

William P. Deni, Jr.
Charles H. Chevalier
J. Brugh Lower
GIBBONS P.C.
One Gateway Center
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: (973) 596-4500
Fax: (973) 596-0545

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
American Regent, Inc.*

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
RECEIVED
2020 FEB -7 P 4: 17

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

AMERICAN REGENT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PHARMACOSMOS THERAPEUTICS INC.
and PHARMACOSMOS A/S,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 20-1350 (Jmv)

Document Electronically Filed

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff American Regent, Inc. (“American Regent” or “Plaintiff”), by its attorneys,
hereby alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for declaratory judgment of infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,431,549 (“the ‘549 patent”) (Ex. 1) and 10,478,450 (“the ‘450 patent”) (Ex. 2) (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”) under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 and the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code, against Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. and Pharmacosmos A/S (collectively, “Pharmacosmos” or “Defendants”). This action relates to

Pharmacosmos's Monoferric[®] (ferric derisomaltose) pharmaceutical drug product, which the U.S. Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") recently approved for the treatment of iron deficiency anemia, and that, on information and belief, Pharmacosmos is in the process of preparing to launch in the United States. Pharmacosmos's commercial manufacture, importation, offers to sell, and sales of Monoferric[®] will actively induce and/or contribute to infringement of claims of each of the Patents-in-Suit.

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff American Regent, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, with a principal place of business at 5 Ramsey Road, Shirley, NY 11967. American Regent was formerly known as Luitpold Pharmaceuticals, Inc., until January 2, 2019, when its New York Certificate of Incorporation was amended to change the name of the corporation to American Regent, Inc. American Regent is a subsidiary of Daiichi Sankyo, Inc.

3. American Regent manufactures and sells injectable pharmaceutical drug products, including Injectafer[®] (ferric carboxymaltose), an iron carbohydrate complex treatment for iron deficiency anemia, in this judicial district and throughout the United States. American Regent has contracted with Daiichi Sankyo, Inc. through a Marketing Services Agreement to market Injectafer[®] within the United States.

4. On information and belief, Defendant Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Delaware, with a principal place of business at 776 Mountain Blvd, Watchung, New Jersey 07069 and an office or facility at 65 Madison Avenue, Morristown, New Jersey 07960. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Pharmacosmos A/S, was "established to pursue FDA approval of and ultimately commercialize Pharmacosmos products in the US market." Ex.

3 at 1.

5. On information and belief, Defendant Pharmacosmos A/S is a company organized and existing under the laws of Denmark, with a principal place of business at Roervangsvej 30, DK-4300 Holbaek, Denmark. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S is an international pharmaceutical company that develops and manufactures specialty carbohydrate products and veterinary products that are marketed and sold throughout the United States, including in this judicial district, either directly or through its United States partners, affiliates, and subsidiaries.

6. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S and Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. currently work in concert and will continue to work in concert with each other with respect to manufacturing, marketing, sale, and distribution of Monoferric[®] in New Jersey and throughout the United States.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 100, et seq., and this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201, and 2202.

8. On information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., under the New Jersey state long arm statute and consistent with due process of law, at least because Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. maintains its principal place of business in New Jersey.

9. On information and belief, this Court also has personal jurisdiction over Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., under the New Jersey state long arm statute and consistent with due process of law, because it regularly does or solicits business in New Jersey or engages in other persistent courses of conduct in New Jersey, demonstrating that Pharmacosmos

Therapeutics Inc. has systematic and continuous contacts with this judicial district.

10. On information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Pharmacosmos A/S, under the New Jersey state long arm statute and consistent with due process of law, because it regularly does or solicits business in New Jersey, engages in other persistent courses of conduct in New Jersey, and/or derives substantial revenue from services or things used or consumed in New Jersey, demonstrating that Pharmacosmos A/S has systematic and continuous contacts with this judicial district.

11. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S purposefully has conducted and continues to conduct business in this judicial district by importing, marketing, and selling specialty carbohydrate products and veterinary products, either directly and/or through its United States partners, affiliates, and subsidiaries throughout the United States, including in this judicial district. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 4 (noting that Pharmacosmos manufactures Dextran products that comply with United States Pharmacopeia (“USP”) specifications and that “Pharmacosmos sells and ships directly to clients everywhere in the World.”); *id.* (noting that Pharmacosmos holds a U.S. FDA certificate); Ex. 5 (providing “[o]rdering and product information for US customers”).

12. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S has imported, offered for sale and/or will imminently import, market, distribute, offer for sale, and/or sell Monoferric[®], either directly or through its United States affiliate Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., in the United States, including in New Jersey, and will derive substantial revenue from the sale of its Monoferric[®] product in the state of New Jersey. Ex. 6 at 1 (noting on January 29, 2020, that Monoferric[®] is currently marketed, under different brand names, in over 30 countries worldwide and announcing FDA approval of Monoferric[®] in the U.S. for the treatment of iron deficiency anemia); Ex. 3 at 1 (“Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., the US affiliate of Pharmacosmos, has

been established to pursue FDA approval of and ultimately commercialize Pharmacosmos products in the US market.”); Ex. 7 at 1 (“Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., a newly formed affiliate of Pharmacosmos, has been established to commercialize Monoferric® in the rapidly growing US high dose IV iron market.”).

13. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S will imminently import, market, distribute, offer for sale, and/or sell Monoferric® in New Jersey, and Monoferric® will be prescribed by healthcare providers practicing in New Jersey and administered by healthcare providers to patients located within New Jersey, all of which will have a substantial effect on New Jersey.

14. American Regent will be harmed by the importation, marketing, distribution, offer for sale, and/or sale of Monoferric®, including in New Jersey.

15. Alternatively, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Pharmacosmos A/S pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(k)(2), to the extent it is not subject to personal jurisdiction in the courts of any state, because Pharmacosmos A/S is a foreign entity, Plaintiffs’ claims arise under federal patent law, and the exercise of jurisdiction satisfies due process requirements, at least because, upon information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S has systematic and continuous contacts throughout the United States by manufacturing, importing, marketing, and/or distributing carbohydrate products and/or veterinary products, either directly to U.S. customers or through its subsidiaries and/or affiliates to U.S. customers.

16. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. has a regular and established place of business in New Jersey under the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because, *inter alia*, its principal place of business is in New Jersey. As set forth above, on information and belief, Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. maintains regular and established places of business in

New Jersey, including offices, laboratories, and/or facilities at 776 Mountain Blvd, Watchung, New Jersey 07069 and at 65 Madison Avenue, Morristown, New Jersey 07960. *See* Ex. 6 at 1. On information and belief, venue is proper in this judicial district with respect to Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) for at least the reason that it maintains a regular and established place of business in this judicial district.

17. On information and belief, venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) for at least the reason that Pharmacosmos A/S is a foreign corporation not residing in any United States district and may be sued in any judicial district that has personal jurisdiction, including this judicial district. Under *In re HTC Corp.*, 889 F. 3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2018), venue for foreign corporations is governed by the general venue statute, which provides that “a defendant not resident in the United States may be sued in any judicial district.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3).

PATENTS-IN-SUIT

18. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) issued the ’549 patent entitled “Methods and Compositions For Administration of Iron,” on April 30, 2013, to inventors Mary Jane Helenek, Marc L. Tokars, and Richard P. Lawrence. As reflected in the assignment records of the PTO, American Regent is the assignee of the ’549 patent and has the right to enforce it. The ’549 patent claims, *inter alia*, methods of treating iron deficiency anemia by administering an iron carbohydrate complex. A true and correct copy of the ’549 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

19. In 2015, Pharmacosmos filed a petition with the PTO for *inter partes* review (“IPR”), seeking to invalidate certain claims of the ’549 patent. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) declined to institute the IPR for at least claims 7, 17, and 21, concluding that

Pharmacosmos had “not shown a reasonable likelihood of prevailing” in its validity challenge as to the non-instituted claims. *Pharmacosmos A/S v. Luitpold Pharm. Inc.*, IPR2015-01493, Paper No. 11 at 9 (PTAB Jan. 8, 2016). In 2019, Pharmacosmos filed a second IPR petition against the ’549 patent, again including claims 7 and 21 in its challenge. The Board denied the petition in its entirety. *Pharmacosmos A/S v. American Regent, Inc.*, No. IPR2019-01142, Paper No. 13 at 16 (PTAB Dec. 18, 2019).

20. The PTO issued the ’450 patent entitled “Methods and Compositions For Administration of Iron,” on November 19, 2019, to inventors Mary Jane Helenek, Marc L. Tokars, and Richard P. Lawrence. As reflected in the assignment records of the PTO, American Regent is the assignee of the ’450 patent and has the right to enforce it. The ’450 patent claims, *inter alia*, methods of treating iron deficiency anemia by the administration of an iron carbohydrate complex. A true and correct copy of the ’450 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 2. On January 6, 2020, Pharmacosmos filed a petition with the PTO for post-grant review, seeking to invalidate all claims of the ’450 patent. *Pharmacosmos A/S v. American Regent, Inc.*, PGR2020-00009, Paper No. 1 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2020).

**ACTS GIVING RISE TO THIS ACTION FOR DEFENDANTS’
INFRINGEMENT OF THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

21. Plaintiff realleges, and incorporates in full herein, each of the preceding paragraphs 1-20.

22. On March 21, 2019, Pharmacosmos A/S submitted New Drug Application (“NDA”) No. 208171 to the FDA for approval to market Monoferric[®], an iron carbohydrate complex injection product, for the treatment of iron deficiency anemia. Ex. 8 at 1.

23. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. was founded in 2019 “to commercialize Monoferric[®] in the rapidly growing US high-dose IV iron market.” See Ex. 7

at 1. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S is working in concert with Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. to “driv[e] the growth of Monoferric[®]” in the United States. *Id.*

24. On information and belief, as of January 2020, Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. had hired a National Sales Director specializing in “commercial healthcare product launches” (Ex. 9) and was soliciting applications for the positions of “Marketing Director” and “Decision Support Director/Sr Director (Commercial Analytics & Sales Operations)” for the launch of Monoferric[®] (Exs. 7, 10).

25. On January 16, 2020, the FDA approved Pharmacosmos’s NDA No. 208171 for Monoferric[®], an iron carbohydrate complex injection product, for the treatment of iron deficiency anemia, clearing the way for the commercial launch of Monoferric[®] in the United States. Ex. 8 at 1.

26. On information and belief, the launch of Monoferric[®] in the United States by Pharmacosmos A/S, in active concert with Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., is imminent. *See* Ex. 6 at 1 (quoting the CEO of Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc. stating “[w]e are excited to provide this new innovative treatment to US physicians.”).

27. On information and belief, Pharmacosmos A/S, in active concert with Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc., will import, manufacture, market, offer for sell, and/or sell Monoferric[®] throughout the United States, including in this judicial district, accompanied by an FDA-approved product labeling (the “Monoferric[®] Label”). *See* Ex. 11.

28. The FDA-approved Monoferric[®] Label states that it is “Manufactured under license from Pharmacosmos A/S,” and distributed by Pharmacosmos A/S. Ex. 11 at 10.

29. The Monoferric[®] Label states that “Monoferric[®] is indicated for the treatment of iron deficiency anemia (IDA) in adult patients: who have intolerance to oral iron or have had

unsatisfactory response to oral iron or who have non-hemodialysis dependent chronic kidney disease (NDD-CKD).” Ex. 11 at 2.

30. The Monoferric[®] Label states that Monoferric[®] is “an iron carbohydrate complex.” Ex. 11 at 7. On information and belief, Monoferric[®] has “very low immunogenic potential.” Ex. 11 at 490.

31. The Monoferric[®] Label states that “Monoferric[®] is a sterile, dark brown, non-transparent aqueous solution available as: Injection: 1,000 mg iron/10 mL (100 mg/mL) single-dose vial” and “[t]he dosage of Monoferric[®] is expressed in mg of elemental iron. Each mL of Monoferric[®] contains 100 mg of elemental iron.” Ex. 11 at 2.

32. The Monoferric[®] Label instructs healthcare providers that “Monoferric[®] is indicated for the treatment of iron deficiency anemia (IDA) in adult patients: who have intolerance to oral iron or have had unsatisfactory response to oral iron who have non-hemodialysis dependent chronic kidney disease (NDD-CKD).” Ex. 11 at 2.

33. The Monoferric[®] Label provides the following instructions to healthcare providers for the use of Monoferric[®] to treat iron deficiency anemia: “For patients weighing 50 kg or more: Administer 1,000 mg of Monoferric[®] by intravenous infusion over at least 20 minutes as a single dose. Repeat dose if iron deficiency anemia reoccurs.” Ex. 11 at 2.

34. On information and belief, healthcare providers will administer Monoferric[®] according to the instructions provided in the Monoferric[®] Label, to treat patients with iron deficiency anemia.

**COUNT I (DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF
INFRINGEMENT OF THE '549 PATENT)**

35. Plaintiff realleges, and incorporates in full herein, each of the preceding

paragraphs 1-34.

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

37. There is an actual case or controversy such that the Court may entertain Plaintiff's request for declaratory relief consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution, and that actual case or controversy requires a declaration of rights by this Court.

38. On information and belief, Defendants will engage in the commercial manufacture, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Monoferric[®] immediately and imminently.

39. The actions alleged herein, including but not limited to, the development of Monoferric[®], the filing, pursuit, and approval of NDA No. 208171, the content of and instructions in the Monoferric[®] Label, and Defendants' activities in support of its commercial launch of Monoferric[®] in the United States, as detailed herein, reliably predict that Defendants have made and will continue to make substantial preparations to manufacture, sell, offer to sell, and/or import Monoferric[®].

40. On information and belief, Defendants became aware of the '549 patent at least no later than January 30, 2015, when American Regent sent a letter to Pharmacosmos A/S regarding infringement of the '549 patent (Ex. 13), or at least no later than June 24, 2015, when Pharmacosmos A/S filed at the PTO a petition for *inter partes* review of the '549 patent.

41. On information and belief, upon awareness of the '549 patent, Defendants know of and intend the infringement of one or more claims of the '549 patent, at least because Defendants' Monoferric[®] Label provides instructions for infringement of at least one claim of the '549 patent, for example, the methods recited in claims 7, 17 and 21.

42. On information and belief, Defendants will include the Monoferric[®] Label within the packaging of Monoferric[®], or will otherwise make it available to healthcare providers.

43. On information and belief, healthcare providers that administer Monoferric[®] in accordance with the instructions provided in the Monoferric[®] Label will directly infringe under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least one claim of the '549 patent, including for example claims 7, 17, and 21. On information and belief, Monoferric[®] is an iron polyisomaltose complex having a substantially non-immunogenic carbohydrate component, and healthcare providers will be instructed by the Monoferric[®] Label to use Monoferric[®] in a method of treating a disease characterized by iron deficiency (iron deficiency anemia) that is not Restless Leg Syndrome, whereby Monoferric[®] will be administered in a single dosage unit of at least about 1.0 grams of elemental iron to a patient in need of such treatment, a second administration of such treatment will be administered upon recurrence of at least one symptom of such disease, and the use of Monoferric[®] will satisfy all of the limitations of at least claims 7, 17, and 21 of the '549 patent. *See* Ex. 11.

44. On information and belief, Defendants know and intend that healthcare providers and/or patients will use Monoferric[®] according to Defendants' provided instructions and/or the Monoferric[®] Label in an infringing manner, and will therefore induce infringement of one or more claims of the '549 patent with the requisite intent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

45. On information and belief, Defendants will take active steps to encourage the use of Monoferric[®] by healthcare providers and/or patients with the knowledge and intent that it will be used by healthcare providers and/or patients in a manner that infringes at least one claim, including for example claims 7, 17, and 21 of the '549 patent, for the pecuniary benefit of Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants will thus induce infringement of at least

one claim of the '549 patent with the requisite intent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

46. On information and belief, Defendants will sell or offer to sell Monoferric[®] specifically labeled for use in practicing at least one claim including for example claims 7, 17, and 21 of the '549 patent, wherein Monoferric[®] is a material part of the claimed invention, wherein Defendants know that physicians will prescribe and patients will use Monoferric[®] in accordance with the instructions and/or Monoferric[®] Label provided by Defendants in practicing at least one claim, including for example claims 7, 17, and 21 of the '549 patent, and wherein Monoferric[®] is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. Upon information and belief, Defendants will thus contribute to the infringement of at least one claim of the '549 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

47. If Defendants' marketing and sale of Monoferric[®] is not enjoined, Plaintiff will suffer substantial and irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

48. Plaintiff is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the future manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Monoferric[®] will constitute active inducement of infringement and contributory infringement of at least claims 7, 17, and 21 of the '549 patent.

**COUNT II (DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF
INFRINGEMENT OF THE '450 PATENT)**

49. Plaintiff realleges, and incorporates in full herein, each of the preceding paragraphs 1-48.

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

51. There is an actual case or controversy such that the Court may entertain Plaintiff's request for declaratory relief consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution, and that actual case or controversy requires a declaration of rights by this Court.

52. On information and belief, Defendants will engage in the commercial manufacture, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of the Monoferric[®] immediately and imminently.

53. The actions alleged herein, including but not limited to, the development of Monoferric[®], the filing, pursuit, and approval of NDA No. 208171, the content of and instructions in the Monoferric[®] Label, and Defendants' activities in support of its commercial launch of Monoferric[®] in the United States, as detailed herein, reliably predict that Defendants have made and will continue to make substantial preparations to manufacture, sell, offer to sell, and/or import Monoferric[®].

54. On information and belief, Defendants became aware of the '450 patent at least no later than January 6, 2020, when they filed at the PTO a petition for post-grant review of the '450 patent listing as real parties-in-interest Pharmacosmos A/S and Pharmacosmos Therapeutics Inc.

55. On information and belief, upon awareness of the '450 patent, Defendants know of and intend the infringement of one or more claims of the '450 patent, at least because Defendants' Monoferric[®] Label provides instructions for infringement of at least one claim of the '450 patent, for example, the methods recited in claims 6, 14, and 22.

56. On information and belief, Defendants will include the Monoferric[®] Label within the packaging of Monoferric[®], or will otherwise make it available to healthcare providers.

57. On information and belief, healthcare providers that administer Monoferric[®] in accordance with the instructions provided in the Monoferric[®] Label will directly infringe under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least one claim of the '450 patent, including for example claims 6, 14, and 22. On information and belief, Monoferric[®]

is an iron polyisomaltose complex having a substantially non-immunogenic carbohydrate component and substantially no cross reactivity with anti-dextran antibodies, and healthcare providers will be instructed by the Monoferric[®] Label to use Monoferric[®] in a method of treating a disease characterized by iron deficiency (iron deficiency anemia), whereby Monoferric[®] will be administered in a single dosage unit of at least 0.7 grams of elemental iron to a patient in need of such treatment, a second administration of such treatment will be administered upon recurrence of at least one symptom of such disease, and the use of Monoferric[®] will satisfy all of the limitations of at least claims 6, 14, and 22 of the '450 patent. *See* Ex. 11.

58. On information and belief, Defendants know and intend that healthcare providers and/or patients will use Monoferric[®] according to Defendants' provided instructions and/or the Monoferric[®] Label in an infringing manner, and will therefore induce infringement of one or more claims of the '450 patent with the requisite intent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

59. On information and belief, Defendants will take active steps to encourage the use of Monoferric[®] by healthcare providers and/or patients with the knowledge and intent that it will be used by healthcare providers and/or patients in a manner that infringes at least one claim, including for example claims 6, 14, and 22 of the '450 patent, for the pecuniary benefit of Defendants. Upon information and belief, Defendants will thus induce infringement of at least one claim of the '450 patent with the requisite intent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).

60. On information and belief, Defendants will sell or offer to sell Monoferric[®] specifically labeled for use in practicing at least one claim including for example 6, 14, and 22 of the '450 patent, wherein Monoferric[®] is a material part of the claimed invention, wherein Defendants know that physicians will prescribe and patients will use Monoferric[®] in accordance with the instructions and/or Monoferric[®] Label provided by Defendants in practicing at least one

claim, including for example 6, 14, and 22 of the '450 patent, and wherein Monoferric[®] is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. Upon information and belief, Defendants will thus contribute to the infringement of at least one claim of the '549 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

61. If Defendants' marketing and sale of Monoferric[®] is not enjoined, Plaintiff will suffer substantial and irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

62. Plaintiff is entitled to a declaratory judgment that the future manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Monoferric[®] will constitute active inducement of infringement and contributory infringement of at least 6, 14, and 22 of the '450 patent.

**COUNT III (DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF
WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT OF THE '549 PATENT)**

63. Plaintiff realleges, and incorporates in full herein, each of the preceding paragraphs 1-62.

64. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '549 patent will be willful. Indeed, Defendants have been aware of the '549 patent at least no later than January 30, 2015, when American Regent sent a letter to Pharmacosmos A/S regarding infringement of the '549 patent, or at least no later than June 24, 2015, when Pharmacosmos A/S filed a petition for *inter partes* review of the '549 patent. The PTAB declined to institute IPR for claims 7, 17, and 21, concluding that Pharmacosmos A/S had "not shown a reasonable likelihood of prevailing" in its validity challenge. *Pharmacosmos A/S v. Luitpold Pharm. Inc.*, IPR2015-01493, Paper No. 11 at 9 (PTAB Jan. 8, 2016).

65. On information and belief, Defendants challenged the validity of the '549 patent with full knowledge that its development and eventual commercialization of Monoferric[®] when offered for sale or sold in the United States and prescribed by treating healthcare providers in

accordance with instructions provided in the Monoferric[®] Label would induce and/or contribute to infringement of the asserted claims of the '549 patent.

66. Defendants' continued development and commercialization of Monoferric[®] once launched in the United States will constitute willful and blatant infringement.

67. For the same reasons set forth above in paragraphs 22-48, Defendants have knowledge of the '549 patent and that their acts will constitute infringement. Defendants have acted and are continuing to act in the face of an objectively high likelihood that their actions will constitute infringement of valid claims of the '549 patent or with reckless disregard of that likelihood.

**COUNT IV (DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF
WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT OF THE '450 PATENT)**

68. Plaintiff realleges, and incorporates in full herein, each of the preceding paragraphs 1-67.

69. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '450 patent will be willful. Indeed, Defendants have been aware of the '450 patent at least no later than January 6, 2020, the date on which Defendants filed a petition for post grant review of claims of the '450 patent.

70. On information and belief, Defendants challenged the validity of the '450 patent with full knowledge that its development and eventual commercialization of Monoferric[®] when offered for sale or sold in the United States and prescribed by treating healthcare providers in accordance with instructions provided in the Monoferric[®] Label would induce and/or contribute to infringement of the asserted claims of the '450 patent.

71. Defendants' continued development and commercialization of Monoferric[®] once launched in the United States will constitute willful and blatant infringement.

72. For the same reasons set forth above in paragraphs 22-34, 50-62, Defendants have knowledge of the '450 patent and that their acts will constitute infringement. Defendants have acted and are continuing to act in the face of an objectively high likelihood that their actions will constitute infringement of valid claims of the '450 patent or with reckless disregard of that likelihood.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant the following relief:

1. A declaration under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 that the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Monoferric® before expiration of the '549 and '450 patents does and will infringe the Patents-in-Suit;
2. An order enjoining Defendants and their affiliates, subsidiaries, officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them, or acting on their behalf, from infringing the '549 and '450 patents;
3. A judgment that, upon launch of Monoferric®, Defendants have infringed one or more of claims of the '549 and '450 patents by making, using, selling, and offering to sell the Monoferric® within the United States and/or importing the Monoferric® into the United States;
4. An award for Plaintiff, upon launch of Monoferric®, of damages in an amount sufficient to compensate for Defendants' infringement of the '549 and '450 patents, together with prejudgment and post-judgment interest and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
5. An award for Plaintiff, upon launch of Monoferric®, of enhanced damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendants' willful infringement of the '549 and '450 patents;
6. A declaration that this case is an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285, and an award for Plaintiff of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

7. An order, upon launch of Monoferric®, requiring Defendants to provide an accounting of Defendants' infringing activities through trial and judgment; and
8. An award of such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: February 7, 2020
Newark, New Jersey

Respectfully submitted,

s/ William P. Deni, Jr.
William P. Deni, Jr.
Charles H. Chevalier
J. Brugh Lower
GIBBONS P.C.
One Gateway Center
Newark, New Jersey 07102
Tel: (973) 596-4500
Fax: (973) 596-0545
wdeni@gibbonslaw.com
cchevalier@gibbonslaw.com
jlower@gibbonslaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
American Regent, Inc.*

Of Counsel:

Barbara R. Rudolph (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
Robert F. Shaffer (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
Cora R. Holt (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
Emily R. Gabranski (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
Constance P. Lee (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
Caitlin E. O'Connell (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP**
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
Tel: (202) 408-4000