

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

In re: OXYCONTIN ANTITRUST LITIGATION

04 Md. 1603 (SHS)

This document relates to:

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

11 Civ. 2037 (SHS)

-against-

12 Civ. 5083 (SHS)

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS, USA, INC.,

Defendant.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

CONTENTS

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	v
PART 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. The Record and Relevant Proceedings	2
A. The Asserted Patent Claims.....	2
B. The 2012 Ranbaxy Trial	3
C. Claim Construction	4
D. The 2013 Trial.....	4
E. This Opinion	4
II. Legal Standards.....	5
A. Procedural Context and the Hatch-Waxman Act.....	5
B. Claims of Patent Infringement	6
C. The Affirmative Defense of Patent Invalidity	7
1. Novelty and Anticipation.....	8
2. Obviousness and Nonobviousness	9
3. Written Description and Enablement	10
4. Definiteness	12
D. Product-by-Process Claims.....	13
E. Attorneys Fees	14
PART 2. THE LOW-ABUK PATENTS.....	15
I. Findings of Fact.....	15
A. Purdue’s development of low-ABUK oxycodone	15
B. Purdue obtains the ‘799, ‘800, and ‘072 Patents	20

1.	The Chapman Application	21
2.	Further proceedings before the PTO.....	22
3.	The low-ABUK patents-in-suit	24
C.	The Noramco process	26
1.	Teva plans to sell tablets containing oxycodone hydrochloride API and a sustained release carrier.	27
2.	Teva’s tablets contain a non-zero amount of 14-hydroxy.....	27
3.	8 α forms during the Noramco process.....	29
4.	8 α converts to 14-hydroxy during the Noramco process.	30
D.	Facts pertinent to obviousness	32
1.	The ordinary skill in the art is impressive.	32
2.	The prior art disclosed the fact that 8 β converted to 14-hydroxy and it disclosed methods of using hydrogenation to reduce 14-hydroxy levels in free base and salt compositions.....	33
3.	Differences between the prior art and the claims.	37
4.	The objective indicia of nonobviousness.....	39
II.	Conclusions of Law	45
A.	Infringement.....	45
1.	Teva’s ANDA infringes claims 30-34 and 76-79 of the ‘800 Patent.	45
2.	Teva’s ANDA infringes claims 1, 4, and 5 of the ‘072 Patent... ..	46
3.	Teva’s ANDA infringes claims 3 and 19 of the ‘799 Patent.....	47
4.	Teva’s use of the Noramco API constitutes an act of infringement.	47
B.	Obviousness pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103	48

1.	The invention would have been obvious to a skilled artisan....	48
2.	The asserted claims are invalid pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103.	55
C.	Invalidity pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	57
1.	The written description of the '799, '800, and '072 Patents satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 112.....	57
2.	The patents meet the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112.60	
D.	Collateral estoppel does not apply.	62
III.	Conclusion	64
	PART 3. THE ABUSE-PROOF PATENTS	66
I.	Factual Background: Abuse of OxyContin became tragically rampant, generating a public health crisis and responses.	66
II.	The '383 Patent: Thermoforming Technology	70
A.	Teva's ANDA infringes the '383 Patent	71
1.	Grunenthal's search for abuse-deterrent formulations led it to a thermoformed, PEO-based tablet.	71
2.	Teva compresses and then cures its tablets, making them extremely hard.....	74
3.	Comparing Teva's process to that of the '383 Patent, the asserted claims read on Teva's tablets.	75
B.	The '383 Patent is invalid as anticipated and obvious.	78
1.	The McGinity Application anticipates the '383 Patent.....	78
2.	At the time of the '383 Patent's development, the prior art made the process obvious.....	86
C.	Conclusion.....	90
III.	The '314 Patent: Gel Test Technology	90

A.	Teva’s ANDA does not infringe the ‘314 Patent, because Purdue has not put forward reliable and relevant evidence of infringement. ...	91
1.	Purdue’s evidence of infringement is based on a gel test that is not designed to replicate the ‘314 Patent’s gel test.....	92
2.	Purdue’s evidence of infringement is based on a gel test conducted in an unreliable manner.....	94
3.	To the extent that any experimental evidence is probative, it suggests that Teva’s tablets do not infringe.....	96
B.	The ‘314 Patent is invalid as indefinite.....	98
1.	The “gel test” gives a skilled artisan insufficient guidance to conduct a replicable experiment.....	98
2.	The ‘314 Patent is both novel and nonobvious.....	103
C.	Conclusion.....	106
PART 4.	CONCLUSION AND RELIEF	107

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.