

Christina L. Saveriano
HILL WALLACK LLP
21 Roszel Road
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Telephone: 609-924-0808
Facsimile: 609-452-1888
csaveriano@hillwallack.com

Lauren Martin
**MCDERMOTT WILL &
EMERY LLP**
28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: 617-535-3889
lnmartin@mwe.com

Thomas P. Steindler
Rebecca Harker Duttry
David Mlaver
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
500 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 202-756-8000
Facsimile: 202-756-8087
tsteindler@mwe.com

Attorneys for Defendant Sandoz Inc.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

UNITED THERAPEUTICS)	
CORPORATION,)	
)	
Plaintiff and Counterclaim-)	
Defendant,)	
)	Civil Action No.
v.)	3:14-cv-5499 (PGS)(LHG)
)	
SANDOZ INC.,)	
)	
Defendant and Counterclaim-)	
Plaintiff.)	

**DEFENDANT SANDOZ INC.'S
OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
A. The Prior Art	1
B. The '393 Patent	2
III. LEGAL STANDARDS FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	3
IV. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. Each Disputed Term Requires Construction.....	3
B. The Disputed Terms	5
1. Term 1 (claims 1 and 9): “product”	5
a. The Open-Ended Language Of The Claims Mandates Sandoz’s Proposed Construction	5
b. UTC’s Proposed Construction Ignores The Open- Ended Nature Of the Claims.....	6
2. Term 2 (claim 1) and term 12 (claim 9): “a product comprising a compound of formula I/IV or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof”	8
a. The Open-Ended Nature Of The Claimed Product Mandates Sandoz’s Proposed Construction	10
b. UTC’s Proposed Definition Seeks To Import An Unrecited Limitation Into The Claim	11
3. Term 3 (claim 1) and term 13 (claim 9): “a process comprising” and “the process comprising”	12
a. There Is A Genuine Dispute As To The Proper Construction Of “A Process Comprising” Such That Construction Is Warranted	13
b. Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Gives Effect To The Patentee’s Definition Of “Comprising”	14
4. Term 4 (claim 1) and term 14 (claim 9): “an alkylating agent”	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

a.	Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Defines “An Alkylating Agent” As The Term Is Used In The Context Of The Claim	15
b.	Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Is Supported By The Specification	16
c.	UTC’s Proposed Construction Is Divorced From The Context Of The Claim In Which The Term Appears	17
5.	Term 5 (claims 1 and 9): “a base B”	18
a.	Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Is Consistent With The Plain Language Of The Claims, While UTC’s Proposed Construction Impermissibly Reads A Limitations Out Of The Claims.	19
b.	Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Is Consistent With The Specification	20
6.	Term 6 (claim 1) and term 15 (claim 9): “a salt of formula I _S ” and “a salt of formula IV _S ”	21
a.	Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Explains And Clarifies The Disputed Term	22
7.	Term 7 (claims 1 and 9): “HB+”	23
a.	Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Gives Effect To The Claim Language	24
b.	Sandoz’s Proposed Construction Is Fully Supported By The Specification	26
c.	UTC’s Proposed Construction Reads Out The “H” and “B” Limitations Of “HB+”	26
8.	Term 8 (claim 1) and term 16 (claim 9): “(c) contacting the product of step (b) with a base B to form a salt of formula [I _S /IV _S]”	27
a.	During Prosecution, UTC Disclaimed Processes Which Involved Salt Formation Where Treprostinil Has Previously Been Isolated	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

9. Term 9 (claim 2): “The product of claim 1, wherein the purity of the compound of formula I in said product is at least 99.5%”31

 a. The Law Requires Different Constructions Of The Claimed Product For Purposes Of Validity And Infringement32

 b. Sandoz’s Proposed Constructions Further Clarify The Meaning Of “The Purity . . . Is At Least 99.5%”, While UTC’s Proposed Construction Does Not34

10. Term 10 (claims 2, 4 and 8) and term 17 (claim 16): “the product of claim 1” and “the product of claim 9”35

11. Term 11 (claim 8) and term 18 (claim 16): “purifying the compound of formula III produced in step (a)” or “purifying the compound of formula VI produced in step (a)”38

 a. Sandoz’s Construction Is Based On The Plain And Ordinary Meaning Of “Purifying” Read In Light Of The Specification.....39

V. CONCLUSION.....40

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX II

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs v. Sandoz Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (en banc)	33
<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	18
<i>Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche, Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10, 32, 34
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	32
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989).....	32
<i>CIAS, Inc. v. Alliance Gaming Corp.</i> , 504 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	5
<i>Cochrane v. Badische Anilin & Soda Farabrik</i> , 111 U.S. 293 (1884).....	33
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Wabash Appliance Corp.</i> , 304 U.S. 364 (1938).....	33
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.</i> , 112 F.3d 495 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	6, 10
<i>IGT v. Bally Gaming Int’l Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1109 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	18, 20
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg, L.P.</i> , 327 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	14
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	18

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.