

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

TEIJIN LIMITED, TEIJIN PHARMA	)	
LIMITED, and TAKEDA	)	
PHARMACEUTICALS U.S.A., INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. _____
	)	
ROXANE LABORATORIES, INC.	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiffs Teijin Limited (“Teijin Ltd.”), together with its subsidiary Teijin Pharma Limited (“Teijin Pharma Ltd.”) (collectively, “Teijin”), and Takeda Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc. (“Takeda”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), for their Complaint against Defendant Roxane Laboratories, Inc. (“Roxane”), hereby allege as follows:

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Teijin Ltd. is a Japanese corporation, having a principal place of business at 6-7, Minami-Hommachi 1-chome, Chuo-ku, Osaka 541-8587, Japan.
2. Plaintiff Teijin Pharma Ltd. is a Japanese corporation, having its principal place of business at 2-1, Kasumigaseki 3-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8585, Japan.
3. Plaintiff Takeda is a Delaware corporation, having its principal place of business at 1 Takeda Parkway, Deerfield, Illinois 60015.
4. Upon information and belief, Roxane is a company organized and existing under the laws of Nevada, having a principal place of business located at 1809 Wilson Road, Columbus, Ohio, 43228. On information and belief, Roxane is in the business of, among other things, developing, manufacturing, packaging, and marketing generic versions of branded

pharmaceutical products for the United States market, including in this judicial district and the State of Delaware, through its own systematic, continuous, constant and pervasive actions. On information and belief, Roxane has previously not challenged this Court's personal jurisdiction. *See, e.g., GlaxoSmithKline LLC v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc. et al.*, No. 11-cv-00542, D.I. 10 (D. Del. July 11, 2011), *Abbott laboratories and Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-00998, D.I. 6 (D. Del. March 1, 2011). Roxane has also purposefully availed itself of the jurisdiction of this Court by, *inter alia*, asserting counterclaims in lawsuits filed against it in this District. *See, e.g., GlaxoSmithKline LLC v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc. et al.*, No. 11-cv-00542, D.I. 10 (D. Del. July 11, 2011); *Abbott laboratories and Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-00998, D.I. 6 (D. Del. March 1, 2011).

#### **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5. This is a civil action for infringement of United States Patent No. 6,225,474 ("the '474 patent" or "the patent-in-suit"). This action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 100 *et seq.*

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Roxane by virtue of, *inter alia*, the fact that Roxane has committed, or aided, abetted, contributed to, and/or participated in the commission of, the tortious act of patent infringement that has led to foreseeable harm and injury to Plaintiffs, including Takeda Pharmaceuticals U.S.A. Inc., a Delaware corporation, having conducted business in Delaware and having derived substantial revenue therefrom, and having

engaged in systematic and continuous contacts with the State of Delaware. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Roxane for the additional reasons set forth below and for other reasons that will be presented to the Court if jurisdiction is challenged.

8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Roxane because upon information and belief, Roxane regularly does business in Delaware and has engaged in a persistent course of conduct within Delaware by continuously and systematically placing goods into the stream of commerce for distribution throughout the United States, including Delaware, and/or by directly selling pharmaceutical products in Delaware. Upon information and belief, Roxane has received at least 94 approvals from the FDA for drug products since 2006 and sells drug products throughout the United States, including Delaware.

9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Roxane because Roxane has previously been sued in this district and has not challenged personal jurisdiction, and Roxane has affirmatively availed itself of the jurisdiction of this Court by filing counterclaims in this district. *See, e.g., GlaxoSmithKline LLC v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc. et al.*, No. 11-cv-00542, D.I. 10 (D. Del. July 11, 2011), *Abbott laboratories and Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation v. Roxane Laboratories, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-00998, D.I. 6 (D. Del. March 1, 2011).

10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Roxane by virtue of, *inter alia*, the fact that Roxane has availed itself of the rights and benefits of Delaware law, and has engaged in systematic, continuous, constant and pervasive contacts with the State.

11. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

**THE PATENT-IN-SUIT**

12. On May 1, 2001, the '474 patent, titled "Polymorphs of 2-(3-cyano-4-isobutyloxyphenyl)-4-methyl-5-thiazolecarboxylic acid and method of producing the same," issued. A copy of the '474 patent is attached as Exhibit A. Teijin Ltd. is the owner of the '474 patent. Teijin Pharma Ltd. and Takeda hold exclusive licenses with respect to the '474 patent.

**ACTS GIVING RISE TO THIS ACTION**

13. Takeda holds New Drug Application ("NDA") No. 21-856 for oral tablets containing 40 or 80 mg of the active ingredient febuxostat. Takeda markets and sells febuxostat tablets in the United States under the brand name "Uloric<sup>®</sup>."

14. Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(b)(1), the '474 patent is listed in the FDA's publication titled, Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations (also known as the "Orange Book"), as covering Uloric<sup>®</sup> or its use.

15. Upon information and belief, Roxane submitted ANDA No. 205414 to the FDA under § 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)) ("Roxane's ANDA"). Upon information and belief, Roxane's ANDA No. 205414 seeks FDA approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, sale, or offer for sale of tablets containing 40 and 80 mg of febuxostat ("the Roxane Generic Product") prior to the expiration of the '474 patent.

16. Upon information and belief, pursuant to § 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, Roxane certified in ANDA No. 205414 that no valid claim of the '474 patent will be infringed by the commercial manufacture, use, or sale of the proposed Roxane Generic Product.

17. Plaintiffs received written notification of Roxane's ANDA No. 205414 and its accompanying § 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) certification by a letter dated February 3, 2014 ("Notice Letter").

18. Roxane's Notice Letter does not deny infringement of claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 of the '474 patent separate and apart from asserting invalidity.

19. Upon information and belief, Roxane will manufacture the Roxane Generic Product and/or API and release the Roxane Generic Product for distribution in the United States.

20. Upon information and belief, Roxane will market and sell the Roxane Generic Product in the United States.

21. Upon information and belief, Roxane's ANDA No. 205414 contains a "Paragraph III" certification with respect to U.S. Patent No. 5,614,520 ("the '520 patent") pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(III). The expiration date of the '520 patent is March 25, 2019.

**INFRINGEMENT BY ROXANE OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,225,474**

22. Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1-21 as if fully set forth herein.

23. Upon information and belief, Roxane's submission of ANDA No. 205414 to the FDA, including its § 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) certification, constitutes infringement of the '474 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

24. Upon information and belief, the commercial manufacture, use, offer to sell, sale, or import of the Roxane Generic Product, if approved by the FDA, prior to the expiration of the '474 patent, including any applicable exclusivities or extensions, would infringe the '474 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271.

25. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs are entitled to relief provided by 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(4), including an order of this Court that the effective date of the approval of Roxane's ANDA No. 205414 be a date that is not earlier than the expiration of the patent term including any extension granted by the USPTO pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 154 or 156, or any later expiration of exclusivity for the '474 patent to which Plaintiffs are or become entitled.

26. Plaintiffs will be irreparably harmed by Roxane's infringing activities, unless those activities are enjoined by this Court. Plaintiffs do not have an adequate remedy at law.

27. Upon information and belief, Roxane was aware of the existence of the '474 patent and was aware that the filing of its ANDA and certification with respect to the '474 patent constituted an act of infringement of that patent.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as follows:


- A. That Roxane has infringed the '474 patent;
- B. That, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(4)(A), the effective date of any approval of ANDA No. 205414 under § 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)) shall not be earlier than the expiration of the '474 patent, including any applicable exclusivities or extensions;
- C. That Roxane, its officers, agents, servants and employees, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from commercially manufacturing, using, offering to sell, selling, or importing into the United States the Roxane Generic Product and any other product that infringes or induces or

contributes to the infringement of one or more claims of the '474 patent prior to its expiration, including any exclusivities or extensions;

D. That Plaintiffs be awarded the attorney fees, costs, and expenses that they incur prosecuting this action; and

E. That Plaintiffs be awarded such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP



Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)  
Maryellen Noreika (#3208)  
1201 North Market Street  
P.O. Box 1347  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
(302) 658-9200  
jblumenfeld@mnat.com  
mnoreika@mnat.com

*Attorneys for Teijin Limited, Teijin Pharma Limited, and Takeda Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc.*

OF COUNSEL:

William F. Cavanaugh, Jr.  
Scott B. Howard  
Zhiqiang Liu  
PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 336-2000

*Attorneys for Takeda Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc.*

February 12, 2014