

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

)	
)	
)	
IN RE BENDAMUSTINE CONSOLIDATED)	C.A. No. 13-2046-GMS (consolidated)
CASES)	
)	
)	
)	

PLAINTIFF CEPHALON, INC.’S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

OF COUNSEL:
David M. Hashmall
Calvin E. Wingfield Jr.
Jonathan A. Auerbach
Timothy J. Rousseau
Joshua A. Whitehill
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
The New York Times Building
620 8th Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 813-8800

Paul F. Ware
Daryl L. Wiesen
Emily L. Rapalino
Nicholas K. Mitrokostas
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 570-1000

John W. Shaw (No. 3362)
Karen E. Keller (No. 4489)
SHAW KELLER LLP
300 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1120
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 298-0700
jshaw@shawkeller.com
kkeller@shawkeller.com

Stephen B. Brauerman (No. 4952)
Vanessa R. Tiradentes (No. 5398)
Sara E. Bussiere (No. 5725fs)
BAYARD, P.A.
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
(302) 655-5000
sbrauerman@bayardlaw.com
vitradentes@bayardlaw.com
sbussiere@bayardlaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff Cephalon, Inc.

Dated: December 19, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	iii
Table of Asserted Patents.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
Argument	4
1. Proposed Constructions for the Disputed Terms of the ‘190 Patent.....	4
(a) “Tertiary-Butyl Alcohol” Should Be Construed According to Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning.....	4
(b) “Pharmaceutical Composition” Means “Composition That Is Made under Conditions Such That It Is Suitable for Administration to Humans, and Includes, but Is Not Limited to, a Pre-Lyophilization Solution or Dispersion As Well As a Liquid Form Ready for Injection or Infusion after Reconstitution of a Lyophilized Preparation”	8
(c) “Lyophilized Pharmaceutical Composition” Means “Freeze-Dried Composition That Is Made under Conditions Such That It Is Suitable for Administration to Humans, and Includes, but Is Not Limited to, a Pre-Lyophilization Solution or Dispersion That Has Been Freeze-Dried As Well As a Liquid Form Ready for Injection or Infusion after Reconstitution of a Lyophilized Preparation”.....	11
(d) “0.5%” Means “0.5 Area Percent Relative to the Amount of Bendamustine As Determined, <i>e.g.</i> , by HPLC”	12
2. Proposed Constructions for the Disputed Terms of the ‘863 Patent.....	15
(a) “Trace Amount of Tertiary-Butyl Alcohol (TBA)” Means “Amount of Tertiary-Butyl Alcohol That Is Equal to or Below Recommended Levels for Pharmaceutical Products”.....	15
(b) “Stable Lyophilized Preparation” Means “Solid Material Obtained by Freeze-Drying Having Sufficient Stability to Have Utility As a Pharmaceutical Product”.....	17
3. Proposed Constructions for the Disputed Terms of the ‘270 Patent.....	20
(a) “Area Percent of Bendamustine” Means “Amount of a Specified Degradant Relative to the Amount of Bendamustine As Determined, <i>e.g.</i> , by HPLC”	20
(b) “Containing Not More Than About 0.9% [0.5% or 0.4%] (Area Percent of Bendamustine) of HP1” Means “Containing Not More Than about 0.9% [0.5% or 0.4%] of HP1 Relative to the Amount of Bendamustine As Determined, <i>e.g.</i> , by HPLC”	21

(c) “Amount of HP1 Measured at Time Zero after Reconstitution” Means “Amount of HP1 Measured Soon after Dissolution in a Solvent”23

(d) “Bendamustine Degradants” Means “Chemical Compounds Resulting from a Change in Chemical Structure of Bendamustine”24

(e) “Containing Less Than or Equal to 4.0% (Area Percent of Bendamustine) of Bendamustine Degradants” Means “Containing Less Than or Equal to 4% of Total Chemical Compounds Resulting from a Change in Chemical Structure Of Bendamustine Relative to the Amount of Bendamustine As Determined, e.g., by HPLC”27

(f) “Pharmaceutical Composition” Means “Composition That Is Made under Conditions Such That It Is Suitable for Administration to Humans, and Includes, But Is Not Limited to, a Pre-Lyophilization Solution or Dispersion As Well As a Liquid Form Ready for Injection or Infusion after Reconstitution of a Lyophilized Preparation”32

(g) “Pharmaceutical Composition That Has Been Reconstituted” Means “Pharmaceutical Composition That Has Been Dissolved in a Solvent”37

(h) “Lyophilized Preparation” / “Lyophilized Composition” Means “Freeze-Dried Preparation” / “Freeze-Dried Composition”38

(i) “Not More Than” / “Not More Than about” / “about” Should Be Construed According to Their Plain and Ordinary Meanings39

4. Proposed Constructions for the Disputed Terms of the ‘524 Patent40

(a) “Solid Form of Bendamustine Hydrochloride, Designated As Bendamustine Hydrochloride Form 1” Should Be Construed As “Crystal Form of Bendamustine Hydrochloride That Can Be Distinguished from Other Forms by Its X-Ray Powder Diffraction Pattern”40

(b) The “X-Ray Powder Diffraction Pattern” Claim Terms Should Be Construed According to Their Plain Meanings, as Cephalon Proposes, and Not to Require, As Defendants Assert, “Peaks That Are Freestanding and Do Not Overlap with the Characteristic Peaks of Any of the Other Forms of Bendamustine”43

(c) “Lyophilized Composition” Means “Freeze-Dried Composition”49

Conclusion50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Dey, L.P.</i> , 287 F.3d 1097 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	36
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc 'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	40
<i>AFG Indus., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.</i> , 375 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	7
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	6
<i>Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 743 F. Supp. 2d 305 (D. Del. 2010).....	20, 31
<i>Baldwin Graphic Sys., Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.</i> , 512 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	7
<i>Beachcombers v. WildeWood Creative Products, Inc.</i> , 31 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	46
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	31
<i>Cardiac Sci., Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips Elecs. N.V.</i> , No. 03-1064, 2006 WL 1050629 (D. Minn. Apr. 20, 2006).....	35
<i>Comark Commc 'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	19, 31, 39, 46
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	10, 26
<i>Epistar Corp. v. Int 'l Trade Comm 'n</i> , 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	47
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc.-Fla.</i> , 764 F.3d 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	22
<i>Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings, Inc.</i> , 405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	44
<i>Honeywell Int 'l, Inc. v. Universal Avionics Sys. Corp.</i> , 493 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	9

<i>Intamin Ltd. v. Magnetar Techs., Corp.</i> , 483 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	6
<i>InterDigital Commc'ns, LLC v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 690 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	34
<i>Intervet Inc. v. Merial Ltd.</i> , 617 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	20
<i>Invensas Corp. v. Renesas Elecs. Corp.</i> , No. 11-448-GMS, 2013 WL 3753621 (D. Del. July 15, 2013).....	16
<i>Johnson Worldwide Assocs., Inc. v. Zebco Corp.</i> , 175 F.3d 985 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	30
<i>Kara Tech. Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	19, 31
<i>L'Oreal S.A. v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Cos.</i> , No. 12-98-GMS, 2013 WL 3788803 (D. Del. July 19, 2013).....	16
<i>Linear Tech. Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 566 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	9, 18, 21, 33
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	6, 22
<i>Mobil Oil Corp. v. Amoco Chems. Corp.</i> , 779 F. Supp. 1429 (D. Del. 1991).....	16
<i>Nippon Steel & Sumitomo Metal Corp v. POSCO</i> , No. 12-2429, 2014 WL 2534929 (D.N.J. June 4, 2014).....	49
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F. 3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	23
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd.</i> , 457 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	36
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).....	passim
<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. Verisign, Inc.</i> , 512 F. Supp. 2d 174 (D. Del. 2007).....	16
<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 346 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	36

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.