1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE DISTRICT	OF NEW JERSEY	
3		_	
4	SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI,	CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: 3:14-cv-07869-MAS-LHG	
5	Plaintiffs,	3:14-cv-08082-MAS-LHG 3:15-cv-02631-MAS-LHG	
6	-vs-		
7	FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC,	MARKMAN HEARING	
8	Defendant.		
9			
10	SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI,	3:14-cv-1502522	
11	Plaintiffs,		
12	-vs-		
	DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC., et al.,		
1 <i>4</i> 15	Defendants.		
16	SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI,	3:14-cv-15-02523	
17	Plaintiffs,		
18			
19	-vs-		
20			
21	GLENMARK GENERICS INC. et al.,		
22	Defendants.		
23			
24			
25			

United States District Court Trenton, New Jersey



1 .			2
	SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS		
3	PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI,	3:15-cv-02520-MAS-LHG	
4	Plaintiffs,		
5	-vs-		
6 .	ACCORD HEALTHCARE, INC.		
7	Defendant.		
8	SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS		
	PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI	3:14-cv-08081-MAS-LHG	
10	Plaintiffs,	3.14-CV-00001-MAS-LHG	
11	-vs-		
	BPI LABS, LLC and BELCHER PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC		
13	Defendants.		
14	berendanes.		
	SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI		
16	Plaintiffs,	3:15-cv-00287-MAS-LHG 3:15-cv-01835-MAS-LHG	
17	-vs-		
18	APOTEX CORP. and APOTEX, INC.		
19	Defendants.		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	United States District Court Trenton, New Jersey		

1	APPEARANCES cont'd
2	FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO, ESQUIRES BY: WILLIAM SOLANDER, ESQUIRE
3	JASON A. LEONARD, ESQUIRE
4	WHITNEY L. MEIER, ESQUIRE JAYITA GUHANIYOGI, ESQUIRE
5	Attorneys for the Plaintiffs Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC, et al.
6	PATUNAS & TARANTINO LLC BY: MICHAEL E. PATUNAS, ESQUIRE
7	Attorneys for the Defendant Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC.
8	GOODWIN PROCTER LLP BY: DARYL L. WIESEN, ESQUIRE AVIV ZALCENSTEIN, ESQUIRE
9	JOHN P. HANISH, Ph.D BRIAN J. PREW, ESQUIRE
10	Attorneys for the Defendant Fresenius Kabi USA, LLC.
11	WILSON, SONSINI, GOODRICH & ROSATI, ESQUIRES
12	BY: MATTHEW R. REED, ESQUIRE S. BREI GUSSACK, ESQUIRE
13	Attorneys for Defendant Mylan Laboratories Ltd.
14	SAIBER LLC BY: ARNOLD B. CALMANN, ESQUIRE
15	Attorneys for the Defendant Mylan Laboratories Ltd.
16	HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP BY: C. KYLE MUSGROVE, ESQUIRE
17	ROBERT F. VROOM, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Defendant Breckenridge Pharmaceutical, Inc.
18	TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
19	BY: ANDREW M. ALUL, ESQUIRE ROGER KILEY, ESQUIRE
20	Attorneys for the Defendant Apotex Corp. and Apotex Inc.
21	HILL WALLACK, LLP BY: CHRISTINA L. SAVERIANO
22	Attorneys for the Defendant Apotex Corp. and Apotex Inc.
23	MCNEELY HARE & WAR, LLP BY: GABRIELA MATERASSI, ESQUIRE WILLIAM HARE, ESQUIRE
24	CHRISTOPHER CASIERI, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Defendant BPI Labs, LLC and Belcher
25	Pharmaceuticals, LLC.
	United States District Court Trenton, New Jersey
	Tremon, New Verdey

1	3 SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS 3:15-cv-01863-MAS-LHG PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI
2	TIMON SIAL WINDS
3	Plaintiffs,
4	
5	-VS-
6	BRECKENRIDGE PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.
7	Defendant.
8	SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC, AVENTIS         3:15-cv-00290-MAS-LHG           PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI.         3:15-cv-03392-MAS-LHG
9	PHARMA S.A. and SANOFI, 3:15-cv-03392-MAS-LHG
10	Plaintiffs,
11	
12	-VS-
13	MYLAN LABORATORIES LTD.
14	
15	Defendant.
16	
17	Clarkson S. Fisher United States Courthouse 402 East State Street
18	Trenton, New Jersey 08608 January 23, 2016
19	B E F O R E: HONORABLE MICHAEL A. SHIPP
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
	APPEARANCES:
21	CONNELL FOLEY, ESQS.
22	BY: LIZA M. WALSH, ESQUIRE and
23	KATELYN O'REILLY, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Plaintiffs Sanofi-Aventis, U.S., LLC and
24	Aventic Dharma C A

L	Trentent, thew bersey
1	APPEARANCES cont'd
2	SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP
3	BY: HELEN H. JI, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Defendant Accord Healthcare, Inc.
4	TRESSLER LLP
5	BY: ROBERT FETTWEIS, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Defendant Breckenridge Pharmaceutical, Inc.
6	CARLSON, CASPERS, VANDENBURGH, LINDQUIST & SCHULMAN, ESQS.
7	BY: GARY J. SPEIER, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Defendant Glenmark Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
8	RIVKIN RADLER, ESQUIRES
9	BY: JORDAN MAMORSKY, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Defendant Glenmark Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
10	LAW OFFICE OF GREGORY J. BEVELOCK, LLC
11	BY: GREGORY J. BEVELOCK, ESQUIRE Attorneys for the Defendant Actavis LLC.
12	WILLKIE, FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP BY: MICHAEL W. JOHNSON, ESQUIRE
13	Attorneys for the Defendant Actavis LLC.
14	BUDD LARNER, P.C. BY: FRANK D. RODRIGUEZ, ESQUIRE
15	Attorneys for the Defendant Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc.
16	and Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd.
17	Contified as True and Connect as required by Title 30 U.S.C.
18	Certified as True and Correct as required by Title 28, U.S.C., Section 753
19	/S/ Cathy J. Ford, CCR, CRR, RPR /S/ Regina A. Tell, CCR, CRR, RMR
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

6

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Good morning.

(Open court begins at 9:07 a.m.)

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3 THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning.

THE DEPUTY COURT CLERK: All rise.

COUNSELS: Good morning, your Honor,

THE COURT: We are here today in the matter of Sanofi-Aventis vs. Fresenius, et al. Docket Number 14-7869.

We're here today during the first part of the morning for the tutorial, after which we will have a break, and then we'll commence with the Markman hearing.

I'd like to do appearances. I've asked that only those attorneys in the well enter their appearances. Everyone else has signed in on the sign-in sheet. Your appearances will be on the transcript and noted for the record.

So, with that being said, let me have counsel enter their appearances.

MS. WALSH: Good morning, your Honor. Appearing on behalf of Sanofi-Aventis. Liza Walsh and Katelvn O'Reilly from Connell Foley. And I'm going to allow my co-counsel, William Solander, and his associates, partners, I should say, introduce themselves.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SOLANDER: Good morning, your Honor. William Solander, Fitzpatrick, Cella, Harper, and Scinto for Sanofi.

MR. LEONARD: Good morning, your Honor. Jason Leonard from Fitzpatrick, Cella, Harper, and Scinto on behalf United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

MR. JOHNSON: Good morning, your Honor, Michael Johnson from Willkie, Farr, and Gallagher LLP on behalf of the defendant Actavis LLC.

THE COURT: Good morning. Is that everybody? with that being said, we're going to go ahead -let's talk about just a few logistics here.

The way I'd like to do this morning, and hopefully we can stick to the time schedule, what I'd like to do -- I'm under the information that the tutorial is, roughly, one hour and 15 minutes; is that correct?

12 MR. SOLANDER: It might be a little bit less than that, your Honor, yes.

> THE COURT: Less is always more in this context so... 9:15 until 10:30. I'd like to be done with the tutorial by 10:30. After that, we'll take a 15 minute-break, and I'd like to commence with the Markman hearing at 10:45. We'll go from 10:45 until 12:45. We'll take a one-hour lunch, from 12:45 to 1:45, and then we'll conclude with the back end at 1:45 to 2:45, okay. And if we need to be a little fluid with some of these times, if things move faster and quicker, we can certainly do that, but going into this, that's kind of the rough time sketch that I'm working with, okay.

> > Counsel.

MR. SOLANDER: Your Honor, I'm happy to start by United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

of Sanofi.

MS. MEIER: Good morning, your Honor. Witney Meier Fitzpatrick, Cella, Harper, and Scinto also on behalf of

MS. GUHANIYOGI: Good morning, your Honor. Jayita Guhaniyogi on behalf of Sanofi from Fitzpatrick, Cella.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me hear from defense.

MR. REED: Good morning, your Honor. Matthew Reed from Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich, and Rosati on behalf of the defendant Mylan Laboratories Limited. And with me today are my associate, Brei Gussack, and, of course, local counsel Arnie Calmann of the Saiber law firm.

MR. CALMANN: Good morning, your Honor.

MR. WIESEN: Good morning, your Honor. Daryl Wiesen from Goodwin Procter on behalf of Fresenius Kabi defendants. With me is Mike Patunas from Patunas Law.

MR. PATUNAS: Good morning, your Honor.

MR. MUSGROVE: Good morning, your Honor. Kyle Musgrove from Haynes and Boone for defendant Breckenridge Pharmaceutical. My local Bob Fettweis is back in the well.

MR. ALUL: Good morning, your Honor, Andrew Alul from Taft, Stettinius, and Hollister on behalf of defendants Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. And with me is my colleague Roger Kiley from Taft, Stettinius, and Hollister and my local saying that we've agreed on how we're going to proceed in terms of the order of things. We're going to do the tutorial from the plaintiffs' perspective first, in its entirety, on both of the subject matters of the patent. They will be split between myself and Mr. Leonard on our side, and then the defendants will give their tutorial in its entirety.

And then in terms of the argument, we plan to proceed patent by patent. There's only really one term in one of the patents so that will go first, and then we'll proceed to the second patent and we'll go term by term through it.

So I'll speak on behalf of the plaintiffs for one term, and then the defendants will go on the same term and proceed that way. And I suspect the arguments will get shorter and shorter as we go because the terms are simpler.

So, your Honor, for our tutorial this morning, I plan first to talk a little bit about the product that's at issue and then the technology, in general, that this product is a member of, the taxane class of drug products, and then I'll talk a little bit about the patents-in suit, and then we'll talk about the specific technologies in each of the patents, the acetone solvate patent, which is the first of the technology which will covered by Mr. Leonard, and then the treatment of prostrate cancer, which I'll come back and talk about at the end.



in fact. Okay. Your Honor, so this is the last of the series of patents in time that Sanofi obtained regarding the cabazitaxel development project, and there are a number of disputed terms. The parties have agreed how these are going to be broken up. There's a preliminary question. The first question is whether or not the preambles should be limitations. And then there are two subsidiary questions that are if they are limitations, what do they mean? The next term is the term "administering," what does that mean? And then two related terms down at the bottom "where the cabazitaxel is in the form of an acetone solvate" and "wherein the cabazitaxel is in base form." We're going to go sort of back and forth on each one of these, and I'll start with what I consider to be a preliminary question of whether or not the preambles of the claims are limiting.

So, just to set the stage, let me discuss what a preamble is. So, a preamble -- your Honor, do you have these slides? I have color versions. And we're presently on Slide 302, which I think is the third slide in the deck.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SOLANDER: So, as I was saying, what is a preamble? Well, a preamble is the words of a claim that come before the term "comprising." Right there. And that term "comprising" is a claim term that's commonly used in patent drafting. There can be other terms, "consisting of,"

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

particular limitation. If it is not a limitation we don't have to worry about proving infringement of it.

And the same is true for invalidity. If it is a limitation of a claim they have the burden under clear and convincing evidence to show that that limitation is taught by the prior art. And if it is not a limitation of the claim they do not have to show that that limitation is taught by the prior art. So, whether something is a limitation or not can be quite important in terms of how the trial is conducted and what things people have to be proving. So, the dispute here is whether "a method for treating" that's part of the preamble is a limitation, is part of the limitation of the entire preamble or is not. That's the dispute. We say, of course, that it is. They say that it is not.

So, let me just go the law. This is section 305. The case law says there's no litmus test that defines when a preamble is a limitation, when it limits the claim scope. That's black letter Federal Circuit law. But the Federal Circuit hasn't completely left us at sea. It has articulated in a number of decisions over the years that have been applied by many district courts a number of tests that one can look at to determine whether or not a preamble is limiting, and we have listed some of the pertinent ones that we'll be discussing here.

First, do the patentees repeatedly use the preambles

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

3,

"consisting essentially of." But, basically, most claims use the term "comprising." And what comes before that term is ordinarily considered the preamble, and that is shown in red up here on the board.

So, what is the dispute here? The dispute is highlighted on the next page. The parties agree that the portion in red starting with "a patient" and going down to "docetaxel" in both claims should be limitations of the claim. The parties disagree on whether "a method for treating" or "a method for increasing the survival of a patient" should be a limitation.

And let me explain what is a limitation of the claim. Let me use one that nobody disputes is a limitation. The word "cabazitaxel" that's found in the claim. What does that mean to be a limitation? It means in order to prove infringement we have to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendants are using or selling cabazitaxel or telling doctors to administer cabazitaxel. We have to prove that. If they're selling some different drug -- and this isn't in dispute here, but if they were selling some different drug like Taxol or docetaxel they would not meet that limitation, and, therefore, they would not infringe the claims.

So, if it is a limitation, we have to prove that they infringed the claims by meeting that limitation, that whatever

to describe the invention in the specification or in the prosecution history? And I'll explain what that means, and I'll explain how it applies here in just a moment.

The second is did the patentees clearly rely on the preambles during prosecution to distinguish the claimed inventions from the prior art?

And the third one is do the limitations in the body of the claims rely upon and derive their antecedent basis from the preambles?

In our view, your Honor, all three of these tests are met by the disputed term "a method for treatment" or "a method for increasing the survival thereof," and, therefore, they should be considered limitations on the claim scope of these patents.

So, let me, if I could go through each one of those tests and show you the evidence, the intrinsic evidence that shows that we're right.

The first test is whether or not the applicants repeatedly used the preamble language to describe the fundamental characteristics of their invention. Your Honor, I have highlighted portions of the specification. This is the abstract. The invention relates to a "treatment of prostate cancer" here. Highlights that it is a method of treating prostate cancer, not a method of doing something else. That's



relates to" we'll see that in the case law; "invention relates" is the same as the "invention is." It is the same thing.

Next part of the specification now we're actually in the specification itself on Columns 1 and 2. "The present invention relates to a treatment of prostate cancer." "The present invention." again, "relates to a treatment of prostate cancer in patients who have previously treated with a docetaxel-based regimen, an unmet need." So, here the specification is relating the method of treating to an unmet medical need. You don't solve an unmet medical need, unless you provide a method that treats, a method for treating a patient. That's the point. The whole point of this patent is they have identified the unmet medical need, as I discussed during the tutorial. These patients had nothing left after they were done with docetaxel, except to make them feel as comfortable as possible before they died. This gave them additional life. That was the unmet need. That is the treating -- that is what is being done to the patient. It is prolonging their life. It is treating them. That is what the claims mean. That is what they're talking about here in the specification.

And, again, meeting an unmet need requires an effective method for treating. Not an ineffective method, not an attempt to treat, it requires an effective method of

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

exactly what is going on here.

So, let's look at the case law. This is the In Re: Cruciferous case. It is a very strange name for a case, but, nevertheless, it is a Federal Circuit case, and in that case they held that the term "rich in glucosinates" helps define the invention, and, therefore, the preamble was limiting. And what kind of language did they use in the specification in that case? Well, very similar language to what you just found on the slides that I just showed you. The invention relates to the production and consumption of foods which are "rich in cancer chemoprotective compounds." Those are the glucosinates at the bottom. An object of the invention is to provide foods and additives that are rich in cancer ...

And, so, the Federal Circuit says, the specification, therefore, indicates that the inventors believed their invention to be making food products which were rich in glucosinates, thus, the limitation was found -- the preamble language was found to be limiting.

Next case is the *Galderma* case, Your Honor. In this one the issue was the term "useful for the treatment of."

Very similar to "method for treating." The Court found that it was a fundamental purpose of the invention to carry out —to carry out this treatment. And it further served to specify the therapeutic application of the method. And that's what we argue is happening here, Your Honor. The "method for

United States District Court

Trenton, New Jersey

treating.

Another part of the specification. "An aspect of the invention." So what does "an aspect of the invention" mean to a person reading a patent? What it means is I have an invention, I'm claiming different aspects of the invention. It is one invention, but I'm claiming different aspects of it. So I can claim a method for treatment, I can say a method for increasing the overall survival of it. One is a subset, if you will, of the former. But it is considered -- the language that people use is it is an aspect of the invention. So, the specification is talking about one aspect of the invention "comprises increasing the survival of a patient." Of course other aspects may lower the PSA, other aspects may improve the patients with respect to their tumor size. But this aspect of the invention "comprises increasing the survival of a patient" who "has previously been treated with a docetaxel-containing regimen" and the patent gives data regarding a "significant longer overall survival" and a 30 percent risk in the reduction of death.

So, again, the invention is being described by the applicants in the specification as actually reducing the risk of death and increasing overall survival, which in Claim 27 is the preamble language that we were asking to be a limitation. So, it meets the test. Repeated use of the preamble is to

treating" language in the claim is specifying that the claim must affect a therapeutic result. That's the point of the invention. That was the unmet medical need. So here the therapeutic application is the use of "the method for treating metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer."

Last case on this subject, your Honor, the *Wyeth* case. The abstract says, well, here the language was in the preamble necessary -- I'm sorry. The recited property was "a ... formulation that 'provides better control of blood plasma levels than conventional tablet formulations ....'" That was the invention at issue in this case. And the term that was being construed in the preamble was a method for eliminating troughs and peaks of drug concentration in a patient's blood plasma. So, in other words, the invention that they made eliminated wide swings in the blood level of this drug. And that was contained in the preamble. So, that was the use or function of the invention that they created. And that was the method of treating in that case. That was what they were trying to achieve.

And the specification repeatedly emphasized that aspect of the invention, and that's what's shown up here. The invention states that "the invention is for a formulation that provides better control of blood plasma." The brief description of the invention explains "this invention provides



# DOCKET

# 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.

