

Nos. 2014-1469, 2014-1504

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

THE MEDICINES COMPANY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

HOSPIRA, INC.,

Defendant-Cross-Appellant,

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Delaware,
Case No. 1:09-cv-00750-RGA (Judge Richard G. Andrews)

EN BANC BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT

Of Counsel:

THOMAS W. KRAUSE
Acting Solicitor

KRISTI L. R. SAWERT
JOSEPH G. PICCOLO
ROBERT E. MCBRIDE
Associate Solicitors
United States Patent and
Trademark Office

BENJAMIN C. MIZER
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

MARK R. FREEMAN
MEGAN BARBERO
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division, Room 7226
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 532-4631

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES	3
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	3
ARGUMENT	4
THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CASE DO NOT TRIGGER THE ON-SALE BAR.....	4
A. The Statutory Term “On Sale” Means A Sale Or Offer For Sale Of The Invention To The Public.....	4
1. The on-sale bar requires a sale or offer for sale of the invention.....	5
2. The sale or offer for sale of the invention must be public	9
3. Congress’s 2011 amendments confirm that “on sale” means a sale that makes the invention available to the public.....	15
4. This Court should overrule its decisions interpreting the on-sale bar to reach non-public sales, including confidential supplier agreements	17
B. The Medicines Company’s Purchase Of Manufacturing Services Did Not Trigger The On-Sale Bar	20
1. There was no sale or offer for sale of the patented drug product.....	20
2. Even if there were a sale or offer for sale, it was not public.....	23
C. The Experimental Use Doctrine Does Not Apply.....	24
CONCLUSION	27

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	<u>Page(s):</u>
<i>Andrews v. Hovey</i> , 123 U.S. 267 (1887)	11
<i>Atlanta Attachment Co. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 516 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	26
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989)	9, 10, 13, 14, 17
<i>Brasseler, U.S.A. I, L.P. v. Stryker Sales Corp.</i> , 182 F.3d 888 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	18
<i>Butler v. Thomson</i> , 92 U.S. 412 (1876)	6
<i>Cannon v. University of Chi.</i> , 441 U.S. 677 (1979)	10
<i>City of Elizabeth v. American Nicholson Pavement Co.</i> , 97 U.S. 126 (1878)	12, 14, 25, 26
<i>Coffin v. Ogden</i> , 85 U.S. (18 Wall.) 120 (1873)	14
<i>Consolidated Fruit-Jar Co. v. Wright</i> , 94 U.S. 92 (1877)	13
<i>Delemater v. Heath</i> , 58 F. 414 (2d Cir. 1893)	13
<i>Egbert v. Lippmann</i> , 104 U.S. 333 (1881)	13
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Grp., Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	17

Gayler v. Wilder,
51 U.S. (10 How.) 477 (1851)14

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)14

Group One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.,
254 F.3d 1041 (Fed. Cir. 2001)6

Hobbs v. United States,
451 F.2d 849 (5th Cir. 1971)17

In re Cygnus Telecomm. Tech., LLC Patent Litig.,
536 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2008)25

In re Hall,
781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)15

In re Kollar,
286 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 7, 21

International Tooth-Crown Co. v. Gaylord,
140 U.S. 55 (1891)14

Medicines Co. v. Hospira, Inc.,
791 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 21, 25

Montclair v. Ramsdell,
107 U.S. 147 (1883)16

Muncie Gear Works v. Outboard, Marine & Mfg. Co.,
315 U.S. 759 (1942)12

NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.,
418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005), *abrogated in part on other grounds by*
Zoltek Corp. v. United States, 672 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2012)6

Pennock v. Dialogue,
27 U.S. (2 Pet.) 1 (1829)9, 10, 14

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.