

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE BENDAMUSTINE CONSOLIDATED)
CASES)

C.A. No. 13-2046-GMS (consolidated)

PLAINTIFF CEPHALON, INC.'S ANSWERING 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

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

Counsel for Plaintiff Cephalon, Inc.

Dated: January 16, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	iii
Table of Asserted Patents (Updated)	vi
Table of Abbreviations	vii
Introduction.....	1
Argument	2
1. Proposed Constructions for the Disputed Terms of the ‘190 Patent.....	2
(a) “Tertiary-Butyl Alcohol”: The Plain and Ordinary Meaning Applies	2
(b) “Pharmaceutical Composition”: The ‘190 Patent’s Express Definition Controls the Construction.....	6
(c) “Lyophilized Pharmaceutical Composition” Encompasses Pharmaceutical Compositions That Are or Have Been Lyophilized.....	10
(d) “0.5%” Refers to the Amount of Bendamustine Ethylester 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.....	14
(a) “Trace Amount of Tertiary-Butyl Alcohol (TBA)” Does Not Require That the Amount Be “Detectable”	14
(b) “Stable Lyophilized Preparation”: The ‘863 Patent’s Express Definition Controls the Construction.....	15
3. Proposed Constructions for the Disputed Terms of the ‘270 Patent.....	18
(a) “Area Percent of Bendamustine” Should Be Construed How the Inventors Explicitly Defined That Phrase in the Patent Specification	18
(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”	20
(c) “Amount of HP1 Measured at Time Zero after Reconstitution”: “Time Zero after Reconstitution” Refers to the First HPLC Measurement Taken Soon After the Lyophilized Preparation Is Dissolved in a Solvent, and Is Not Restricted to an Illusory, Precise Point in Time at Which the Lyophilized Preparation Is “Reconstituted”	21
(d) “Bendamustine Degradants” Is Not Limited to the Four Degradants Identified in Accord and Breckenridge’s Construction	24
(e) “Containing Less Than or Equal to 4.0% (Area Percent of Bendamustine) of Bendamustine Degradants” Should Be	

	Construed According to How the ‘270 Patent Explicitly Defines the Phrase’s Constituent Terms and Not to Require, As Innopharma Proposes, That the Claimed Composition Have “an Alcohol Added That Materially Alters the Solubility of Bendamustine”	27
(f)	“Pharmaceutical Composition”: The ‘270 Patent’s Express Definition Controls the Construction	29
(g)	“Pharmaceutical Composition That Has Been Reconstituted” Means “Pharmaceutical Composition That Has Been Dissolved in a Solvent”	37
(h)	“Lyophilized Preparation” and “Lyophilized Composition” Mean “Freeze-Dried Preparation” and “Freeze-Dried Composition”	40
(i)	“Not More Than” / “Not More Than about” / “about” Should Be Construed According to Their Plain and Ordinary Meanings	41
4.	Proposed Constructions for the Disputed Terms of the ‘524 Patent	42
(a)	The Construction of “Solid Form of Bendamustine Hydrochloride, Designated As Bendamustine Hydrochloride Form 1” Should Not Include a Limitation That the Crystal Form “Does Not Contain Any Water”	42
(b)	The “X-Ray Powder Diffraction Pattern” Claim Terms Do Not Require “Peaks That Are Freestanding and Do Not Overlap with the Characteristic Peaks of Any of the Other Forms of Bendamustine”	47
(c)	“Lyophilized Composition” Means “Freeze-Dried Composition”	49
	Conclusion	50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
<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).....	42
<i>Agere Sys., Inc. v. Broadcom Corp.</i> , No. 03-3138, 2004 WL 1658530 (E.D. Pa. July 20, 2004)	22
<i>ArcelorMittal France v. AK Steel Corp.</i> , 700 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	32
<i>Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 743 F. Supp. 2d 305 (D. Del. 2010).....	3, 18, 28, 41
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	38
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Labs., Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	32
<i>Cephalon Inc. v. Mylan Pharm. Inc.</i> , 962 F. Supp. 2d 688 (D. Del. 2013).....	22
<i>Comark Commc 'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	passim
<i>CVI/Beta Ventures, Inc. v. Tura LP</i> , 112 F.3d 1146 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	32
<i>Epistar Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm 'n</i> , 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	46
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	33, 36
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. Universal Avionics Sys. Corp.</i> , 493 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	19
<i>In re Johnston</i> , 435 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	38
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	31

<i>Intel Corp. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 946 F.2d 821 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	3, 32
<i>Intermec Techs. Corp. v. Palm Inc.</i> , 811 F. Supp. 2d 973 (D. Del. 2011)	4, 38
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs., Inc.</i> , 429 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	34
<i>Kara Tech. Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	3, 18, 28, 41
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	5, 29, 33
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	24
<i>Paragon Solutions, LLC v. Timex Corp.</i> , 566 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	22
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd.</i> , 457 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	35
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	42, 46, 50
<i>Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , No. CV 11-902-LPS-CJB, 2014 WL 1961980 (D. Del. May 15, 2014)	35
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharms., Inc.</i> , 438 F.3d 1123 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	18, 28, 41
<i>Regents of Univ. of Minnesota v. AGA Med. Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	32
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	22, 24
<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 346 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	34
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. Memorex Prods., Inc.</i> , 415 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	16
<i>Select Retrieval LLC v. Amerimark Direct LLC</i> , No. 1:11-CV-00812-RGA, 2013 WL 5657565 (D. Del. Oct. 17, 2013)	5, 29

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.