```
1
                         UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                       FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
 2
 3
    HELSINN HEALTHCARE, S.A. and
 4
    ROCHE PALO ALTO, LLC,
                                        CIVIL ACTION NUMBERS:
 5
              Plaintiffs,
                                              11-3962
 6
               -vs-
 7
                                                TRIAL
    DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD.,
    DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,
    TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,
    and TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL
 9
    INDUSTRIES, LTD.
10
              Defendants.
11
         Clarkson S. Fisher United States Courthouse
         402 East State Street
12
         Trenton, New Jersey 08608
         June 2, 2015
13
    BEFORE:
                        THE HONORABLE MARY L. COOPER
14
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
    Certified as True and Correct as required by Title 28, U.S.C.,
23
    Section 753
24
    /S/ Regina A. Berenato-Tell, CCR, CRR, RMR, RPR
    /S/ Carol Farrell, CCR, CRR, RMR, CCP, RPR, RSA
25
```



Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd., et al.

```
1
                         UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                       FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
 2
 3
    HELSINN HEALTHCARE, S.A. and
 4
   ROCHE PALO ALTO, LLC,
                                      CIVIL ACTION NUMBERS:
 5
              Plaintiffs,
                                              11-3962
 6
               -vs-
 7
   DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD.,
                                                TRIAL
    DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,
   TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,
    and TEVA PHARMACEUTICAL
 9
   INDUSTRIES, LTD.
10
              Defendants.
11
         Clarkson S. Fisher United States Courthouse
         402 East State Street
12
         Trenton, New Jersey 08608
         June 2, 2015
13
    BEFORE:
                        THE HONORABLE MARY L. COOPER
14
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
    Certified as True and Correct as required by Title 28, U.S.C.,
23
    Section 753
24
    /S/ Regina A. Berenato-Tell, CCR, CRR, RMR, RPR
    /S/ Carol Farrell, CCR, CRR, RMR, CCP, RPR, RSA
25
```



```
1
    APPEARANCES:
 2
    PAUL HASTINGS
        JOSEPH O'MALLEY, ESQUIRE
 3
         ERIC W. DITTMANN, ESQUIRE
         ISAAC S. ASHKENAZI, ESQUIRE
 4
    SAUL EWING
    BY: CHARLES M. LIZZA, ESQUIRE
 5
    Attorneys for the Plaintiffs
 6
    BUDD LARNER
 7
         STUART D. SENDER, ESQUIRE
    BY:
         MICHAEL H. IMBACUAN, ESQUIRE
 8
         H. HOWARD WANG, ESQUIRE
         CONSTANCE S. HUTTNER, ESQUIRE
 9
         KENNETH E. CROWELL, ESQUIRE
    Attorneys for the Defendant, Dr. Reddy's Laboratories
10
    WINSTON & STRAWN
11
    BY: JOVIAL WONG, ESQUIRE
         GEORGE LOMBARDI, ESQUIRE
12
         JULIA MANO JOHNSON, ESQUIRE
         BRENDAN F. BARKER, ESQUIRE
13
    LITE DePALMA, GREENBERG, LLC
    BY: MAYRA V. TARANTINO, ESQUIRE
14
    Attorneys for the Defendant, Teva
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



```
1
                              I N D E X
 2
 3
 4
    WITNESS
            DIRECT CROSSREDIRECT RECROSS
 5
 6
    OPENING ARGUMENTS:
    By Mr. Lombardi, 13
 7
    By Ms. O'Malley 61
 8
    GIORGIO CALDERARI
    By Mr. Lombardi 105
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```



-Opening Argument - Mr. O'Malley-

do that, 505(b)(2), and there are generics who have tried that with palonosetron.

So this copying is not mandated with respect to these facts and these patent claims. And, in fact, you know, this whole notion of copying being a secondary consideration, the thought behind it is, if you don't think much of our invention, don't use it, go do your own thing. And some tried.

Now, I'm going to switch gears here and talk about the on-sale bar. And we have several arguments with respect to the on-sale bar. The post-AIA '219 claimed invention was not available to the public, and, therefore, not subject to the on-sale bar, that's the subject of the summary judgment briefing. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on the law. You have that in your files.

I will comment that this notion that this patent is litigation inspired, I don't know what that means. Helsinn took advantage of lawful avenues to petition the government. The law had changed. We did not change the law. And now we believe the law, as it applies today to these patents, takes the on-sale bar completely off the table.

And then our arguments are going to be that the SP and Oread agreements were not commercial --

THE COURT: If you have to be under the pre-AIA version, is that this series of arguments or --

