

**REDACTED**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

**ALLERGAN, INC.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,  
*et al.***

**Defendants.**

**Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-01455-WCB  
LEAD CASE**

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

**PLAINTIFF ALLERGAN, INC.'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT**

**CONFIDENTIAL UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER**

MYLAN - EXHIBIT 1154

Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. et al. v. Allergan, Inc.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. Introduction..... 1
- II. Legal Standard ..... 2
- III. Response to statement of issues to be decided by the court ..... 4
- IV. Response to defendants’ statement of Material Facts..... 4
  - A. Dry Eye and KCS Are Both Disorders of the Tear Film..... 5
  - B. Increasing Tear Production Treats KCS and Dry Eye, as Stated on the Product Labels 6
  - C. Data Submitted to the FDA Shows that Restasis® Treats Dry Eye and KCS by Increasing Tear Production ..... 8
  - D. Marketing Materials Allowed by FDAs State that Restasis® Treats KCS and Dry Eye and Restores Tear Production..... 9
- V. Argument ..... 10
  - A. A Showing of Infringement Does Not Require that the Label and the Claims Use the Same Language ..... 10
  - B. There Is at Least a Factual Dispute as to Whether the Indication on the Label Meets All the Claims..... 12
  - C. Defendants’ Cases All Deal with Entirely Different Uses on the Label and Claims and Are Inapplicable Here ..... 14
  - D. Defendants’ Labels Induce Infringement of Claims to KCS, Dry Eye, and Restoring Tearing, and there Are No Substantial Non-Infringing Uses..... 17
- VI. Conclusion ..... 19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Allergan v. Apotex*, Nos. 1:10-cv-681, 1:11-cv-298, 1:11-cv-650, 2013 WL 286251 (M.D. N.C. Jan. 24, 2013) ..... 11

*Allergan, Inc. v. Alcon Laboratories, Inc.*, 324 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... 15

*Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242 (1986) ..... 2

*Astrazeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc.*, 633 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2010) ..... 2, 11, 13, 18

*Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Lupin, Ltd.*, 676 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ..... 14, 15

*Braintree Laboratories, Inc. v. Breckenridge Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, -- F.3d --, 2017 WL 1829140 (Fed. Cir. May 5, 2017) ..... 11, 13, 18

*Eli Lilly and Co. v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC*, 435 F. App'x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ..... 19

*Glaxo Grp. Ltd. v. TorPharm, Inc.*, 153 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ..... 3

*Golden Blount, Inc. v. Robert H. Peterson Co.*, 365 F.3d 1054 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ..... 3

*Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*, No. 2:07-cv-4417, 2010 WL 3522786 (D.N.J. Sept. 2, 2010) ..... 10

*In re Depomed Patent Litigation*, No. 2:13-cv-4507, 2016 WL 7163647 (D.N.J. Sept. 30, 2016) ..... 19

*L.A. Biomedical Research Institute at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, No. 2:13-cv-08567, 2014 WL 11241786 (C.D. Cal. May 12, 2014) ..... 12, 18

*Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.*, 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... 3

*Optical Disc Corp. v. Del Mar Avionics*, 208 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ..... 3

*Raytheon Co. v. Indigo Sys. Corp.*, 688 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ..... 3

*SRAM Corp. v. AD-II Eng'g, Inc.*, 465 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ..... 2

*Sunovion Pharm., Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.*, 731 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 3

*Warner-Lambert Co. v. Apotex Corp.*, 316 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... 15, 16

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c) ..... 2

...

## I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants' motion for summary judgment should be denied, as it is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of both the facts and the law. Restasis® was the first-ever product that treats the problem underlying dry eye and KCS by increasing the production of a patient's tears. The label for Restasis® and proposed labels for all Defendants' copycat products state that the products are indicated for "increas[ing] tear production in patients whose tear production is presumed to be suppressed due to ocular inflammation associated with keratoconjunctivitis sicca." (Dkt. 342, Ex. 4, Restasis® Label AGN\_RES0069704-709 at AGN\_RES0069705.) There is no dispute that increasing tear production does, in fact, treat KCS and dry eye. A deficiency in tears is the way that physicians diagnose KCS, a form of dry eye, and an increase in tear production is the way to treat those conditions. In fact, there is no other reason to increase tear production other than to treat KCS or dry eye, thereby restoring tears in patients suffering from those conditions.

Yet, according to Defendants, there is not even a factual dispute as to whether claims to "treating KCS," "treating dry eye," and "restoring tear production" are infringed.<sup>1</sup> This argument is specious—Defendants' labels directly instruct physicians and patients to use the products to increase tear production *in patients with KCS*, which is a subset of dry eye disease, thereby *treating* those patients' KCS and dry eye. And it takes no more than the application of

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the Court's Order dated January 26, 2017 (Dkt. 265) Allergan further limited its asserted claims on Friday, June 9, reducing the number to 13. The only still-asserted claims at issue in Defendants' motion are claims 13, 16, 22, 26, and 27 of the '191 patent and claim 26 of the '111 patent. Allergan believes that Defendants' motion as to the claims no longer at issue (claims 13, 14, and 24 of the '162 patent, claims 11 and 18 of the '556 patent, and claims 17 and 25 of the '111 patent) is wrong, but Allergan will not address those claims because they are no longer at issue and are now moot.

keratoconjunctivitis sicca,” that does not mean that the FDA ultimately made a finding that Restasis® does not treat KCS or dry eye. Defendants ignore that, after the FDA initially rejected the proposed indication, Allergan continued to perform further analysis on the data to demonstrate efficacy, leading the FDA to approve the product with a labeled indication that more precisely describes how the product works and expressly contemplates use in treating KCS (a subset of dry eye). (See Ex. 4, Corr. to FDA of Oct. 28, 2002, AGN\_RES0066832 at AGN\_RES0066836 (“Schirmer wetting is a clinically relevant and appropriate end point for studying dry eye disease.”); Dkt. 342 at 12 (Defendants state “KCS [] is a *subset* of dry eye.”) (emphasis added); Claim Construction Order, Dkt. 214 at 13 (defining KCS as “*a type of* dry eye disease involving an absolute or partial deficiency in aqueous tear production”) (emphasis added); see also Dkt. 342, Ex. 4, Restasis® Label AGN\_RES0069704-709 at AGN\_RES0069705.)

Moreover, as discussed above, the FDA has also allowed Allergan to market Restasis® for treatment of KCS and dry eye, and to refer to its ability to restore tears. (Ex. 6, Advertisement AGN\_RES0585435-441 at AGN\_RES0585435, AGN\_RES0585437, AGN\_RES0585441; Ex. 7, FAQ AGN\_RES1103931-32 at AGN\_RES1103931.) There is nothing about the history of the approval process for Restasis® to suggest that use of the product to treat dry eye or KCS, or to restore tearing, are distinct, off-label uses.

**D. Defendants’ Labels Induce Infringement of Claims to KCS, Dry Eye, and Restoring Tearing, and there Are No Substantial Non-Infringing Uses**

Finally, Defendants’ arguments concerning lack of intent to induce and substantial non-infringing uses are all built on the faulty premise that uses of the product for treatment of KCS and dry eye and for restoring tear production are “off-label” and non-infringing. But, as discussed in detail above, there is at least a factual dispute on those arguments.

# 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.