

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ELAN PHARMA	)	
INTERNATIONAL LTD,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 06-438 GMS
	)	
ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, INC,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**JUDGMENT**

This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury rendered its verdict on June 13, 2008. The verdict was accompanied by a verdict form (D.I. 613), a copy of which is attached hereto. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered in favor of the plaintiff, ELAN PHARMA INTERNATIONAL LTD and against the defendant, ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, INC., that ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, INC., literally infringes Claims 3 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,399,363 in the amount of FIFTY-FIVE MILLION TWO HUNDRED THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$55,230,000.00) for damages from January 7, 2005 through June 13, 2008, FINDING A REASONABLE ROYALTY RATE OF SIX PERCENT (6%); and that the infringement is not willful;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that judgment be and is hereby entered in favor of the plaintiff, ELAN PHARMA INTERNATIONAL LTD and against the defendant, ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, INC., for the validity of Claims 1, 3, 5, 10, and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,399,363 and Claims 1, 2, 3, 13, 14, and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 5,834,025;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that judgment be and is hereby entered in favor of the plaintiff, ELAN PHARMA INTERNATIONAL LTD and against the defendant, ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE, INC., for the enforceability of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,399,363 and 5,834,025.

Dated: June 16, 2008

/s/ Gregory M. Sleet  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT CHIEF JUDGE

**VERDICT FORM**

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

**QUESTION 1: INFRINGEMENT**

**As to the '363 Patent ONLY:**

**Question No. 1(a): Literal Infringement Of '363 Patent**

Do you find that Elan has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Abraxis has literally infringed any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,399,363?

Check YES (for Elan) or NO (for Abraxis) for each claim:

	<b>YES (for Elan)</b>	<b>NO (for Abraxis)</b>
<b>Claim 3</b>	✓	
<b>Claim 5</b>	✓	

**PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION 2.**

**QUESTION 2: INVALIDITY**

**As to the '363 Patent:**

**Question No. 2(a)(i): Invalidity Of '363 Patent For Lack of Enablement Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112**

Do you find that Abraxis has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,399,363 is invalid for lack of enablement?

Check YES (for Abraxis) or NO (for Elan) for each claim:

	YES (for Abraxis)	NO (for Elan)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 3		✓
Claim 5		✓
Claim 10		✓
Claim 11		✓

**Question No. 2(a)(ii): Invalidity Of '363 Patent For Lack Of Adequate Written Description Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112**

Do you find that Abraxis has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,399,363 is invalid for lack of adequate written description?

Check YES (for Abraxis) or NO (for Elan) for each claim:

	YES (for Abraxis)	NO (for Elan)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 3		✓
Claim 5		✓
Claim 10		✓
Claim 11		✓

**As to the '025 Patent:**

**Question No. 2(b)(i): Invalidity Of '025 Patent For Lack of Enablement Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112**

Do you find that Abraxis has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,834,025 is invalid for lack of enablement?

Check YES (for Abraxis) or NO (for Elan) for each claim:

	YES (for Abraxis)	NO (for Elan)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 2		✓
Claim 3		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 14		✓
Claim 15		✓

**Question No. 2(b)(ii): Invalidity Of '025 Patent For Lack Of Adequate Written Description Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112**

Do you find that Abraxis has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,834,025 is invalid for lack of adequate written description?

Check YES (for Abraxis) or NO (for Elan) for each claim:

	YES (for Abraxis)	NO (for Elan)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 2		✓
Claim 3		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 14		✓
Claim 15		✓

**PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION 3.**

# 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.