

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Interest of the Federal Trade Commission	2
II.	Competition in the Pharmaceutical Industry.....	4
III.	Pharmaceutical Product Redesigns Can Constitute Exclusionary Conduct	10
IV.	Conclusion	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abbott Labs v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc., 432 F. Supp. 2d 408 (D. Del. 2006)..... 13

Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Corp., 472 U.S. 585 (1985)..... 11

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 2

Berkey Photo, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co., 603 F.2d 263 (2d Cir. 1979)..... 11, 12

Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc., 501 F.3d 297 (3d Cir. 2007)..... 11

C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... 12

Caraco Pharm. Labs., Ltd. v. Novo Nordisk A/S, — U.S. —, 132 S. Ct. 1670 (2012) 3

eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C., 547 U.S. 388 (2006)..... 3

LePage’s Inc., v. 3M, 324 F.3d 141 (3d Cir. 2003) 10, 11

Mannington Mills, Inc. v. Congoleum Indus., Inc., 610 F.2d 1059 (3d Cir. 1979) 11

SmithKline Corp. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 575 F.2d 1056 (3d Cir. 1978)..... 11

United States v. Dentsply Int’l, Inc., 399 F.3d 181 (3d Cir. 2005)..... 11

United States v. Grinnell Corp., 384 U.S. 563 (1966)..... 10

United States v. Microsoft, 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001) 2, 11, 12

Va. State Bd. of Pharmacy v. Va. Citizens Consumer Council, Inc., 425 U.S. 748 (1976)..... 4

Xerox Corp. v. Media Scis. Int’l, Inc., 511 F. Supp. 2d 372 (S.D.N.Y 2007)..... 12

Statutes

15 U.S.C. § 46..... 3

15 U.S.C. §§ 41-58 2

21 U.S.C. § 355..... 5

H.R. Rep. No. 98-857, Pt. 1, p. 14-17 (1984)..... 5

The Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984, Pub. L. No. 98-417 3

Other Authorities

...

Allison Masson & Robert L. Steiner, FTC, <i>Generic Substitution and Prescription Drug Prices: Economic Effects of State Drug Product Selection Laws</i> (September 1985).....	4, 10
Department of Justice & Federal Trade Commission, <i>Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property</i> (1995)	3
<i>Drug Product Selection</i> , Staff Report to the FTC, Bureau of Consumer Protection (Jan. 1979).....	4, 6, 7
FDA Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, <i>Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations</i> (32d ed.)	5
FDA, <i>Facts About Generic Drugs</i>	7
Federal Trade Commission, <i>The Evolving IP Marketplace: Aligning Patent Notice and Remedies with Competition</i> (2011).....	3
Federal Trade Commission, <i>To Promote Innovation: The Proper Balance of Competition and Patent Law and Policy</i> (2003)	3
Fiona M. Scott Morton, <i>Barriers to Entry, Brand Advertising, and Generic Entry in the US Pharmaceutical Industry</i> , 18 Int'l J. Indus. Org. 1085 (2000)	6
FTC, <i>Authorized Generic Drugs: Short-Term Effects and Long-Term Impact</i> (2011)	4, 7, 8
FTC, <i>Emerging Health Care Issues: Follow-on Biologic Drug Competition</i> (June 2009).....	4
FTC, <i>Pay-For-Delay: How Drug Company Pay-offs Cost Consumers Billions</i> (2010)	4, 7
G. Michael Allen et al., <i>Physician Awareness of Drugs Cost: A Systematic Review</i> , 4 PLOS Med. 1486 (2007).....	6
Generic Pharmaceutical Association, <i>Generic Drug Savings in the U.S.</i> (4th ed. 2012)	7
Hovenkamp et al, <i>IP and Antitrust</i> , 2d. Ed. (2010) § 15.3	9, 12
KaiserEDU.org, <i>Prescription Drug Costs</i>	4
Marc-André Gagnon, Joel Lexchin, <i>The Cost of Pushing Pills: A New Estimate of Pharmaceutical Promotion Expenditures in the United States</i> , 5 PLoS Med 32 (Jan. 2008)	9
Michael A. Carrier, <i>A Real-World Analysis of Pharmaceutical Settlements: The Missing Dimension of Product Hopping</i> , 62 Fla. L. Rev. 1009 (Sept. 2010)	5, 8
<i>Overview of FTC Antitrust Actions in Pharmaceutical Services and Products</i> (June 2012)	2
<i>Report of the American Bar Association Section of Antitrust Law Special Committee to Study the Role of the Federal Trade Commission</i> , 58 Antitrust L.J. 43 (1989).....	3

The Use of Medicines in the United States: Review of 2010, IMS Institute for Healthcare Informatics (April 2011)..... 8

U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Trade Commission, *Antitrust Enforcement and Intellectual Property Rights: Promoting Innovation and Competition* (2007)..... 3

William H. Shrank et al., *The Consequences of Requesting “Dispense as Written,”* 124 Am. J. Med. 309 (2011) 7

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.