

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
Stephen P. Swinton (Bar No. 106398)
2 steve.swinton@lw.com
Darryl H. Steensma (Bar No. 221073)
3 darryl.steensma@lw.com
12636 High Bluff Drive, Suite 400
4 San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 523-5400
5 Facsimile: (858) 523-5450

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
CADENCE PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

8 SCHWARTZ SEMERDJIAN BALLARD & CAULEY LLP
John S. Moot (Bar No. 106060)
9 johnm@ssbclaw.com
101 West Broadway, Suite 810
10 San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 236-8821
11 Facsimile: (619) 236-8827

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff
SCR PHARMATOP

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 CADENCE PHARMACEUTICALS,
INC. and SCR PHARMATOP,

18
19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 SANDOZ INC.,

22 Defendant.

CASE NO. '13CV0278 JAH BLM

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

1 **COMPLAINT**

2 Plaintiffs Cadence Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and SCR Pharmatop (collectively,
3 “Plaintiffs”) for their Complaint against defendant Sandoz Inc. (“Sandoz”), allege
4 as follows:

5 **PARTIES**

6 1. Plaintiff Cadence Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Cadence”) is a corporation
7 organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal
8 place of business at 12481 High Bluff Drive, Suite 200, San Diego, California,
9 92130. As set forth herein, Cadence is the exclusive licensee of the Patents-in-
10 Suit.

11 2. Plaintiff SCR Pharmatop (“Pharmatop”) is a civil law partnership
12 organized and existing under the laws of France, having its headquarters at 10,
13 Square St. Florentin, 78150 Le Chesnay, France. As set forth herein, Pharmatop is
14 the assignee of the Patents-in-Suit.

15 3. Upon information and belief, defendant Sandoz is a company
16 organized and existing under the laws of Colorado, having a principal place of
17 business at 506 Carnegie Center, Princeton, New Jersey 08450. Upon information
18 and belief, Sandoz is in the business of manufacturing, distributing, and selling
19 pharmaceutical products throughout the United States, and Sandoz regularly
20 conducts business in California including in this judicial district.

21 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

22 4. This is a civil action for infringement of United States Patent
23 No. 6,028,222 and U.S. Patent No. 6,992,218 (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”).
24 This action is based upon the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 100
25 *et seq.*

26 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27 5. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action
28 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

1 11. Pharmatop granted an exclusive license to the '218 patent to BMS,
2 with a right to sublicense. BMS in turn granted Cadence an exclusive sublicense,
3 exclusive even to itself, to the '218 patent with regard to all rights pertinent to this
4 action. A true and correct copy of the '218 patent is attached as Exhibit B.

5 **OFIRMEV®**

6 12. Cadence holds approved New Drug Application (“NDA”) No. 022450
7 for OFIRMEV®, the first and only intravenous (IV) formulation of acetaminophen
8 available in the United States. OFIRMEV® was approved by the Food and Drug
9 Administration (the “FDA”) on November 2, 2010. OFIRMEV® is indicated for
10 the treatment of mild to moderate pain, management of moderate to severe pain
11 with adjunctive opioid analgesics, and reduction of fever.

12 13. The publication “Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic
13 Equivalence Evaluations” (the “Orange Book”) identifies drug products approved
14 on the basis of safety and effectiveness by the FDA under the Federal Food, Drug,
15 and Cosmetic Act. Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(b)(1) and attendant FDA
16 regulations, the '222 patent and the '218 patent were listed in the Orange Book
17 with respect to OFIRMEV®.

18 **SANDOZ’S INFRINGEMENT OF THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

19 14. Upon information and belief, Sandoz submitted Abbreviated New
20 Drug Application (“ANDA”) No. 20-4052 to the FDA, under the Federal Food,
21 Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)), seeking approval to engage in the
22 commercial manufacture, use, sale or offer for sale, and/or importation of
23 Acetaminophen Injection, 10 mg/mL, 100 mL vials (“Sandoz’s Generic Product”),
24 as a generic version of the OFIRMEV® product, prior to the expiration of the
25 Patents-in-Suit.

26 15. By a letter dated December 21, 2012 (the “Sandoz Letter”), which
27 was received by outside counsel on December 24, 2012, Sandoz stated that it had
28 submitted ANDA No. 20-4052 seeking approval to engage in the commercial

1 manufacture, use, sale or offer for sale, and/or importation of Sandoz's Generic
2 Product prior to the expiration of the Patents-in-Suit.

3 16. The Sandoz Letter also stated that ANDA No. 20-4052 contains a
4 "Paragraph IV certification" that alleges the '222 patent and '218 patent are
5 invalid, unenforceable, and that Sandoz's Generic Product purportedly will not
6 infringe any valid claim of the '222 patent and the '218 patent.

7 17. Upon information and belief, Sandoz has represented to the FDA that
8 Sandoz's Generic Product will have the same active ingredient as OFIRMEV®,
9 have the same route of administration, dosage form, and strength as OFIRMEV®,
10 and is bioequivalent to OFIRMEV®.

11 18. Sandoz's submission of ANDA No. 20-4052 to the FDA, including its
12 section 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) allegations, constitutes infringement of the Patents-
13 in-Suit under 35 USC § 271(e)(2)(A). Moreover, in the event that Sandoz
14 commercially manufactures, imports, uses, offers for sale, or sells Sandoz's
15 Generic Product or induces or contributes to such conduct, said actions would
16 constitute infringement of the Patents-in-Suit under 35 USC § 271(a), (b) and/or
17 (c).

18 19. Sandoz was aware of the Patents-in-Suit prior to filing ANDA No. 20-
19 4052, and its actions render this an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

20 20. The acts of infringement by Sandoz set forth above will cause
21 Plaintiffs irreparable harm for which they have no adequate remedy at law, and
22 will continue unless enjoined by this Court.

23 **COUNT I**

24 **(Infringement of the '222 Patent by Sandoz)**

25 21. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs 1 to 20 as if
26 fully set forth herein.

27
28

COUNT III

(Infringement of the '218 Patent by Sandoz)

1
2
3 29. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs 1 to 20 as if
4 fully set forth herein.

5 30. Sandoz's submission of ANDA No. 20-4052, including its section
6 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) allegations, constitutes infringement of the '218 patent
7 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2) by Sandoz.

8 31. Upon information and belief, upon FDA approval of ANDA No. 20-
9 4052, Sandoz will infringe the '218 patent by making, using, offering to sell, or
10 selling Sandoz's Generic Product in the United States and/or importing Sandoz's
11 Generic Product into the United States, and by actively inducing and/or
12 contributing to infringement by others, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b)
13 and/or (c).

14 32. Upon information and belief, Sandoz had actual and constructive
15 knowledge of the '218 patent prior to filing ANDA No. 20-4052 and acted without
16 a reasonable basis for a good faith belief that it would not be liable for infringing
17 the '218 patent.

COUNT IV

(Declaratory Judgment of Infringement of the '218 Patent by Sandoz)

18
19
20 33. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs 1 to 20 as if
21 fully set forth herein.

22 34. This claim arises under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C.
23 §§ 2201 and 2202.

24 35. Plaintiffs are further entitled to a declaration that, if Sandoz, prior to
25 patent expiry, commercially manufactures, uses, offers for sale, or sells Sandoz's
26 Generic Product within the United States, imports Sandoz's Generic Product into
27 the United States, or induces or contributes to such conduct, Sandoz would infringe
28 the '218 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b) and/or (c).

- 1 F. An award of costs and expenses in this action; and
- 2 G. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: February 4, 2013

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By: s/ Stephen P. Swinton
Stephen P. Swinton
Darryl H. Steensma

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Cadence Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

SCHWARTZ SEMERDJIAN
BALLARD & CAULEY LLP

By: s/John S. Moot (w/permission)
John S. Moot

Attorneys for Plaintiff
SCR PHARMATOP