

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Kowa Company, Ltd., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 14-CV-2758 (PAC)

Kowa Company, Ltd., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Apotex, Inc., et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 14-CV-7934 (PAC)

PLAINTIFFS' POST-TRIAL MEMORANDUM

Table of Contents

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	1
I. THE ‘336 PATENT	4
A. Introduction.....	4
B. Amneal Has No “Legal” Basis for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.	6
C. Amneal Has No “Factual” Case for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.	10
D. Secondary Considerations.....	13
E. Conclusion	13
II. THE ‘993 PATENT	14
A. Introduction to Crystallinity and Powder X-ray Diffraction (PXRD)	14
B. The Claims of the ‘993 Patent are Infringed.....	16
1. Applicable Legal Principles	16
2. Level of ordinary skill in the art	18
C. Defendants Infringe the ‘993 Patent	23
1. Amneal stipulated that its ANDA Products contain Form A Pitavastatin Calcium, and infringe claims 1, 22-25 of the ‘993 patent	23
2. The Apotex ANDA Products contain Form A Pitavastatin Calcium Manufactured by MSN Laboratories, Ltd., and Thus Infringe Claims 1, 22, and 23-25 of the ‘993 patent	23
III. THE CLAIMS OF THE ‘993 PATENT ARE VALID	34
A. Defendants Have the Burden of Proving Invalidity by Clear and Convincing Evidence.	34
B. Law of Express and Inherent Anticipation	34
C. Law of Obviousness.....	35
IV. the ‘993 Patent	36
A. The ‘993 Patent and Prosecution History	36
B. The Prior Art Relied Upon by Amneal and Apotex Was Before the U.S.P.T.O and Considered by the Examiner.....	37
C. Prior Art References and Documents Listed on the Face of a Patent Are Presumed to Have Been Considered by a Competent Examiner Having Expertise in the Relevant Field	40
V. Background of the Technology - Polymorph Crystal Formation	41
VI. ARGUMENT	43
A. EP ‘406 Does Not Anticipate Claims 1 or 22-25 of the ‘993 Patent	43
B. A POSA Following Example 3 of EP ‘406 Could Produce a Variety of Polymorphic Forms	43
1. The December 14, 2006 Third Party Observation Submitted in the EP ‘232 Prosecution Does Not Show Example 3 of EP ‘406 Inherently Produces Form A of	

Claims 1 and 22-25	47
2. Claims 1 and 22-25 of the '993 Patent Would Not Have Been Obvious	52
VII. EVIDENCE OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	60
A. Commercial Success	61
B. Unexpected Results.....	62
C. Long-Felt Need	64
D. Failure of Others	64
E. Praise of others.....	65
F. Industry skepticism	65
G. Copying.....	65
H. Acquiescence.....	65
VI. CONCLUSION	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abbott Biotech. Ltd. v. Centocor Ortho Biotech</i>	43
<i>Abbvie Inc. v. Mathilda & Terence Kennedy Inst.</i> , 956 F. Supp. 2d 429 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	7, 8, 13
<i>Acumed LLC v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 483 F.3d 800 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	17
<i>Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc. v. Scimed Life Sys., Inc.</i> , 261 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	17
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	36
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Alcon Labs., Inc.</i> , 324 F. 3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	17
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche, Ltd.</i> , 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	13
<i>Astrazeneca AB v. Reddy's Labs.</i> , Civil Action No. 11-2317 (JAP), 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 62149 (D.N.J. Apr. 30, 2013)	33
<i>AstraZeneca v. Andrx</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3990	31, 32, 33
<i>Bausch & Lomb, Inc.</i> , 79 F. Supp. 2d at 255 (W.D.N.Y. 2000).....	41
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	17
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , No. 10-5810 (MLC), 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 44481 (D.N.J. Mar. 28, 2013)	26, 34
<i>Cadence Pharms., Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>Cephalon, Inc. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 939 F. Supp. 2d 456 (D. Del. 2013).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cephalon, Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.</i> , 769 F. Supp. 2d 761 (D. Del. 2011).....	17

<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	36
<i>Creative Compounds, LLC v. Starmark Labs.</i> , 651 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	17
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm.</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	64
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	11
<i>Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	64
<i>Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	60
<i>Eisai</i> , 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32462	<i>passim</i>
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Parenteral Medicines, Inc.</i> , 689 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	13, 62
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 619 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	7, 8
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.</i> , 471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	36
<i>Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Natco Pharma Ltd.</i> , 753 F.3d 1208 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	9
<i>Glaxo, Inc. v. Novopharm, Ltd.</i> , 110 F.3d 1562 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	17
<i>Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.</i> , 52 F.3d 1043 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	37, 49, 52
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	37, 63
<i>In re Depomed Patent Litig.</i> , No. 13-4507, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 166077 (D.N.J. Sep. 30, 2016)	38, 60
<i>In re Depomed Patent Litig.</i> , No. 13-CV-04507, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14455 (D.N.J. Feb. 5, 2016)	19, 21, 30, 34
<i>In re Fallaux</i> , 564 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	9, 10

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.