

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP,
AstraZeneca UK Limited,
IPR Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and
Shionogi Seiyaku Kabushiki Kaisha,
Plaintiffs,

Civ. No.:

v.

Teva Pharmaceuticals USA,
Defendant.

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiffs, AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, AstraZeneca UK Limited, IPR Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Shionogi Seiyaku Kabushiki Kaisha, for their Complaint against Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, hereby state as follows:

Nature of the Action

1. This is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 100 et seq., and in particular under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271(e) and (a). This action relates to an Abbreviated New Drug Application (“ANDA”) filed and amended by and/or for the benefit of Teva Pharmaceuticals USA with the United States Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) for approval to market generic versions of Plaintiffs’ highly successful Crestor[®] pharmaceutical products that are sold in the United States (the “Teva ANDA”).

Parties

2. Plaintiff AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP (“AstraZeneca”) is a corporation operating and existing under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 1800 Concord Pike, Wilmington, Delaware 19803 USA.

3. Plaintiff AstraZeneca UK Limited is a corporation operating and existing under the laws of the United Kingdom with its principal place of business at 15 Stanhope Gate, London W1K 1LN, England.

4. Plaintiff IPR Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“IPR”) is a corporation operating and existing under the laws of Puerto Rico with its principal place of business at Carr 188 Lote 17, San Isidro Industrial Park, Canovanas, Puerto Rico 00729.

5. Plaintiff Shionogi Seiyaku Kabushiki Kaisha is a corporation operating and existing under the laws of Japan with its principal place of business at 1-8, Doshomachi 3-chome, Chuo-ku, Osaka 541-0045 Japan.

6. On information and belief, Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals USA (“Teva”) is a corporation operating and existing under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 1090 Horsham Road, North Wales, Pennsylvania 19454.

Background

7. IPR is the holder of approved New Drug Application (“NDA”) No. 021366 for Crestor[®] Tablets, in 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, and 40 mg dosage forms, containing rosuvastatin calcium. AstraZeneca is IPR’s authorized agent for matters related to NDA No. 021366.

8. CRESTOR[®] (rosuvastatin calcium) is a prescription drug belonging to a group of medicines (called statins) that are used to treat high cholesterol. Crestor[®] is one of the most effective lipid-lowering statins available. Over 11 million patients have been prescribed Crestor[®], and over 110 million prescriptions have been written worldwide for Crestor[®].

9. Plaintiffs, among other things, manufacture, market, promote, educate the public and physicians about, and conduct research and development on existing and new indications for Crestor[®] Tablets. Plaintiffs financially benefit from sales of Crestor[®] Tablets in the United States.

10. On information and belief, Teva filed with the FDA, in Rockville, Maryland, ANDA No. 79-166 under 21 U.S.C. § 355(j) to obtain FDA approval for the commercial manufacture, use, importation, offer for sale, and sale in the United States of rosuvastatin calcium tablets in 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, and 40 mg dosage strengths, which are generic versions of Plaintiffs' Crestor[®] Tablets in 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, and 40 mg dosage strengths, respectively.

11. By letter dated October 29, 2007, Teva notified Plaintiffs that it had filed an ANDA seeking FDA approval to market rosuvastatin calcium tablets in 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, and 40 mg dosage strengths ("Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets"), and that it was providing information to Plaintiffs pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(B)(ii) and 21 C.F.R. § 314.95.

12. By letter dated June 11, 2008, received by Plaintiffs on or about June 13, 2008 Teva notified Plaintiffs that it had amended its ANDA seeking FDA approval to market the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets, and that it was providing information to Plaintiffs pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(B)(ii) and 21 C.F.R. § 314.95.

13. On information and belief, Teva is in the business of developing, manufacturing, marketing, distributing, and selling generic pharmaceutical products within the United States, including the State of Delaware.

Jurisdiction and Venue

14. Subject matter jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201, and 2202.

15. On information and belief, Teva develops and manufactures generic drugs and markets, distributes, and sells its generic drugs throughout the United States, including the State of Delaware.

16. Personal jurisdiction over Teva is proper because it purposefully avails itself of the privilege of selling its generic products in the state of Delaware and can therefore reasonably

expect to be subject to jurisdiction in Courts in Delaware. Among other things, upon information and belief, Teva places goods into the stream of commerce for distribution throughout the United States, including the State of Delaware.

17. Personal jurisdiction over Teva is proper because Teva is incorporated in Delaware and has purposely availed itself of the privilege of doing business in this State. Further, Teva maintains continuous and systematic contacts with the State of Delaware so as to reasonably allow jurisdiction to be exercised over it.

18. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b).

Count I

Infringement of United States Patent No. RE37,314 Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)

19. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1-18 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

20. United States Patent No. RE37,314 (“the ‘314 patent”), entitled “Pyrimidine Derivatives,” was duly and legally reissued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on August 7, 2001. Plaintiffs hold all substantial rights in the ‘314 patent and have the right to sue for infringement thereof. A true and correct copy of the ‘314 patent is attached as Exhibit A.

21. On information and belief, Teva amended ANDA No. 79-166 in order to obtain approval to market the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets in the United States before the expiration of the ‘314 patent. On information and belief, Teva also filed with the FDA, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) and 21 C.F.R. § 314.94(a)(12)(i)(A)(4), a certification letter alleging that the claims of the ‘314 patent are invalid, unenforceable, or not infringed.

22. On information and belief, Teva does not assert that Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets fall outside the scope of claims 6 and 8 of the ‘314 patent.

23. Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A), the submission by Teva to the FDA of amended ANDA No. 79-166 to obtain approval for the commercial manufacture, use, or sale of the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets before the expiration date of the '314 patent constitutes infringement of one or more claims of the '314 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

24. Plaintiffs will be substantially and irreparably harmed by the infringing activities described above unless those activities are precluded by this Court. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

Count II

Declaratory Judgment of Infringement of United States Patent No. RE37,314 Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a)

25. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1-24 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

26. Upon information and belief, Teva has made substantial preparations to sell Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets labeled for the same dosages as the Crestor[®] products.

27. Upon information and belief, Teva intends to commence sale of Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets immediately upon receiving approval from the FDA.

28. The manufacture, importation, sale, and offer for sale of Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets, once approved by the FDA, will directly infringe, induce and/or contribute to the infringement of one or more claims of the '314 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

29. Plaintiffs will be substantially and irreparably harmed by the infringing activities described above unless those activities are enjoined by this Court. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

30. An actual controversy exists relating to Teva's threatened infringement of the '314 patent.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in its favor as follows:

- (1) holding that the claims of the '314 patent are valid and enforceable;
- (2) holding that the submission and/or amendment of ANDA No. 79-166 by Teva infringes one or more claims of the '314 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2);
- (3) declaring that the manufacture, use, offering for sale, or sale of the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets within the United States or importing the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets into the United States before expiration of the '314 patent will infringe one or more claims of the '314 patent;
- (4) ordering, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(4)(A), that the effective date of any FDA approval of the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets shall be no earlier than the expiration date of the '314 patent;
- (5) enjoining Teva and all persons acting in concert with it, from commercially manufacturing, using, offering for sale, or selling the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets within the United States or importing into the United States the Teva Rosuvastatin Calcium Tablets, prior to the expiration of the '314 patent;
- (6) declaring this to be an exceptional case and awarding Plaintiffs their attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- (7) awarding Plaintiffs their costs and expenses in this action; and
- (8) awarding Plaintiffs any further and additional relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: 7/10/08

Ford F. Farabow
Charles E. Lipsey
Kenneth M. Frankel
York M. Faulkner
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, WILMINGTON, DE 19899
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
901 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 408-4000
Facsimile: (202) 408-4400

Henry J. Renk
FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER &
SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
Telephone: (212) 218-2100
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

Of Counsel for Plaintiffs

Respectfully Submitted:

Mary W. Bourke / DKH
Mary W. Bourke (#2356)
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 N. Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, DE 19899
Telephone: (302) 658-9141
Facsimile: (302) 658-5614
mbourke@cblh.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs