i> , 28 F.4th 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bayer Healthcare LLC v. Baxalta Inc.</i> , 989 F.3d 964 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	9
<i>Bd. of Trs. of Leland Stanford Junior Univ. v. Chinese Univ. of H.K.</i> , 860 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	9
<i>Brooktree Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , 977 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	30
<i>Capon v. Eshhar</i> , 418 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	13
<i>Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc. v. Abbott Lab'ys</i> , 636 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	19
<i>Cephalon, Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	26

<i>Cummins-Allison Corp. v. SBM Co.</i> , 584 F. Supp. 2d 916 (E.D. Tex. 2008).....	28
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 276 F. Supp. 3d 629 (E.D. Tex. 2017).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Fail-Safe, L.L.C. v A.O. Smith Corp.</i> , 744 F. Supp. 2d 870 (E.D. Wis. 2010).....	30
<i>Fiskars, Inc. v. Hunt Mfg. Co.</i> , 221 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	28
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	28
<i>Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker</i> , 329 U.S. 1 (1946).....	10, 11
<i>In re Herschler</i> , 591 F.2d 693 (C.C.P.A. 1979)	13
<i>Hologic, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 884 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	25
<i>Hyatt v. Dudas</i> , 551 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	17
<i>Idenix Pharms. LLC v. Gilead Scis. Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1149 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	16, 27
<i>Immunex Corp. v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 964 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	22
<i>Juno Therapeutics, Inc. v. Kite Pharma, Inc.</i> , 10 F.4th 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	12, 16
<i>Lam, Inc. v. Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 718 F.2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	28, 30
<i>Lochner Techs., LLC v. Vizio, Inc.</i> , 567 F. App'x 931 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	17
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	20
<i>Marine Polymer Techs., Inc. v. HemCon, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	5

<i>New Railhead Mfg., L.L.C. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.</i> , 298 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	25
<i>Nuvo Pharm. (Ir.) Designated Activity Co. v. Dr. Reddy's Lab'ys Inc.</i> , 923 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	24
<i>Oiness v. Walgreen Co.</i> , 88 F.3d 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	29
<i>Pernix Ir. Pain DAC v. Alvogen Malta Operations Ltd.</i> , 323 F. Supp. 3d 566 (D. Del. 2018).....	15
<i>PPG Indus., Inc. v. Guardian Indus. Corp.</i> , 75 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	26
<i>Regents of the Univ. of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 119 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	18
<i>Rodríguez-Valentin v. Doctors' Ctr. Hosp. (Manati), Inc.</i> , 27 F.4th 14 (1st Cir. 2022).....	1, 28
<i>Sanchez v. Foley</i> , 972 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2020).....	6
<i>Sebastino v. Springfield Terminal Ry.</i> , 530 F. Supp. 3d 81 (D. Mass. 2021).....	5
<i>Shockley v. Arcan, Inc.</i> , 248 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	28, 29
<i>Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	5
<i>TQ Delta, LLC v. CISCO Sys., Inc.</i> , 942 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	5
<i>Valmont Indus., Inc. v. Reinke Mfg. Co.</i> , 983 F.2d 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	10
<i>In re Wands</i> , 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	25, 26
<i>Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co.</i> , 520 U.S. 17 (1997).....	10
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	5, 23

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.