IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

BAYER HEALTHCARE LLC and MEDA PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. _____
APOTEX INC. and APOTEX CORP.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Bayer HealthCare LLC ("Bayer") and Meda Pharmaceuticals Inc. ("Meda," and collectively with Bayer, "Plaintiffs") file this Complaint for patent infringement against Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. (collectively, "Apotex"), and by their attorneys, hereby allege as follows:

1. This is an action for patent infringement under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code, and for a declaratory judgment of patent infringement under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, that arises out of Apotex's submission of an Abbreviated New Drug New Drug Application ("ANDA") to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") seeking approval to commercially manufacture, use, offer for sale, sell, and/or import azelastine hydrochloride nasal solution (0.15%, 205.5 mcg/spray, OTC) ("Apotex's ANDA Product"), a generic version of Astepro® Allergy (azelastine hydrochloride nasal spray, 0.15%, 205.5 mcg/spray, OTC) prior to the expiration of U.S. Patent No. 8,071,073 ("the '073 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 8,518,919 ("the '919 patent"); and U.S. Patent No. 9,919,050 ("the '050 patent"). These patents are referred to collectively herein as the "Patents-in-Suit."

2. Apotex notified Plaintiffs by letters dated August 25 and August 26, 2021 ("Apotex's Notice Letters") that it had submitted to the FDA ANDA No. 216421 ("Apotex's

ANDA"), seeking approval from the FDA to engage in the commercial manufacture, use and/or sale of Apotex's ANDA Product prior to the expiration of the Patents-in-Suit.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Bayer HealthCare LLC is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the States of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 100 Bayer Boulevard, Whippany, New Jersey. Bayer HealthCare LLC is the holder of New Drug Application ("NDA") No. 213872 for the sale of azelastine hydrochloride nasal solution (0.15%, 205.5 mcg/spray, OTC), which has been approved by the FDA.

4. Plaintiff Meda Pharmaceuticals Inc. is a company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 1000 Mylan Boulevard, Canonsburg, PA 15317.

5. On information and belief, defendant Apotex Inc. is a company organized and existing under the laws of Canada with a principal place of business at 150 Signet Drive, Toronto, Ontario M9L 1T9, Canada. On information and belief, Apotex Inc. is in the business of, among other things, manufacturing and selling generic versions of branded pharmaceutical drugs through various operating subsidiaries, including Apotex Corp.

6. On information and belief, defendant Apotex Corp. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with a principal place of business at 2400 North Commerce Parkway, Suite 400, Weston, Florida 33326. On information and belief, Apotex Corp. is in the business of, among other things, manufacturing and selling generic versions of branded pharmaceutical products for the U.S. market.

7. On information and belief, Apotex Corp. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Apotex Inc. and is controlled and/or dominated by Apotex Inc.

8. On information and belief, Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. acted in concert to prepare and submit Apotex's ANDA to the FDA.

JURISDICTION

9. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), and 2201 and 2202.

10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over each of Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp.

11. Apotex Inc. is subject to personal jurisdiction in Delaware because, among other things, Apotex Inc., itself and through its wholly-owned subsidiary Apotex Corp., has purposefully availed itself of the benefits and protections of Delaware's laws such that it should reasonably anticipate being haled into court here. On information and belief, Apotex Inc., itself and through its wholly-owned subsidiary Apotex Corp., develops, manufactures, imports, markets, offers to sell, and/or sells generic drugs throughout the United States, including in the State of Delaware, and therefore transacts business within the State of Delaware, and/or has engaged in systematic and continuous business contacts within the State of Delaware. In addition, Apotex Inc. is subject to personal jurisdiction in Delaware because, on information and belief, it controls Apotex Corp. and therefore the activities of Apotex Corp. in this jurisdiction are attributed to Apotex Inc.

12. Apotex Corp. is subject to personal jurisdiction in Delaware because, among other things, it has purposely availed itself of the benefits and protections of Delaware's laws such that it should reasonably anticipate being haled into court here. Apotex Corp. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, is qualified to do business in Delaware, and has appointed a registered agent for service of process in Delaware. It therefore has consented to general jurisdiction in Delaware. In addition, on information and belief, Apotex Corp. develops, manufactures, imports, markets, offers to sell, and/or sells generic drugs throughout the United States, including in the State of Delaware and therefore transacts business

within the State of Delaware related to Plaintiffs' claims, and/or has engaged in systematic and continuous business contacts within the State of Delaware.

13. On information and belief, Apotex knows and intends that following any approval of Apotex's ANDA No. 216421, Apotex will manufacture and import into the United States Apotex's ANDA Product and directly or indirectly market, sell, and distribute Apotex's ANDA Product throughout the United States, including in Delaware. On information and belief, following any FDA approval of ANDA No. 216421, Apotex knows and intends that Apotex's ANDA Product will be marketed, used, distributed, offered for sale, and sold in the United States and within Delaware. On information and belief, following any FDA approval of Apotex's ANDA No. 216421, Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. will act in concert to distribute and sell Apotex's ANDA Product throughout the United States, including within Delaware.

14. On information and belief, Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. are agents of each other, and/or operate in concert as integrated parts of the same business group, and enter into agreements with each other that are nearer than arm's length, including with respect to the development, regulatory approval, marketing, sale, offer for sale, and distribution of generic pharmaceutical products throughout the United States, including into Delaware, and including with respect to Apotex's ANDA Product at issue. On information and belief, Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. together participated in, assisted, and cooperated in the acts complained of herein.

15. Apotex has previously used the process contemplated by the Hatch-Waxman Act to challenge branded pharmaceutical companies' patents by filing a certification of the type described in Section 505(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) of the FDCA, 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV), serving a notice letter on those companies, and engaging in patent litigation arising from the process contemplated by the Hatch-Waxman Act.

16. On information and belief, Apotex, with knowledge of the Hatch-Waxman Act process, directed Apotex's Notice Letters to Plaintiffs, entities incorporated in Delaware, and alleged in Apotex's Notice Letters that all of the Patents-in-Suit are invalid and/or not infringed. On information and belief, Apotex knowingly and deliberately challenged Plaintiffs' patent rights, and knew when it did so that it was triggering the forty-five day period for Plaintiffs to bring an action for patent infringement under the Hatch-Waxman Act.

17. Because Plaintiffs are incorporated in Delaware, Plaintiffs suffer injuries and consequences from Apotex's filing of Apotex's ANDA, challenging Plaintiffs' patent rights, in Delaware. On information and belief, Apotex knew that it was deliberately challenging the patent rights of Delaware entities and seeking to invalidate intellectual property held in Delaware. Apotex has been a litigant in connection with other infringement actions under the Hatch-Waxman Act, and reasonably should have anticipated that by sending Apotex's Notice Letters to Plaintiffs, Delaware corporations, that it would be sued in Delaware for patent infringement.

18. In addition, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Apotex because Apotex Inc. and Apotex Corp. regularly engage in patent litigation concerning FDA-approved branded drug products in this district, do not contest personal jurisdiction in this district, and have purposefully availed themselves of the rights and benefits of this Court by asserting claims and/or counterclaims in this Court. *See, e.g.*, *Bial-Portela & CA S.A. v. Apotex Inc. et al.*, Case No. 21-187-CFC, D.I. 6 (D. Del. Feb. 19, 2021); *Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Apotex Inc. et al.*, Case No. 20-749-RGA, D.I. 7 (D. Del. June 26, 2020); *AstraZeneca AB v. Apotex Inc. et al.*, Case No. 18-2010-RGA, D.I. 8 (D. Del. Jan. 2, 2019); *Astellas US LLC v. Apotex Inc. et al.*, Case No. 18-1675-CFC, D.I. 84 (D. Del. July 5, 2019).

19. On information and belief, if Apotex's ANDA is approved, Apotex will directly or indirectly manufacture, market, sell, and/or distribute Apotex's ANDA Product within the United States, including in Delaware, consistent with Apotex's practices for the marketing and distribution of other generic pharmaceutical products. On information and belief, Apotex regularly does business in Delaware, and its practices with other generic pharmaceutical products have involved placing those products into the stream of commerce for distribution throughout the United States, including in Delaware. On information and belief, Apotex's generic pharmaceutical products are used and/or consumed within and throughout the United States, including in Delaware. On information and belief, Apotex's ANDA Product will be dispensed by pharmacies located within Delaware, and used by patients in Delaware. Each of these activities would have a substantial effect within Delaware and would constitute infringement of the Patents-in-Suit in the event that Apotex's ANDA Product is approved before the Patents-in-Suit expire.

20. On information and belief, Apotex derives substantial revenue from generic pharmaceutical products that are used and/or consumed within Delaware, and which are manufactured by Apotex and/or for which Apotex Inc. or Apotex Corp. is the named applicant on approved ANDAs. On information and belief, various products for which Apotex Inc. or Apotex Corp. is the named applicant on approved ANDAs are available at retail pharmacies in Delaware.

21. Alternatively, if Apotex Inc.'s connections with Delaware, including its connections with Apotex Corp., are found to be insufficient to confer personal jurisdiction, then, upon information and belief, Apotex Inc. is not subject to jurisdiction in any state's courts of general jurisdiction, and exercising jurisdiction over Apotex Inc. in Delaware is consistent with the United States Constitution and laws. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(k)(2).

VENUE

22. Venue is proper in this district as to Apotex Inc. pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because, *inter alia*, Apotex Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Canada and is subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district.

23. Venue is proper in this district as to Apotex Corp. pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because, *inter alia*, Apotex Corp. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and is subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

24. Astepro® Allergy is an over-the-counter nasal spray containing azelastine hydrochloride (0.15%, 205.5 mcg/spray).

25. On information and belief, Apotex's ANDA Product is a generic version of Plaintiffs' Astepro® Allergy.

26. Plaintiffs are filing this Complaint within forty-five days of receipt of Apotex's Notice Letters.

COUNT I – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '073 PATENT

27. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

28. The '073 patent, entitled "Compositions Comprising Azelastine and Methods of Use Thereof" (attached as Exhibit A), was duly and legally issued on December 6, 2011.

29. Meda is the owner and assignee of the '073 patent.

30. Bayer holds an exclusive license to the '073 patent for the commercial exploitation and sale of Astepro® Allergy.

31. In general, the claims of the '073 patent are directed to liquid pharmaceutical compositions comprising azelastine hydrochloride for treating allergic rhinitis or non-allergic vasomotor rhinitis.

32. Astepro® Allergy is covered by the '073 patent, including at least claims 2 and 3 of the '073 patent, and the '073 patent has been listed in connection with Astepro® Allergy in the FDA's Orange Book.

33. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex notified Plaintiffs of the submission of Apotex's ANDA to the FDA. The purpose of this submission was to obtain approval under the FDCA to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, and sale and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product prior to the expiration of the '073 patent.

34. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex also notified Plaintiffs that, as part of its ANDA, Apotex had filed certifications of the type described in Section 505(j)(2)(B)(iv) of the FDCA, 21 U.S.C. § 355 (j)(2)(B)(iv), with respect to the '073 patent. On information and belief, Apotex submitted its ANDA to the FDA containing certifications pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) asserting that the '073 patent is invalid, unenforceable, and/or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product.

35. According to Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex's ANDA Product is a nasal spray solution that contains 0.15% azelastine hydrochloride. On information and belief, Apotex's ANDA Product meets the other limitations of at least claims 2 and 3 of the '050 patent.

36. On information and belief, Apotex's ANDA Product and the use of Apotex's ANDA Product in accordance with its proposed labeling are covered by at least claims 2 and 3 of the '073 patent.

37. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex did not contest the infringement of claims 2, 3, 5-12, 14, 15, or 18–28 of the '073 patent on any basis other than the alleged invalidity of those claims.

38. Apotex's submission of Apotex's ANDA for the purpose of obtaining approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product before the expiration of the '073 patent was an act of infringement of the '073 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

39. On information and belief, Apotex will engage in the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, marketing, distribution, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product immediately and imminently upon approval of its ANDA.

40. On information and belief, the manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product would infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '073 patent, including at least claims 2 and 3 of the '073 patent.

41. On information and belief, the manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product in accordance with, and as directed by, its proposed labeling would infringe one or more claims of the '073 patent, including at least claims 2 and 3 of the '073 patent.

42. On information and belief, Apotex plans and intends to, and will, actively induce infringement of the '073 patent when Apotex's ANDA is approved, and plans and intends to, and will, do so immediately and imminently upon approval. Apotex's activities will be done with knowledge of the '073 patent and specific intent to infringe that patent.

43. Notwithstanding Apotex's knowledge of the claims of the '073 patent, Apotex has continued to assert its intent to manufacture, offer for sale, sell, distribute, and/or import Apotex's ANDA Product with its product labeling following FDA approval of Apotex's ANDA prior to the expiration of the '073 patent.

44. The foregoing actions by Apotex constitute and/or will constitute infringement of the '073 patent and active inducement of infringement by others of the '073 patent.

45. Plaintiffs will be substantially and irreparably damaged by infringement of the '073 patent.

46. Unless Apotex is enjoined from infringing the '073 patent and actively inducing infringement of the '073 patent, Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable injury. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT II – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INFRINGEMENT OF THE '073 PATENT

47. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

48. The Court may declare the rights and legal relations of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 because there is a case of actual controversy between Plaintiffs on the one hand and Apotex on the other regarding Apotex's infringement and active inducement of infringement of the '073 patent.

49. The Court should declare that the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product with its proposed labeling, or any other Apotex drug product that is covered by or whose use is covered by the '073 patent, will infringe and induce the infringement by others of the '073 patent.

COUNT III – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '919 PATENT

50. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

51. The '919 patent, entitled, "Compositions Comprising Azelastine and Methods of use Thereof" (attached as Exhibit B), was duly and legally issued on August 27, 2013.

52. Meda is the owner and assignee of the '919 patent.

53. Bayer holds an exclusive license to the '919 patent for the commercial exploitation and sale of Astepro® Allergy.

54. In general, the claims of the '919 patent are directed to methods for treating allergic rhinitis and non-allergic vasomotor rhinitis comprising administering a liquid pharmaceutical composition comprising azelastine hydrochloride.

55. The use of Astepro® Allergy is accordance with its labeling is covered by the '919 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '919 patent, and the '919 patent has been listed in connection with Astepro® Allergy in the FDA's Orange Book.

56. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex notified Plaintiffs of the submission of Apotex's ANDA to the FDA. The purpose of this submission was to obtain approval under the FDCA to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, and sale and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product prior to the expiration of the '919 patent.

57. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex also notified Plaintiffs that, as part of its ANDA, Apotex had filed certifications of the type described in Section 505(j)(2)(B)(iv) of the FDCA, 21 U.S.C. § 355 (j)(2)(B)(iv), with respect to the '919 patent. On information and belief, Apotex submitted its ANDA to the FDA containing certifications pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) asserting that the '919 patent is invalid, unenforceable, and/or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product.

58. According to Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex's ANDA Product is a nasal spray solution that contains 0.15% azelastine hydrochloride. On information and belief, the use of Apotex's ANDA Product in accordance with its proposed labeling is covered by at least claim 1 of the '919 patent.

59. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex did not contest the infringement of claim 1–10 or 12–20 of the '919 patent on any basis other than the alleged invalidity of that claim.

60. Apotex's submission of Apotex's ANDA for the purpose of obtaining approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product before the expiration of the '919 patent was an act of infringement of the '919 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

61. On information and belief, Apotex will engage in the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, marketing, distribution, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product, including with its proposed labeling, immediately and imminently upon approval of its ANDA.

62. On information and belief, the manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product in accordance with, and as directed by, its proposed labeling would infringe one or more claims of the '919 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '919 patent.

63. On information and belief, Apotex plans and intends to, and will, actively induce infringement of the '919 patent when Apotex's ANDA is approved, and plans and intends to, and will, do so immediately and imminently upon approval. Apotex's activities will be done with knowledge of the '919 patent and specific intent to infringe that patent.

64. On information and belief, Apotex knows that Apotex's ANDA Product and its proposed labeling are especially made or adapted for use in infringing the '919 patent, that Apotex's ANDA Product is not a staple article or commodity of commerce, and that Apotex's ANDA Product and its proposed labeling are not suitable for substantial noninfringing use. On information and belief, Apotex plans and intends to, and will, contribute to infringement of the '919 patent immediately and imminently upon approval of Apotex's ANDA.

65. Notwithstanding Apotex's knowledge of the claims of the '919 patent, Apotex has continued to assert its intent to manufacture, offer for sale, sell, distribute, and/or import Apotex's

ANDA Product with its proposed labeling following FDA approval of Apotex's ANDA prior to the expiration of the '919 patent.

66. The foregoing actions by Apotex constitute and/or will constitute infringement of the '919 patent; active inducement of infringement of the '919 patent; and contribution to the infringement by others of the '919 patent.

67. Plaintiffs will be substantially and irreparably damaged by infringement of the '919 patent.

68. Unless Apotex is enjoined from infringing the '919 patent, actively inducing infringement of the '919 patent, and contributing to the infringement by others of the '919 patent, Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable injury. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT IV – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INFRINGEMENT OF THE '919 PATENT

69. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

70. The Court may declare the rights and legal relations of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 because there is a case of actual controversy between Plaintiffs on the one hand and Apotex on the other regarding Apotex's infringement, active inducement of infringement, and contribution to the infringement by others of the '919 patent.

71. The Court should declare that the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product with its proposed labeling, or any other Apotex drug product whose use is covered by the '919 patent, will infringe, induce the infringement of, and contribute to the infringement by others of the '919 patent.

COUNT V – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '050 PATENT

72. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

73. The '050 patent, entitled "Compositions Comprising Azelastine" (attached as Exhibit C), was duly and legally issued on March 20, 2018.

74. Meda is the owner and assignee of the '050 patent.

75. Bayer holds an exclusive license to the '050 patent for the commercial exploitation and sale of Astepro® Allergy.

76. In general, the claims of the '050 patent are directed to liquid intranasal compositions comprising azelastine hydrochloride.

77. Astepro® Allergy is covered by the '050 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '050 patent, and the '050 patent has been listed in connection with Astepro® Allergy in the FDA's Orange Book.

78. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex notified Plaintiffs of the submission of Apotex's ANDA to the FDA. The purpose of this submission was to obtain approval under the FDCA to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, and sale and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product prior to the expiration of the '050 patent.

79. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex also notified Plaintiffs that, as part of its ANDA, Apotex had filed certifications of the type described in Section 505(j)(2)(B)(iv) of the FDCA, 21 U.S.C. § 355 (j)(2)(B)(iv), with respect to the '050 patent. On information and belief, Apotex submitted its ANDA to the FDA containing certifications pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) asserting that the '050 patent is invalid, unenforceable, and/or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product.

80. According to Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex's ANDA Product is a nasal spray solution that contains 0.15% azelastine hydrochloride. On information and belief, Apotex's ANDA Product meets the other limitations of at least claim 1 of the '050 patent.

81. On information and belief, Apotex's ANDA Product and the use of Apotex's ANDA Product in accordance with its proposed labeling are covered by at least claim 1 of the '050 patent.

82. Apotex's submission of Apotex's ANDA for the purpose of obtaining approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product before the expiration of the '050 patent was an act of infringement of the '050 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

83. On information and belief, Apotex will engage in the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, marketing, distribution, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product immediately and imminently upon approval of its ANDA.

84. On information and belief, the manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product would infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '050 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '050 patent.

85. In Apotex's Notice Letters, Apotex did not contest the infringement of claims 1–13 of the '050 patent on any basis other than the alleged invalidity of that claim.

86. Apotex's submission of Apotex's ANDA for the purpose of obtaining approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product before the expiration of the '050 patent was an act of infringement of the '050 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2)(A).

87. On information and belief, Apotex will engage in the manufacture, use, offer for sale, sale, marketing, distribution, and/or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product immediately and imminently upon approval of its ANDA.

88. On information and belief, the manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product would infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '050 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '050 patent.

89. On information and belief, the manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product in accordance with, and as directed by, its proposed labeling would infringe one or more claims of the '050 patent, including at least claim 1 of the '050 patent.

90. On information and belief, Apotex plans and intends to, and will, actively induce infringement of the '050 patent when Apotex's ANDA is approved, and plans and intends to, and will, do so immediately and imminently upon approval. Apotex's activities will be done with knowledge of the '050 patent and specific intent to infringe that patent.

91. Notwithstanding Apotex's knowledge of the claims of the '050 patent, Apotex has continued to assert its intent to manufacture, offer for sale, sell, distribute, and/or import Apotex's ANDA Product with its proposed labeling following FDA approval of Apotex's ANDA prior to the expiration of the '050 patent.

92. The foregoing actions by Apotex constitute and/or will constitute infringement of the '050 patent and active inducement of infringement of the '050 patent.

93. Plaintiffs will be substantially and irreparably damaged by infringement of the '050 patent.

94. Unless Apotex is enjoined from infringing the '050 patent and actively inducing infringement of the '050 patent, Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable injury. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT VI – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INFRINGEMENT OF THE '050 PATENT

95. Plaintiffs incorporate each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

96. The Court may declare the rights and legal relations of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 because there is a case of actual controversy between Plaintiffs on the one hand and Apotex on the other regarding Apotex's infringement and active inducement of infringement of the '050 patent.

97. The Court should declare that the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product with its proposed labeling, or any other Apotex drug product that is covered by or whose use is covered by the '050 patent, will infringe and induce the infringement of the '050 patent.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request the following relief:

a) A judgment that each of the Patents-in-Suit has been infringed under 35 U.S.C. § 271(e)(2) by Apotex's submission to the FDA of Apotex's ANDA;

b) A judgment ordering that the effective date of any FDA approval of commercial manufacture, use, or sale of Apotex's ANDA Product, or any other drug product that infringes or the use of which infringes one or more of the Patents-in-Suit, be not earlier than the latest of the expiration dates of said patents, inclusive of any extension(s) and additional period(s) of exclusivity;

c) A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Apotex, and all persons acting

in concert with Apotex, from the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale, or importation into the United States of Apotex's ANDA Product, or any other drug product covered by or whose use is covered by one or more of the Patents-in-Suit, prior to the expiration of said patents, inclusive of any extension(s) and additional period(s) of exclusivity;

d) A judgment declaring that the commercial manufacture, use, sale, offer for sale or importation of Apotex's ANDA Product, or any other drug product which is covered by or whose use is covered by one-or-more of the Patents-in-Suit, prior to the expiration of said patents, will infringe, induce the infringement of, and contribute to the infringement by others of, said patents;

e) A declaration that this is an exceptional case and an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285;

f) Costs and expenses in this action; and

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

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

/s/ Derek J. Fahnestock

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Rodger D. Smith II (#3778)
Derek J. Fahnestock (#4705)
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
jblumenfeld@morrisnichols.com
rsmith@morrisnichols.com
dfahnestock@morrisnichols.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Bayer HealthCare LLC

OF COUNSEL:

Dov P. Grossman
Christopher J. Mandernach
Andrew L. Hoffman
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 434-5000

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, P.C.

/s/ Jennifer A. Ward

Jennifer A. Ward (#6476)
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 800
Wilmington, DE 19801-5225
(302) 304-7600
jward@wsgr.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Meda Pharmaceuticals Inc.

OF COUNSEL:

Brandon M. White
PERKINS COIE LLP
700 13th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 654-6200

October 7, 2021