

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

KISSEI PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.,)	
WATSON LABORATORIES, INC. and)	
ACTAVIS, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-1092 (LPS)
)	
SANDOZ INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiffs Kissei Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Watson Laboratories, Inc., and Actavis Inc., (collectively “Plaintiffs”), by and through their undersigned counsel, bring this Amended Complaint for patent infringement against Defendant Sandoz Inc. (“Sandoz” or “Defendant”) and allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement. This action relates to an Abbreviated New Drug Application (“ANDA”) submitted by and/or for the benefit of Sandoz with the United States Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) for approval to market a generic version of Plaintiffs’ RAPAFLOR[®] capsules, 4 mg and 8 mg, that are sold in the United States.

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Kissei Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. (“Kissei”) is a Japanese corporation, having its principal place of business at 19-48, Yoshino, Matsumoto City, Nagano Prefecture 399-8710, Japan. Kissei is an R&D-oriented pharmaceutical company that

contributes to the health of people around the world through innovative drug products. Kissei is the owner and assignee of U.S. Patent No. 5,387,603 (“the ‘603 patent”).

3. Actavis, Inc. (“Actavis”) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada with a principal place of business at Morris Corporate Center III, 400 Interpace Parkway, Parsippany, New Jersey. Actavis is the exclusive licensee of the ‘603 patent.

4. Watson Laboratories, Inc. (“Watson”) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with a principal place of business at 577 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84108. Watson is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Actavis, and is the registered holder of approved New Drug Application No. 22-206.

5. On information and belief, Defendant Sandoz is a corporation organized under the laws of Colorado, having a principal place of business at 506 Carnegie Center, Suite 400, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. On information and belief, Sandoz develops and markets a wide range of generic drug products and regularly conducts business throughout the United States, including in the State of Delaware.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States of America, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, *et seq.*, including 35 U.S.C. § 271. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

7. On information and belief, Sandoz is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District by virtue of its presence and activities in the State of Delaware, and by having systematic and continuous contacts with the State of Delaware so as to reasonably allow personal jurisdiction to be exercised over it.

8. On information and belief, Sandoz is registered to distribute drugs in the State of Delaware, and is in the business of making and selling generic pharmaceutical products, which Sandoz distributes in the State of Delaware and throughout the United States.

9. Sandoz is registered with the Delaware Board of Pharmacy, pursuant to 24 *Del. C.* § 2540, as a licensed “Distributor/Manufacturer CSR” (License No. DS0131) and “Pharmacy-Wholesale” (License A4-0000260). Sandoz admitted this in its Answer in *Cephalon v. Sandoz*, C.A. No. 12-248 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2012).

10. Additionally, personal jurisdiction over Sandoz is proper because it has previously submitted to jurisdiction in this Court, and has availed itself of the jurisdiction of this Court by asserting counterclaims in lawsuits pending in this District.

11. Sandoz has admitted or consented to jurisdiction (for purposes of litigation) and filed counterclaims in, for example, *Cephalon v. Sandoz*, C.A. No. 12-248 (D. Del. Mar. 23, 2012); *Abbott v. Sandoz*, C.A. No. 12-103 (D. Del. Apr. 9, 2012); *GlaxoSmithKline v. Sandoz*, C.A. No. 11-1284 (D. Del. Mar. 5, 2012); *Pfizer v. Sandoz*, C.A. No. 11-1252 (D. Del. Mar. 8, 2012); *Abbott v. Sandoz*, C.A. No. 11-424 (D. Del. Nov. 14, 2011); *Abbott v. Sandoz Inc.*, C.A. No. 11-145 (D. Del. May 13, 2011); and *Research Foundation of State University of New York et al v. Sandoz Inc.*, C.A. No. 11-162 (D. Del. Apr. 18, 2011).

12. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c), and § 1400(b).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. The ‘603 Patent

13. On February 7, 1995, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and lawfully issued the ‘603 patent, entitled “1,5,7-Trisubstituted Indoline Compounds and Salts

Thereof” to inventors Makio Kitazawa, Masaaki Ban, Kosuke Okazaki, Motoyasu Ozawa, Toshikazu Yazaki, and Ryoichi Yamagishi. Kissei is the assignee of the ‘603 patent. A true and accurate copy of the ‘603 patent is attached as Exhibit A to this Amended Complaint.

14. The ‘603 patent claims, *inter alia*, the silodosin compound (the active ingredient in RAPAFLO[®]), a pharmaceutical composition of silodosin, and a method for the treatment of dysuria by administering to a mammal or a human a therapeutically effective amount of silodosin.

B. RAPAFLO[®] Drug Product

15. Plaintiff Watson is the registered holder of New Drug Application No. 22-206 for RAPAFLO[®] capsules, 4 mg and 8 mg, which contain silodosin as the active ingredient. The FDA approved NDA No. 22-206 on October 8, 2008.

16. RAPAFLO[®] capsules, 4 mg and 8 mg, are indicated for the treatment of the signs and symptoms of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH), and are marketed and sold in the United States by a subsidiary of Actavis.

17. The ‘603 patent is listed in the *Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations* (published by the FDA and commonly known as the “Orange Book”) with respect to RAPAFLO[®] capsules, 4 mg and 8 mg dosage forms.

C. Sandoz’s ANDA No. 204726

18. Upon information and belief, Sandoz submitted ANDA No. 204726 to the FDA under § 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)), seeking approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale or importation of silodosin capsules, 4 mg and 8 mg (“Sandoz’s ANDA Products”), as a generic version of RAPAFLO[®], before the expiration of the ‘603 patent.

19. Upon information and belief, Sandoz's ANDA No. 204726 contains information to show that Sandoz's ANDA Products (a) are bioequivalent to RAPAFLO[®] 4 mg and 8 mg capsules, (b) have the same active ingredient as RAPAFLO[®] 4 mg and 8 mg capsules, (c) have the same route of administration, dosage form, and strength as RAPAFLO[®] 4 mg and 8 mg capsules, and (d) have the same, or substantially the same, proposed labeling as RAPAFLO[®] 4 mg and 8 mg capsules.

20. By letter dated May 7, 2013 (the "Notice Letter"), purporting to be a "Notice of Certification Under 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(B) (§ 505(j)(2)(B) of Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act) and 21 C.F.R. § 314.95," Sandoz notified Kissei, Watson and Actavis that it had submitted ANDA No. 204726 to the FDA seeking approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, and sale of Sandoz's ANDA Products, which are generic versions of RAPAFLO[®] 4 mg and 8 mg capsules, prior to the expiration of the '603 patent.

21. Kissei did not receive the Notice Letter until May 8, 2013.

22. Actavis did not receive the Notice Letter until on or about May 8, 2013.

23. Watson did not receive the Notice Letter until on or about May 8, 2013.

24. The Notice Letter stated that Sandoz included in its ANDA No. 204726, a "Paragraph IV" certification under 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV), alleging that the claims of the '603 patent are invalid, unenforceable, and/or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale and/or importation into the United States of Sandoz's ANDA Products.

25. The Notice Letter alleges that the '603 patent is invalid, unenforceable, and/or will not be infringed by "the manufacture, use, importation, sale or offer for sale" of Sandoz's ANDA Products, but does not provide any valid basis for these allegations.

26. Sandoz's submission of ANDA No. 204726 to the FDA constitutes infringement of the '603 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2).

COUNT I
(Patent Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,387,603 Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2))

27. Plaintiffs expressly incorporate by reference and reallege paragraphs 1-26, as if fully set forth herein.

28. Upon information and belief, Sandoz's ANDA Products and their use are the subject of one or more claims of the '603 patent.

29. Upon information and belief, when Sandoz filed ANDA No. 204726, it was aware of the '603 patent and that the filing of its ANDA with the request for its approval prior to the expiration of the '603 patent was an act of infringement. Sandoz was aware of the existence of the '603 patent at least as of the date it sent the May 7, 2013 Notice Letter.

30. Sandoz's submission of ANDA No. 204726 for the purposes of obtaining approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use and sale of Sandoz's ANDA Products, prior to the expiration of the '603 patent, is an act of infringement of the '603 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

31. Upon information and belief, Sandoz has infringed the '603 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A) because the purpose of the submission of ANDA No. 204726 is to permit the commercial manufacture, use, importation, sale, and/or offer for sale of Sandoz's ANDA Products in the United States, which would infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of one or more claims of the '603 patent.

32. Upon information and belief, unless enjoined by this Court, upon FDA approval of ANDA No. 204726, Sandoz intends to make, use, offer to sell, import and/or sell

Sandoz's ANDA Products in the United States, which would infringe, contribute to the infringement of, and/or induce the infringement of one or more claims of the '603 patent.

33. Upon information and belief, upon FDA approval of ANDA No. 204726, Sandoz intends to encourage acts of direct infringement with knowledge of the '603 patent and knowledge that its acts are encouraging infringement. Upon further information and belief, Sandoz intends to induce direct infringement of one or more claims of the '603 patent at least by resellers, pharmacies, health care professionals and end users of Sandoz's ANDA Products.

34. Sandoz has been aware of the existence of the '603 patent and has no reasonable basis for believing that the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale and/or importation into the United States of Sandoz's ANDA Products will not infringe, contribute to the infringement thereof, and/or induce the infringement of the '603 patent, thus rendering this case "exceptional," as that term is set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 285.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court to enter judgment in their favor and grant the following relief:

A. A judgment that Sandoz has infringed the '603 patent, and that the commercial sale, offer for sale, use, importation and/or manufacture of Sandoz's ANDA Products, described in ANDA No. 204726 would infringe, induce infringement of, and/or contribute to the infringement of the '603 patent;

B. A judgment, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(4)(A), that the effective date for approval of Sandoz's ANDA No. 204726, under § 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)), is to be a date that is not earlier than the expiration of the '603 patent plus and any additional periods of exclusivity;

C. A judgment and order preliminarily and permanently restraining and enjoining Sandoz and its officers, agents, servants, employees, parents, subsidiaries, affiliate corporations, other related business entities and all other persons acting in concert, participation, or in privity with them, and their successors or assigns, from infringing any claims of the '603 patent by making, using, selling, offering for sale and/or importing Sandoz's ANDA Products in the United States;

D. A finding that this is an exceptional case and awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees, as provided by 35 U.S.C. §§ 271(e)(4) and 285;

E. Awarding Plaintiffs their costs and other expenses incurred in connection with this action; and

F. Such further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

/s/ Rodger D. Smith II

Rodger D. Smith II (#3778)

Jeremy A. Tigan (#5239)

1201 North Market Street

P.O. Box 1347

Wilmington, DE 19899

(302) 658-9200

rsmith@mnat.com

jtigan@mnat.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Kissei Pharmaceutical
Co., Ltd.*

OF COUNSEL:

Richard T. McCaulley, Jr.

Louis E. Fogel

ROPES & GRAY LLP

191 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3200

Chicago, IL 60606

(312) 845-1200

Brian Kao

ROPES & GRAY LLP

1211 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036-8704

(212) 596-9000

Maxwell A. Fox

Kaede Toh

ROPES & GRAY LLP

Yusen Building 2F

3-2, Marunouchi 2-chome

Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

100-0005 Japan

+81-3-6259-3501

RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.

/s/ Jason J. Rawnsley

Steven J. Fineman (#4025)
Jason J. Rawnsley (#5379)
920 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 651-7700
fineman@rlf.com
rawnsley@rlf.com

OF COUNSEL:

Gary E. Hood
Mark Deming
POLSINELLI PC
161 North Clark Street, Suite 4200
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 819-1900

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Watson Laboratories,
Inc. and Actavis, Inc.*

September 10, 2013

7550748.1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 10, 2013, I caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing to all registered participants.

I further certify that I caused copies of the foregoing document to be served on September 10, 2013, upon the following in the manner indicated:

Arthur G. Connolly, III, Esquire
Ryan P. Newell, Esquire
CONNOLLY GALLAGHER LLP
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Attorneys for Defendant Sandoz Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Jeffrey R. Gargano, Esquire
Brent A. Hawkins, Esquire
Kevin P. Shortsle, Esquire
Rita J. Yoon, Esquire
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
227 West Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60606
Attorneys for Defendant Sandoz Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Thomas P. Steindler, Esquire
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13th Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Attorneys for Defendant Sandoz Inc.

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

/s/ Rodger D. Smith II

Rodger D. Smith II (#3778)