IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

ALLERGAN, INC.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:15-cv-1455-WCB
	§	LEAD CASE
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., et al.,	§	
	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Leave to Amend Invalidity Contentions ("Motion to Amend"), Dkt. No. 303. The Motion to Amend is GRANTED, and the parties are directed to meet and confer regarding appropriate fact discovery related to the subject matter of the motion, as discussed below.

BACKGROUND

The defendant pharmaceutical companies are seeking approval by the Food and Drug Administration to sell a generic version of Restasis, an ophthalmic product sold by plaintiff Allergan, Inc. On August 24, 2015, Allergan filed a patent infringement action under the Hatch-Waxman Act against defendants Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.; Akorn, Inc.; Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; and Mylan, Inc., alleging infringement of several Allergan patents related to Restasis. Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., No. 2:15-cv-1455 (E.D. Tex.). Allergan later filed related actions against defendants Innopharma, Inc., and Famy Care Limited. Allergan, Inc. v. Innopharma, Inc., No. 2:15-cv-1504 (E.D. Tex., filed Sept. 8, 2015); Allergan, Inc. v. Famy Care Ltd., No. 2:16-cv-401 (E.D. Tex., filed April 12, 2016). The latter two actions were consolidated with case no. 2:15-cv-1455.

The defendants asserted anticipation and obviousness defenses based on two patents issued to Dr. Shulin Ding, who worked for Allergan as a formulator from 1987 to 1998. See Dkt. No. 303-2, at 9. During the discovery period, Allergan turned over documents related to Dr. Ding's work on cyclosporin treatments. In March 2016, Allergan produced Dr. Ding's 1997 Technical Report entitled "Technology Transfer Report for Phase III Manufacture of Cyclosporine 0.1% and 0.05% Ophthalmic Emulsions," as well as a draft technical report entitled "Freeze to Thaw and Low to High Cycling Studies Report for Cyclosporine Ophthalmic Emulsion Formulations 8735X and 9054X." See Dkt. No. 315-1. In September 2016, Allergan produced the laboratory notebook of Toan Ha, who worked under Dr. Ding. See Dkt. No. 315-2.

In January 2017, the defendants deposed several witnesses regarding Dr. Ding's involvement in Allergan's development of Restasis. See, e.g., Dkt. No. 314-2, at 33, 51. On January 16, 2017, the defendants noticed Dr. Ding's deposition and served a subpoena for the production of documents related to her work on the development of Restasis. See Dkt. No. 314, at 4.

Fact discovery closed on February 10, 2017. See Dkt. No. 269, at 2. The defendants deposed Dr. Ding on February 24, 2017, as she had not been available before then, see Dkt. No. 314, at 4. Additional materials were produced to the defendants the day before her deposition, including a copy of the previously produced draft technical report, but with Dr. Ding's handwritten notes on it. Dkt. No. 303, at 6-7.

On March 20, 2017, the defendants notified Allergan that they intended to seek leave to add a new invalidity theory of incorrect inventorship under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f). Allergan opposed the amendment. See Dkt. No. 314, at 4.

The deadline for the parties to amend their pleadings was June 9, 2016. Dkt. No. 137, at 3.[1] The defendants filed their Motion to Amend on March 24, 2017.

DISCUSSION

Once a scheduling order has been entered in a case and a deadline has been set for filing amended pleadings, the decision whether to permit a post-deadline amendment is governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b). See Squyres v. Heico Companies, L.L.C., 782 F.3d 224, 237 (5th Cir. 2015); EEOC v. Serv. Temps Inc., 679 F.3d 323, 333-34 (5th Cir. 2012); L.G. Motorsports, Inc. v. NGMCO, Inc., No. 4:11-cv-112, 2013 WL 2543398, at *6 (E.D. Tex. June 6, 2013). Under Rule 16(b)(4), a motion to modify the scheduling order by permitting the filing of an amended pleading after the deadline in the scheduling order may be granted "only for good cause and with the judge's consent."

The party seeking to modify a scheduling order has the burden to show good cause. Squyres, 782 F.3d at 237; Self v. Quinn's Rental Servs. (USA), LLC, Civil Action No. H-15-1569, 2016 WL 6835093, at *1 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 21, 2016). Moreover, the Fifth Circuit has held that Rule 16 gives trial courts "broad discretion to preserve the integrity and purpose of the pretrial order." Geiserman v. MacDonald, 893 F.2d 787, 790 (5th Cir. 1990) (quoting Hodges v. United States, 597 F.2d 1014, 1018 (5th Cir. 1979)). The Fifth Circuit has directed that in deciding whether to permit amendments to the pleadings after the deadline for such amendments, district courts should consider "(1) the explanation for the party's failure to [timely move for leave to amend]; (2) the importance of the [amendment]; (3) potential prejudice in allowing the [amendment]; and (4) the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice." United States ex rel. Bias v. Tangipahoa Parish Sch. Bd., 816 F.3d 315, 328 (5th Cir. 2016) (quoting S&W

[1] For Famy Care Ltd., the deadline was August 31, 2016. See Dkt. No. 170, at 3.

Enters., L.L.C. v. SouthTrust Bank of Ala., N.A., 315 F.3d 533, 536 (5th Cir. 2003) (alterations in original)); Filgueira v. U.S. Bank Nat'l Ass'n, 734 F.3d 420, 422 (5th Cir. 2013); Ciena Corp. v. Nortel Networks, Inc., 233 F.R.D. 493, 494 (E.D. Tex. 2006). The Court will consider each of those factors in exercising its discretion whether to grant the Motion to Amend.

I. The Defendants' Explanation for the Untimely Motion to Amend

The defendants contend that they did not have a sufficient basis to assert an invalidity defense based on the nonjoinder of an inventor under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) until they deposed Dr. Ding. The defendants also point out that they noticed Dr. Ding's deposition before the close of fact discovery, but that the deposition was postponed to accommodate Dr. Ding's retirement schedule.

In response, Allergan argues that the defendants had all the necessary material to raise a 102(f) invalidity defense by at least September 2016, and that Dr. Ding's testimony merely "confirmed" what was apparent from that material. Allergan also notes that after Dr. Ding's deposition, the defendants waited a month before filing the Motion to Amend and that they offer no explanation for that period of delay.

The Court finds that the defendants are not at fault for the delay between the time of Allergan's early production of materials regarding Dr. Ding's work and the time of Dr. Ding's deposition. The materials produced earlier show that (1) Toan Ha set forth the Restasis formulation and that formulation was in fact manufactured for further study with Dr. Ding's approval, Dkt. No. 303-7; (2) Dr. Ding authored the 1997 Technical Report which stated that a cyclosporin product was selected for Phase III studies, Dkt. No. 303-8; and (3) studies conducted on 0.1% and 0.05% cyclosporin emulsions showed that the two emulsions performed similarly, see Dkt. No. 303-9, at 4.

Those earlier materials suggest that Dr. Ding played a role in the development of cyclosporin treatments generally.[2] Her deposition testimony, however, went farther, showing that she may have played a significant role in the development of the specific formulation for Restasis.

During her deposition, Dr. Ding testified that in 1993 or 1994 she began working on the development of Restasis and that she continued working on that project until she left Allergan in 1998. See Dkt. No. 303-2, at 11, 14, 16. She stated that she conducted experiments with the specific formulation for Restasis. Id. at 99, 101. When shown the laboratory notebook of Toan Ha, which discloses that formulation, Dr. Ding testified that Toan Ha was a staff member working under her guidance. Id. at 93-94.

Also at her deposition, Dr. Ding confirmed that she was the author of the 1997 Technical Report. Dkt. No. 303-2, at 143-44. More importantly, she explained that the product moving into Phase III study, identified in the Technical Report as "9054X," is the same as the Restasis formulation disclosed in Toan Ha's laboratory notebook, where the formulation is identified as "9054."

Finally, Dr. Ding testified regarding the recently produced handwritten notes on the draft technical report. Dkt. No. 303-2, at 172. She stated that she had written the handwritten note that read: "The two formulations [0.1% and 0.05%] are similar in every regard with the exception of cyclosporine concentration." She then explained that the note refers to the

[2] The Court does not include deposition testimony from other witnesses regarding Dr. Ding's role as "earlier material" that may have prompted the defendants to seek to amend their invalidity contentions at an earlier time. Allergan points to relevant deposition testimony from Dr. Brenda Reis on January 13, 2017, see Dkt. No. 314, at 3-4, but the defendants promptly noticed Dr. Ding's deposition three days later on January 16, 2017.

DOCKET ALARM

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.