

Charles M. Lizza
William C. Baton
SAUL EWING LLP
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5490
(973) 286-6700
clizza@saul.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Sepracor Inc. and
University of Massachusetts*

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

<hr/>)	
SEPRACOR INC. and UNIVERSITY)	
OF MASSACHUSETTS,)	Civil Action No.:
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
)	INFRINGEMENT
PERRIGO RESEARCH AND)	
DEVELOPMENT COMPANY,)	
PERRIGO COMPANY and)	
L. PERRIGO COMPANY,)	(Filed Electronically)
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>)	

Plaintiffs Sepracor Inc. ("Sepracor") and University of Massachusetts ("UMass"),
by their attorneys, for their Complaint against Defendants Perrigo Research and Development
Company, Perrigo Company and L. Perrigo Company hereby allege as follows:

Nature of the Action

1. This is an action for patent infringement under the patent laws of the United
States, 35 U.S.C. § 100 *et seq.*, arising from Defendants' filing of an Abbreviated New Drug
Application ("ANDA") with the United States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") seeking

approval to commercially market a generic version of the patented Clarinex® drug products prior to the expiration of United States Patent No. 7,214,683 (“the ‘683 patent”) and United States Patent No. 7,214,684 (“the ‘684 patent”), which are owned by Sepracor and UMass.

The Parties

2. Plaintiff Sepracor is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a place of business at 84 Waterford Drive, Marlborough, Massachusetts 01752.

3. Plaintiff UMass is a public institution of higher education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, having a place of business at 55 Lake Avenue North, Worcester, Massachusetts 01655.

4. Upon information and belief, Perrigo R&D Company, the company described as filing ANDA No. 78-361 in Defendants’ letter to Plaintiffs dated September 7, 2007, is an abbreviated version of Perrigo Research and Development Company.

5. Upon information and belief, Perrigo Research and Development Company (“Perrigo R&D”) is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Michigan, having an office and place of business at 515 Eastern Avenue, Allegan, Michigan 49010.

6. Upon information and belief, Perrigo Company is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Michigan, having an office and place of business at 515 Eastern Avenue, Allegan, Michigan 49010. Upon information and belief, Perrigo Company was registered to do business in New Jersey and currently conducts business in New Jersey.

7. Upon information and belief, L. Perrigo Company is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Michigan, having a place of business at 71 Suttons Lane, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854 and having a registered agent in New Jersey.

8. Perrigo R&D, Perrigo Company and L. Perrigo Company are hereinafter collectively referred to as “Perrigo.”

Jurisdiction and Venue

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

10. Upon information and belief, Perrigo R&D, Perrigo Company and L. Perrigo Company, directly or through related companies, conduct business in New Jersey, have availed themselves of the rights and benefits of New Jersey law or have engaged in continuous and systematic contacts with New Jersey.

11. Upon information and belief, both Perrigo R&D and L. Perrigo Company are wholly owned subsidiaries of, and share common officers and directors with, Perrigo Company. Further, upon information and belief, Perrigo R&D, L. Perrigo Company and Perrigo Company operate as a single entity.

12. Upon information and belief, the acts of Perrigo R&D complained of herein were aided and abetted by and done with the cooperation, participation, and assistance of Perrigo Company and L. Perrigo Company.

13. Upon information and belief, Perrigo has submitted to the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Perrigo by virtue of, *inter alia*, the above-mentioned facts.

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

The Patents In Suit and the Clarinex[®] Drug Products

15. On May 8, 2007, the '683 patent, entitled "Compositions of Descarboethoxyloratadine," was duly and legally issued. Sepracor and UMass are assignees of the entire right, title and interest in the '683 patent. A copy of the '683 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

16. On May 8, 2007, the '684 patent, entitled "Methods for the Treatment of Allergic Rhinitis," was duly and legally issued. Sepracor and UMass are assignees of the entire right, title and interest in the '684 patent. A copy of the '684 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

17. The '683 and '684 patents are identified in the FDA publication entitled "Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations" in association with 5 milligram desloratadine tablets, which are sold as a commercial product under the trade name Clarinex[®], and those patents cover an approved use of commercial Clarinex[®].

Acts Giving Rise to this Action

18. Plaintiff Sepracor received a letter from Defendants, dated September 7, 2007 and received on September 10, 2007 ("the Notification Letter"), notifying them that Defendants had filed with the FDA an ANDA (No. 78-361) under § 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)) to obtain FDA approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, importation, use, offer for sale or sale of generic tablets containing 5 milligrams desloratadine ("Perrigo's Proposed Products").

19. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to engage and will engage in the commercial manufacture, importation, use, offer for sale or sale of Perrigo's Proposed Products promptly upon receiving FDA approval to do so.

20. The Notification Letter states that, in Defendants' opinion, the '683 and '684 patents are invalid and that the marketing or selling of Perrigo's Proposed Products will not infringe claims of the '683 or '684 patent directly, by inducement or contributorily.

21. The Notification Letter does not allege that the '683 and '684 patents are unenforceable.

Count I – Infringement of the '683 Patent by Defendants

22. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations of paragraphs 1-21 as though fully set forth herein.

23. Defendants' submission of its ANDA to obtain approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, importation, use, offer for sale or sale of Perrigo's Proposed Products, prior to the expiration of the '683 patent, constitutes infringement of one or more of the claims of the '683 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

24. Unless enjoined by this Court, upon FDA approval of ANDA No. 78-361, Perrigo will infringe the '683 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by making, using, importing, offering to sell, or selling Perrigo's Proposed Products in the United States.

25. Defendants had notice of the '683 patent prior to undertaking their acts of infringement. Defendants' certification to the FDA that its proposed product will not infringe and/or that the '683 patent is invalid or unenforceable lacked a good faith basis. Defendants' filing of its ANDA constitutes a wholly unjustified infringement of the '683 patent, and makes this action exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

26. Plaintiffs will be substantially harmed if Perrigo's infringement of the '683 patent is not enjoined, and Plaintiffs are entitled to equitable relief.

Count II – Infringement of the ‘684 Patent by Defendants

27. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations of paragraphs 1-26 as though fully set forth herein.

28. Defendants’ submission of its ANDA to obtain approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, importation, use, offer for sale or sale of Perrigo’s Proposed Products, prior to the expiration of the ‘684 patent, constitutes infringement of one or more of the claims of the ‘684 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

29. Unless enjoined by this Court, upon FDA approval of ANDA No. 78-361, Perrigo will infringe the ‘684 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by making, using, importing, offering to sell, or selling Perrigo’s Proposed Products in the United States.

30. Defendants had notice of the ‘684 patent prior to undertaking their acts of infringement. Defendants’ certification to the FDA that its proposed product will not infringe and/or that the ‘684 patent is invalid or unenforceable lacked a good faith basis. Defendants’ filing of its ANDA constitutes a wholly unjustified infringement of the ‘684 patent, and makes this action exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

31. Plaintiffs will be substantially harmed if Perrigo’s infringement of the ‘684 patent is not enjoined, and Plaintiffs are entitled to equitable relief.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request the following relief:

A. A Judgment declaring that Defendants have infringed one or more claims of the ‘683 patent;

B. A Judgment declaring that Defendants have infringed one or more claims of the ‘684 patent;

C. An Order that the effective date of any FDA approval of Defendants' ANDA No. 78-361 be no earlier than the date on which the '683 patent expires, including any regulatory or patent term extension;

D. An Order that the effective date of any FDA approval of Defendants' ANDA No. 78-361 be no earlier than the date on which the '684 patent expires, including any regulatory or patent term extension;

E. Preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining Defendants and their officers, agents, attorneys and employees, and those acting in privity or concert with them, from making, using, importing, offering to sell, or selling Perrigo's Proposed Products until after the expiration of the '683 patent, including any regulatory or patent term extension;

F. Preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining Defendants and their officers, agents, attorneys and employees, and those acting in privity or concert with them, from making, using, importing, offering to sell, or selling Perrigo's Proposed Products until after the expiration of the '684 patent, including any regulatory or patent term extension;

G. A declaration that the commercial manufacture, use, importation into the United States, sale or offering for sale of Perrigo's Proposed Products will directly infringe or induce and/or contribute to infringement of the '683 patent;

H. A declaration that the commercial manufacture, use, importation into the United States, sale or offering for sale of Perrigo's Proposed Products will directly infringe or induce and/or contribute to infringement of the '684 patent;

I. If Defendants engage in the commercial manufacture, use, importation into the United States, offer to sell, or sale of Perrigo's Proposed Products prior to the expiration of the '683 patent, a Judgment awarding damages to Plaintiffs resulting from such infringement,

increased to treble the amount found or assessed based on the willfulness of the infringement, together with interest;

J. If Defendants engage in the commercial manufacture, use, importation into the United States, offer to sell, or sale of Perrigo's Proposed Products prior to the expiration of the '684 patent, a Judgment awarding damages to Plaintiffs resulting from such infringement, increased to treble the amount found or assessed based on the willfulness of the infringement, together with interest;

K. Attorneys fees in this action based on willful infringement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 and/or as an exceptional case pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 285;

L. Costs and expenses in this action; and

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

Dated: October 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Charles M. Lizza

Charles M. Lizza

William C. Baton

SAUL EWING LLP

One Riverfront Plaza

Newark, New Jersey 07102-5490

(973) 286-6700

clizza@saul.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Sepracor Inc. and

University of Massachusetts

OF COUNSEL:

Dominick A. Conde

William E. Solander

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, New York 10112

(212) 218-2100

dconde@fchs.com

LOCAL CIVIL RULE 11.2 & 40.1 CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the matters captioned: (1) *Schering Corporation v. Zydus Pharmaceuticals, USA, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 06-4715 (MLC) (D.N.J.); (2) *Schering Corporation v. Caraco Pharmaceutical Laboratories Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 06-14386 (E.D. Mich.); and (3) *Schering Corporation v. GeoPharma Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 06-1843 (M.D. Fla.), which have been consolidated before the Honorable Mary L. Cooper under the caption, *In Re: Desloratadine Patent Litigation*, MDL No. 1851 (MLC) (D.N.J.), are related patent infringement cases because the defendants in the matter in controversy are defendants in the previously identified matter, and the alleged acts causing the infringement in both cases are the same, *i.e.*, based upon the defendants filing of the same ANDAs with the FDA. Also, the patents asserted in the current matter are related to the previously identified matter because all the patents are associated with Clarinex® products.

I also certify that the matters captioned, *Sepracor Inc., et al. v. Orchid Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 07-4623 (MLC) (D.N.J.), *Sepracor Inc., et al. v. Glenmark Pharmaceuticals, Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 07-3385 (MLC) (D.N.J.) (the “Glenmark case”) and *Sepracor Inc., et al. v. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 07-4213 (MLC) (D.N.J.) (the “Sun case”), all assigned to Judge Cooper, are related actions because they involve the same plaintiffs and two of the same patents as the matter in controversy.

I also certify that the matters captioned, *Sepracor Inc., et al. v. Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories, Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 07-5001 (FLW) (D.N.J.) and *Sepracor Inc., et al. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 07-5017 (JAP) (D.N.J.) are related actions because they involve the same plaintiffs and the same patents as the matter in controversy.

In light of the number of related cases pending before different judges, I submitted a letter to the Honorable Garrett E. Brown, Chief Judge of this Court, on September 19, 2007, to request that the related cases, including the current matter, be assigned to Judge Cooper, before whom the earlier filed, related cases are pending. As stated in my letter, reassigning these cases will avoid a situation where many different judges could be separately presiding over each one of the several related cases, in turn, impacting judicial resources and possibly resulting in inconsistent rulings. Following this letter, the *Sun* and *Glenmark* cases were reassigned by Chief Judge Brown to Judge Cooper.

I further certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the matter in controversy is not the subject of any other action pending in any court, or of any pending arbitration or administrative proceeding.

Dated: October 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Charles M. Lizza

Charles M. Lizza
William C. Baton
SAUL EWING LLP
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5490
(973) 286-6700
clizza@saul.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Sepracor Inc. and
University of Massachusetts*

OF COUNSEL:

Dominick A. Conde
William E. Solander
FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112
(212) 218-2100
dconde@fchs.com