

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

ASTELLAS US LLC; ASTELLAS  
PHARMA US, INC.; and GILEAD  
SCIENCES, INC.

Plaintiffs,

V.

C.A. No. \_\_\_\_\_

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD.  
and DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES,  
INC.

Defendant.

## COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiffs Astellas US LLC and Astellas Pharma US, Inc. (collectively, “Astellas”) and Gilead Sciences, Inc. (“Gilead”) (Astellas and Gilead, collectively, “Plaintiffs”), by their attorneys, hereby allege as follows:

## NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code, against Defendants Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd. ("Dr. Reddy's Ltd.") and Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc. ("Dr. Reddy's Inc.," and together with Dr. Reddy's Ltd., "DRL"). This action relates to Abbreviated New Drug Application ("ANDA") No. 213210 filed by DRL with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration ("FDA").

2. In ANDA No. 213210, DRL seeks approval to market 0.4 mg/5 mL (0.08 mg/mL) intravenous solution of regadenoson, a generic version of Plaintiffs' Lexiscan® drug product (the

“DRL ANDA product”), prior to expiration of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,106,183 (the “’183 patent”), RE 47,301 (the “’301 patent”), and 8,524,883 (the “’883 patent”). The ’183 patent, ’301 patent, and ’883 patent are collectively referred to herein as the “patents-in-suit.”

### **PARTIES**

3. Astellas US LLC is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware having its principal place of business at 1 Astellas Way, Northbrook, Illinois 60062.

4. Astellas Pharma US, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, having its principal place of business at 1 Astellas Way, Northbrook, IL 60062.

5. Gilead is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, having its principal place of business at 333 Lakeside Drive, Foster City, CA 94404.

6. Plaintiffs are engaged in the business of creating, developing, and bringing to market revolutionary pharmaceutical products to help patients prevail against serious diseases, including diagnostic pharmacologic stress agents. Plaintiffs sell Lexiscan in this judicial district and throughout the United States.

7. Upon information and belief, Dr. Reddy’s Ltd. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of India, having its principal place of business at Door No. 8-2-337, Road No. 3, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Telangana, 500034, Andhra Pradesh, India.

8. Upon information and belief, Dr. Reddy’s Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, having its principal place of business at 107 College Road East, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

10. This Court has jurisdiction over DRL because, *inter alia*, DRL has committed an act of patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2) and intends a future course of conduct that includes acts of patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g) in Delaware. These acts have led and will lead to foreseeable harm and injury to Plaintiffs, both Delaware corporations, in Delaware. For example, on information and belief, following approval of ANDA No. 213210, DRL will make, use, import, sell, and/or offer for sale the DRL ANDA Product in the United States, including in Delaware, prior to the expiration of the patents-in-suit.

11. This Court also has jurisdiction over DRL because, *inter alia*, this action arises from actions of DRL directed toward Delaware, and because DRL has purposefully availed itself of the rights and benefits of Delaware law by engaging in systematic and continuous contacts with Delaware. Upon information and belief, DRL regularly and continuously transacts business within Delaware, including by selling pharmaceutical products in Delaware either directly or indirectly through affiliated companies. Upon information and belief, DRL derives substantial revenue from the sale of those products in Delaware and has availed itself of the privilege of conducting business within Delaware.

12. Dr. Reddy's Ltd. and Dr. Reddy's Inc. have previously consented to suit in this judicial district and have availed themselves of Delaware courts through the assertion of counterclaims in suits brought in Delaware including *Genzyme Corp. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd.*, No. 13-1506-GMS, D.I. 19 (D. Del. Oct. 16, 2013); *Astrazeneca AB v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Inc.*, No. 15-988-SLR, D.I. 48 (D. Del. Nov. 19, 2015); *In Re Copaxone 40 Mg Consolidated Cases*,

No. 1:14-01171-CFC, D.I. 61 (D. Del. May 21, 2015); *Amgen, Inc. v. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd.*, No. 1:16-00900-GMS, D.I. 19 (D. Del. Dec. 16, 2016). Dr. Reddy's, Inc. was also substituted as a party after purchasing ANDAs from a defendant in *Reckitt Benckiser Pharm. Inc. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs. S.A.*, No. CV 14-1451-RGA, 2017 WL 3782782, at \*1 n.3 (D. Del. Aug. 31, 2017).

13. In the alternative, this Court has jurisdiction over Dr. Reddy's Ltd. because the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(k)(2)(A) are met.

14. Venue is proper in this Court as to each claim against Dr. Reddy's Inc. under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and/or 1400(b).

15. Venue is proper in this Court as to each claim against Dr. Reddy's Ltd. under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3), because Dr. Reddy's Ltd., upon information and belief, is not a resident of the United States and may thus be sued in any judicial district.

16. DRL, through its counsel, by e-mail dated June 7, 2019, agreed that it does not contest jurisdiction or venue in this Court in this matter.

#### **PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

17. On January 31, 2012, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '183 patent, titled "Process for preparing an A<sub>2A</sub>-adenosine receptor agonist and its polymorphs." A true and correct copy of the '183 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The claims of the '183 patent are valid, enforceable, and not expired. Gilead is the owner of the '183 patent and Astellas US LLC is the exclusive licensee of the '183 patent.

18. On March 19, 2019, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '301 patent, titled "Process for preparing an A<sub>2A</sub>-adenosine receptor agonist and its polymorphs." The '301 patent is a reissue of U.S. Patent No. 9,085,601 (the "'601 patent"), which issued on July 21, 2015. A true and correct copy of the '301 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit

B. The claims of the '301 patent are valid, enforceable, and not expired. Gilead is the owner of the '301 patent and Astellas US LLC is the exclusive licensee of the '301 patent.

19. On September 3, 2013, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued the '883 patent, titled "Monohydrate of (1-{9-[4S,2R,3R,5R)-3,4-dihydroxy-5-(hydroxymethyl)oxolan-2-yl]-6-aminopurine-2-yl}pyrazol-4-yl)-N-methylcarboxamide." A true and correct copy of the '883 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C. The claims of the '883 patent are valid, enforceable, and not expired. Gilead is the owner of the '883 patent and Astellas US LLC is the exclusive licensee of the '883 patent.

20. Astellas Pharma US, Inc. is the holder of New Drug Application ("NDA") No. 022161, by which the FDA granted approval for the marketing and sale of 0.4 mg/5 mL (0.08 mg/mL) intravenous solution of regadenoson. Plaintiffs market 0.4 mg/5 mL (0.08 mg/mL) intravenous solution of regadenoson in the United States, under the trade name "Lexiscan®." The FDA's official publication of approved drugs (the "Orange Book") includes Lexiscan together with the '183 and '301 patents. Lexiscan is a pharmacologic agent used in a cardiac nuclear stress test. Lexiscan works by increasing blood flow in the coronary arteries. Lexiscan is given prior to a myocardial perfusion imaging (MPI) test, which provides physicians with detailed information about blood flow into a patient's heart. Approximately half of the people undergoing a cardiac stress test are unable to use a treadmill or a stationary bicycle because of medical conditions. Lexiscan may be used when a person is unable to exercise enough to increase blood flow to the heart during a cardiac nuclear stress test.

21. The prescribing information for Lexiscan identifies the drug as "a pharmacologic stress agent indicated for radionuclide myocardial perfusion imaging (MPI) in patients unable to

undergo adequate exercise stress.” A copy of the complete prescribing information for Lexiscan approved in NDA No. 022161 is attached as Exhibit D.

22. The ’883 patent claims processes for preparing a pharmaceutical composition of regadenoson with at least one pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

### **INFRINGEMENT BY DRL**

23. By a letter dated May 13, 2019, DRL notified Plaintiffs that DRL had submitted ANDA No. 213210 to the FDA under Section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 355(j)) (“the Lexiscan Notice Letter”).

24. The Lexiscan Notice Letter states that DRL has submitted an ANDA under 21 U.S.C. § 355(j) to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, importation, offer for sale, or sale of the DRL ANDA product before the expiration of the ’183 and ’301 patents. Upon information and belief, DRL intends to—directly or indirectly—engage in the commercial manufacture, use, and sale of the DRL ANDA product.

25. By filing ANDA No. 213210, DRL has necessarily represented to the FDA that the DRL ANDA product has the same active ingredient as Lexiscan, has the same dosage form and strength as Lexiscan, and is bioequivalent to Lexiscan.

26. Upon information and belief, DRL is seeking approval to market the DRL ANDA product for the same approved indication as Lexiscan.

27. In the Lexiscan Notice Letter, DRL stated that the ’183 and ’301 patents are invalid, unenforceable, and/or will not be infringed by the commercial manufacture, use, and sale of the DRL ANDA product.

28. In the Lexiscan Notice Letter, DRL offered confidential access to portions of its ANDA No. 213210, on terms and conditions set forth in the Lexiscan Notice Letter (“the DRL Offer”). DRL requested that Plaintiffs accept the DRL Offer before receiving access to DRL’s

ANDA No. 213210. The DRL Offer contained unreasonable restrictions well beyond those that would apply under a protective order on who could view the ANDA. For example, the DRL Offer contained a broad patent prosecution bar, which, among other things, does not have a carve out for *inter partes* reviews, and a broad bar on any work related to actions before the FDA. The DRL Offer unreasonably restricted the ability of counsel to seek the opinions of Plaintiffs' employees and outside experts. The restrictions DRL has placed on access to ANDA No. 213210 contravene 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(5)(C)(i)(III), which states that an offer of confidential access "shall contain such restrictions as to persons entitled to access, and on the use and disposition of any information accessed, ***as would apply had a protective order been entered for the purpose of protecting trade secrets and other confidential business information***" (emphasis added).

29. Upon information and belief, DRL uses processes covered by the claims of the '883 patent to prepare DRL's ANDA product.

30. Upon information and belief, the product resulting from the process claimed in the '883 patent is made, used, offered for sale, and/or sold without material change to the product resulting from the process claimed by the '883 patent.

31. The product resulting from the process claimed by the '883 patent is not a nonessential and/or trivial component of another product.

32. Upon information and belief, DRL intends to import into the United States and/or offer to sell, sell, make, and/or use within the United States the DRL ANDA product, which is made by the process patented by the '883 patent, prior to the expiration of the '883 patent.

33. Upon information and belief, DRL has made and will continue to make substantial and meaningful preparations to practice the method claimed in the '883 patent and/or import, offer to sell, sell, make, and/or use within the United States its ANDA product, which is made by the

process covered by the '883 patent, prior to the expiration of the '883 patent. DRL's preparations include, but are not limited to, developing DRL's generic product, filing ANDA No. 213210, and engaging in litigation concerning the DRL ANDA product.

34. Upon information and belief, DRL plans to continue to use the processes claimed in the '883 patent to make its ANDA product.

35. Upon information and belief, DRL had actual and/or constructive notice of the '883 patent prior to filing ANDA No. 213210.

### **COUNT I**

#### **(INFRINGEMENT OF THE '183 PATENT)**

36. Each of the preceding paragraphs 1 to 35 paragraphs is incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

37. DRL's submission of ANDA No. 213210 to obtain approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer to sell, or sale of the DRL ANDA product prior to the expiration of the '183 patent constituted a technical act of infringement of at least one of the claims of the '183 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, including but not limited to claims 1-3 and 8-9, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

38. DRL's commercial manufacture, use, offer to sell, sale, or importation of the DRL ANDA product prior to the expiration of the '183 patent, and its inducement of and/or contribution to such conduct, would further infringe at least one of the claims of the '183 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, including at least claims 1-3 and 8-9, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g).

39. Upon FDA approval of DRL's ANDA No. 213210, DRL will infringe one or more claims of the '183 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, including at least claims 1-3 and 8-9, by making, using, offering to sell, and selling the DRL ANDA product in the

United States and/or importing said product into the United States, and/or by actively inducing and contributing to infringement of the '183 patent by others, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g), unless enjoined by the Court.

40. If DRL's marketing and sale of the DRL ANDA product prior to expiration of the '183 patent and all other relevant exclusivities are not enjoined, Plaintiffs will suffer substantial and irreparable harm for which there is no remedy at law.

## **COUNT II**

### **(INFRINGEMENT OF THE '301 PATENT)**

41. Each of the preceding paragraphs 1 to 40 is incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

42. DRL's submission of ANDA No. 213210 to obtain approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer to sell, or sale of the DRL ANDA product prior to the expiration of the '301 patent constituted a technical act of infringement of at least one of the claims of the '301 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, including but not limited to claims 6, 11, and 17, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

43. DRL's commercial manufacture, use, offer to sell, sale, or importation of the DRL ANDA product prior to the expiration of the '301 patent, and its inducement of and/or contribution to such conduct, would further infringe at least one of the claims of the '301 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, including but not limited to claims 6, 11, and 17, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g).

44. Upon FDA approval of DRL's ANDA No. 213210, DRL will infringe one or more claims of the '301 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, including but not limited to claims 6, 11, and 17, by making, using, offering to sell, and selling the DRL ANDA product in the United States and/or importing said product into the United States, and/or by actively

inducing and contributing to infringement of the '301 patent by others, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g), unless enjoined by the Court.

45. If DRL's marketing and sale of the DRL ANDA product prior to expiration of the '301 patent and all other relevant exclusivities are not enjoined, Plaintiffs will suffer substantial and irreparable harm for which there is no remedy at law.

### **COUNT III**

#### **(DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INFRINGEMENT OF THE '883 PATENT)**

46. Each of the preceding paragraphs 1 to 45 is incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

47. A definite and concrete, real and substantial, justiciable controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality exist between Plaintiffs and DRL regarding infringement of the '883 patent.

48. DRL has made and will continue to make substantial and meaningful preparations to perform the processes claimed in the '883 patent or to import a product which is made by a process claimed by the '883 patent into the United States prior to the expiration of the '883 patent.

49. DRL's conduct including, but not limited to, the filing of ANDA No. 213210 and attempting to meet the regulatory requirements for approval of ANDA No. 213210, demonstrate a refusal to change its course of action.

50. DRL's performance of the processes claimed in the '883 patent and/or importation in the United States, offers to sell, sale, and/or use of DRL's products made by the patented process prior to the expiration of the '883 patent, and its inducement of and/or contribution to such conduct, would infringe claims 1-5, of the '883 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g).

51. Plaintiffs should be granted a judicial declaration that the claims of the '883 patent are not invalid, are not unenforceable and that the importation into the United States, use, offer for

sale, and/or sale in the United States of a product made using the processes claimed in the '883 patent, the use of the processes claimed in the '883 patent, and/or actively inducing and contributing to infringement of the '883 patent by others will constitute infringement of the '883 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (a), (b), (c) and/or (g).

52. If DRL's marketing and sale of the DRL ANDA product prior to expiration of the '883 patent and all other relevant exclusivities are not enjoined, Plaintiffs will suffer substantial and irreparable harm for which there is no remedy at law.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court grant the following relief:

1. A judgment that the claims of the '183 and '301 patents are not invalid, are not unenforceable, and are infringed by DRL's submission of ANDA No. 213210, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A), and that DRL's making, using, offering to sell, or selling in the United States, or importing into the United States the DRL's ANDA product will infringe the claims of the '183 and '301 patents, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g).

2. An order pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(4)(A) providing that the effective date of any approval of ANDA No. 213210 shall be a date which is not earlier than the latest expiration date of the '183 and '301 patents, including any extensions and/or additional periods of exclusivity to which Plaintiffs are or become entitled.

3. A judgment declaring that the claims of the '883 patent are not invalid, are not unenforceable, and that DRL's importing, selling, offering to sell, and/or using the generic product described in ANDA No. 213210, or inducing or contributing to such conduct, will infringe the '883 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), (b), (c) and/or (g);

4. An order permanently enjoining DRL, its affiliates, subsidiaries, and each of its officers, agents, servants and employees and those acting in privity or concert with them, from making, using, offering to sell, or selling in the United States, or importing into the United States the DRL ANDA product until after the latest expiration date of the patents-in-suit, including any extensions and/or additional periods of exclusivity to which Plaintiffs are or become entitled.

5. Damages or other monetary relief, including costs, fees, pre- and post-judgment interest, to Plaintiffs if DRL engages in commercial manufacture, use, offers to sell, sale, or importation in or into the United States of the DRL ANDA product prior to the latest expiration date of the patents-in-suit, including any extensions and/or additional periods of exclusivity to which Plaintiffs are or become entitled.

6. Such further and other relief as this Court deems proper and just, including any appropriate relief under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

Dated: June 21, 2019

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

Of Counsel:

Amy K. Wigmore  
Tracey C. Allen  
Brittany B. Amadi  
Charles T. Cox Jr.  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 663-6000  
Amy.Wigmore@wilmerhale.com  
Tracey.Allen@wilmerhale.com  
Brittany.Amadi@wilmerhale.com  
Charlie.Cox@wilmerhale.com

By: /s/ Robert M. Oakes  
Robert M. Oakes (#5217)  
222 Delaware Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 652-5070  
oakes@fr.com  
  
W. Chad Shear (#5711)  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, CA 92130  
(858) 678-5070  
shear@fr.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Astellas US LLC,  
Astellas Pharma US, Inc. and Gilead  
Sciences, Inc.*

Robert M. Galvin  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
950 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 858-6000  
Robert.Galvin@wilmerhale.com

Kevin M. Yurkerwich  
Alison C. Burton  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(617) 526-6000  
Kevin.Yurkerwich@wilmerhale.com  
Alison.Burton@wilmerhale.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Astellas US LLC and  
Astellas Pharma US, Inc.*

Lisa M. Ferri  
Manuel J. Velez  
MAYER BROWN LLP  
1221 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
(212) 506-2500  
lferri@mayerbrown.com  
mvelez@mayerbrown.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff Gilead Sciences, Inc.*