

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

ALLERGAN, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,

et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-1455 WCB LEAD

Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-1504 WCB

Civil Action No. 2:16-cv-0401 WCB

ALLERGAN'S POST-TRIAL FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. FINDINGS OF FACT.....	1
A. Background.....	4
1. Restasis® Is a Groundbreaking Treatment for Dry Eye and KCS	4
2. Dry Eye Disease.....	5
a. Dry Eye Disease Is a Progressive, Serious Ocular Condition that Causes Great Discomfort to Patients	5
b. Diagnosis and Treatment of Dry Eye Disease Before Restasis®	7
3. Allergan Developed Restasis® Through Years of Formulation and Clinical Work.....	11
a. Early Work with Cyclosporin Led to Failures by Others	11
b. Allergan’s Formulation Challenge.....	13
c. Allergan’s Phase 2 Clinical Work.....	17
d. Allergan’s Phase 3 Clinical Trials Lead to Unexpected Results.....	27
4. The Patents-in-Suit.....	34
B. Defendants’ ANDA Products Infringe the Asserted Claims	35
1. Defendants’ ANDA Products Meet the Composition Limitations of the Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit	35
2. Defendants’ ANDA Products Meet the Administration Limitations of the Asserted Methods Claims	38
3. Defendants’ ANDA Products Meet the Clinical Limitations of the Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit	40
4. Defendants’ ANDA Products Infringe the Asserted Composition Claims, and the Use of Defendants’ ANDA Products as Directed Induce and Contribute to Infringement of the Asserted Method Claims	44
5. Defendants’ New Non-Infringement Argument is Rejected	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

	<u>Page</u>
C. Defendants Have Failed to Prove By Clear and Convincing Evidence that the Asserted Claims Are Invalid	48
1. The Court Finds Defendants’ Experts Drs. Hanes and Calman Not Credible, and Defendants Have Therefore Failed to Meet Their Burden on Invalidity	48
2. The Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	56
3. The Defendants Failed To Prove By Clear and Convincing Evidence That The ’979 Patent Anticipates Any Claims of the Patents-in-Suit	57
a. The ’979 Patent Fails to Disclose a Formulation with 0.05% Cyclosporin and 1.25% Castor Oil	58
b. The ’979 Patent Fails to Disclose the Recited Clinical Limitations of the Asserted Claims, Either Expressly or Inherently	64
4. Defendants Failed To Prove By Clear And Convincing Evidence That Any Of The Cited References Render Obvious Any Claims of the Patents-in-Suit.....	67
a. The ’979 Patent Does Not Render Obvious Any of the Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit	68
b. The ’979 Patent in Combination with Sall Does Not Render Obvious Any of the Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit.....	75
c. The ’979 Patent in Combination with Sall and the ’607 Patent Does Not Render Obvious Any of the Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit	79
d. The ’979 Patent in Combination with Sall and Acheampong Does Not Render Obvious Any of the Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit.....	82
5. Objective Indicia Support a Finding of Nonobviousness	83
a. Unexpected Results.....	84
b. Long Felt Need	96
c. Failure of Others	100

..

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

	<u>Page</u>
d. Commercial Success	102
e. Copying.....	105
f. The Objective Factors Have a Nexus to the Asserted Claims	105
6. The Defendants Have Failed To Prove By Clear and Convincing Evidence That The Patents-in-Suit Are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	107
7. Defendants Have Failed to Prove By Clear And Convincing Evidence Incorrect Inventorship on the Patents-in-Suit	108
8. Defendants Have Not Shown by Clear and Convincing Evidence that the Patents Are Invalid for Lack of Enablement.....	112
a. “Acrylate/C10-30 Alkyl Acrylate Cross-Polymer” is a convention name encompassing a limited number of materials, not a chemical name describing a genus of chemicals.....	112
b. The Patents-in-Suit Enable Claims Including an “Acrylate/C10-30 Alkyl Acrylate Cross-Polymer.”	117
D. The Facts Support Allergan’s Entitlement to Injunctive Relief.....	119
II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	121
A. Defendants Infringe the Asserted Claims of the Patents-In-Suit	121
1. Defendants’ Proposed Products Described in Their ANDAs, and the Use of the Products as Directed, Meet All the Limitations of the Asserted Claims	122
2. Defendants Are Liable for Inducement and Contributory Infringement.....	124
3. Defendants’ New Non-Infringement Argument Is Both Waived and Factually Incorrect	127
B. Defendants Have Failed to Prove Invalidity by Clear and Convincing Evidence.....	130
1. Defendants’ Expert Testimony on Invalidity Was Conclusory and Lacked Credibility	130

...

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

	<u>Page</u>
2. The Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit Are Not Invalid as Anticipated.....	132
3. The Asserted Claims of the Patents-in-Suit Are Not Invalid as Obvious.....	136
a. Defendants Failed to Show Inherency By Clear and Convincing Evidence.....	141
b. Objective Indicia Also Provide Evidence of Non-obviousness.....	143
4. Defendants Failed to Prove by Clear and Convincing Evidence that the Asserted Claims Are Invalid for Lack of Enablement.....	148
a. Claim Construction Law Regarding “Acrylate/C10-30 Alkyl Acrylate Cross-Polymers”	148
b. The Asserted Claims Are Enabled.....	151
5. Defendants Failed to Prove by Clear and Convincing Evidence that the Asserted Claims Are Invalid for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	154
6. Defendants Failed to Prove by Clear and Convincing Evidence that the Asserted Claims Are Invalid for Incorrect Inventorship.....	155
C. A Permanent Injunction Is Appropriate.....	157
1. Allergan Will Suffer Irreparable Harm.....	158
2. Remedies at Law Are Inadequate	159
3. Balance of the Harms Favors Allergan.....	159
4. The Public Interest Favors Allergan	160

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.