

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

- - -

ELAN PHARMA INTERNATIONAL : Civil Action  
LIMITED, :  
 :  
 Plaintiff, :  
 :  
 v. :  
 :  
 ABRAXIS BIOSCIENCE INC., :  
 :  
 Defendant. : No. 06-438-GMS

- - -

Wilmington, Delaware  
Monday, June 9, 2008  
8:30 a.m.  
SIXTH DAY OF TRIAL

- - -

BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY M. SLEET, Chief Judge,  
and a Jury

APPEARANCES:

JOHN G. DAY, ESQ.  
Ashby & Geddes  
-and-  
STEPHEN SCHEVE, ESQ.,  
LINDA M. GLOVER, ESQ.,  
JEFFREY SULLIVAN, ESQ.,  
LISA A. CHIARINI, ESQ.  
ROBERT RIDDLE, ESQ., and  
PAUL FEHLNER, ESQ.  
Baker Botts LLP  
(Houston, TX)  
-and-  
GREGORY BOKAR, ESQ.  
Counsel - Elan Drug Delivery

Counsel for Plaintiff

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 ELENA C. NORMAN, ESQ., and  
3 MICHELLE SHERETTA BUDICAK, ESQ.  
4 Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP  
5 -and-  
6 MICHAEL A. JACOBS, ESQ.,  
7 EMILY A. EVANS, ESQ.,  
8 ERIC S. WALTERS, ESQ.,  
9 DIANA KRUZE, ESQ., and  
10 ERIK J. OLSON, ESQ.  
11 Morrison & Foerster  
12 (San Francisco, CA)

13 Counsel for Defendant

14 - - - - -

15 THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Please be  
16 seated for a moment.

17 (Counsel respond "Good morning.")

18 THE COURT: Mr. Jacobs.

19 MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Scheve  
20 has signaled an intent to examine Dr. Desai, our first  
21 witness this morning, about privilege log entries in  
22 Dr. Desai's notebook.

23 We have seen a graphic displayed on the screen  
24 in which Mr. Scheve would display those privilege log  
25 entries or notebook pages with privilege redactions on them.

Mr. Scheve's contention is because the Court has  
decreed that an adverse inference will be drawn from  
Dr. Brittain's related privilege assertions, Elan should be  
able to develop a record that Abraxis asserted the privilege  
over, in this case, Dr. Desai's notebook entries.

1           The two are not parallel. The Court made  
2 findings with respect to Dr. Brittain in order to even get  
3 into examining a witness on the stand about topics that bear  
4 on attorney-client privilege. Our position is the Court  
5 would have to make similar findings.

6           We think Mr. Scheve, Elan, should be directed  
7 not to raise any such issues or any such implication to  
8 examine Dr. Desai on any topics that bear on attorney-client  
9 privilege issues during the cross-examination of Dr. Desai.

10           THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Scheve.

11           MR. SCHEVE: Thank you, Your Honor.

12           If I could, beforehand, Mr. Day couldn't be here  
13 today. He says there is a small event going on this  
14 evening.

15           THE COURT: He took the day off. Huh?

16           MR. SCHEVE: Or at least half the day. He is  
17 dealing with some issues Your Honor may be familiar with.

18           THE COURT: Indeed. Our children's graduation  
19 from high school.

20           MR. SCHEVE: Yes.

21           Your Honor, if I may put up a slide, what this  
22 is about, and there has been a Bench brief filed by Abraxis  
23 that cites the case authority.

24           MR. JACOBS: May we provide that to Your Honor?

25           THE COURT: Yes.

1 MR. SCHEVE: And that case authority on Page 2,  
2 Your Honor, if I may quote from, in the first instance, from  
3 Weinstein's federal evidence, saying, The claim of a  
4 privilege is not a proper subject of comment by judge or  
5 counsel. No inferences may be drawn therefrom.

6 Then, later on in the Ninth Circuit, they cite  
7 another case, that there could be no negative inference from  
8 a defendant witness' claims of attorney-client privilege.

9 I raise that because what we did with  
10 Dr. Brittain is create a privilege log. You will recall, he  
11 signed an agreement with an attorney named Sipio and was  
12 providing consultation with Mr. Sipio. Every one of those  
13 was placed on a privilege log.

14 I think the record, and Your Honor will recall,  
15 the position we urged upon the Court is it would be  
16 inappropriate for an inference to be drawn from the fact  
17 that we claimed those are privileged.

18 Your Honor has, to this date, said that you will  
19 allow that inference to be drawn. This is what has occurred  
20 during discovery, which is the image up here.

21 What Abraxis has done, Your Honor, has claimed  
22 privilege over, quote, results from experiments that they,  
23 "to" communicate to the counsel. Not reflecting anything  
24 that was communicated to counsel, or Desai lab notebook  
25 reflecting information to communicate to patent counsel

1 regarding product composition.

2 They have, I don't remember what the number is  
3 there, it is page after page after page of testimony results  
4 from the lab notebook that I can't see because they are  
5 claiming it's privileged.

6 I don't understand how they are now going to  
7 call Dr. Desai, who is going to testify, and be able to  
8 claim that a lab notebook is privileged when it clearly  
9 doesn't say, Reflects communication with attorney. This is  
10 lab results.

11 My view, Your Honor, is while we think the  
12 proper ruling, and I say this, Your Honor, because none of  
13 us want to come back and try this case again, we think it is  
14 legal error for an inference to be drawn when counsel, when  
15 Mr. Brittain's gave us those documents, that he consulted  
16 with Mr. Sipio on, we put them on a privilege log. There  
17 was never a motion brought to compel. Never a request that  
18 Your Honor look at it to determine whether, in fact, it was  
19 privileged.

20 And now they have asked you, they want a  
21 negative inference to be drawn from the fact we put it up  
22 there. If you look at the cases cited in their brief, it's  
23 error.

24 But they want to be able to pull Dr. Brittain in  
25 here tomorrow and go through that. I am saying, If that's

# 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.