

# Court Report

By Sherri Oslick -- February 26, 2012



About Court Report: Each week we will report briefly on recently filed biotech and pharma cases.

*Cellectis S.A. v. Precision Biosciences Inc.* 1:12-cv-00204; filed February 21, 2012 in the District Court of Delaware

Declaratory judgment of invalidity and non-infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,119,361 ("Methods of Cleaving DNA with Rationally-Designed

Meganucleases," issued February 21, 2012) and <u>8,119,381</u> ("Rationally Designed Meganucleases with Altered Sequence Specificity and DNA-Binding Affinity," issued February 21, 2012). View the complaint <u>here</u>.

## Precision BioSciences, Inc. v. Cellectis SA et al.

5:12-cv-00076; filed February 20, 2012 in the Eastern District of North Carolina

- Plaintiff: Precision BioSciences, Inc.
- Defendants: Cellectis SA; Cellectis bioresearch; Cellectis bioresearch Inc.

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. <u>8,119,361</u> ("Methods of Cleaving DNA with Rationally-Designed Meganucleases," issued February 21, 2012) based on Cellectis' manufacture, use, and sale of certain products, including meganucleases targeting the HIV1 genome. View the complaint <u>here</u>.

## Precision BioSciences, Inc. v. Cellectis SA et al.

5:12-cv-00077; filed February 20, 2012 in the Eastern District of North Carolina

- Plaintiff: Precision BioSciences, Inc.
- Defendants: Cellectis SA; Cellectis bioresearch; Cellectis bioresearch Inc.

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. <u>8,119,381</u> ("Rationally Designed Meganucleases with Altered Sequence Specificity and DNA-Binding Affinity," issued February 21, 2012) based on Cellectis' manufacture, use, and sale of certain products, including meganucleases targeting the HIV1 genome and meganucleases targeting the GS gene in Chinese Hamster Ovary cells. View the complaint <u>here</u>.

## Spectrum Pharmaceuticals, Inc. et al. v. InnoPharma Inc.

2:12-cv-00265; filed February 17, 2012 in the District Court of Nevada

- Plaintiffs: Spectrum Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; University of Strathclyde
- Defendant: InnoPharma Inc.

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. <u>6,500,829</u> ("Substantially Pure Diastereoisomers of Tetrahydrofolate Derivatives," issued December 31, 2002) following a Paragraph IV certification as part of InnoPharma's

filing of an ANDA to manufacture a generic version of Spectrum's Fusilev® (levoleucovorin, used to treat advanced metastatic colorectal cancer). View the complaint <u>here</u>.

### Novo Nordisk Inc. et al. v. Aurobindo Pharma Ltd. et al.

3:12-cv-01026; filed February 16, 2012 in the District Court of New Jersey

- Plaintiffs: Novo Nordisk Inc.; Novo Nordisk A/S
- Defendants: Aurobindo Pharma Ltd.; Aurobindo Pharma USA, Inc.

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. <u>6,677,358</u> ("NIDDM Regimen," issued January 13, 2004) following a Paragraph IV certification as part of Aurobindo's filing of an ANDA to manufacture a generic version of Novo Nordisk's Prandin® (repaglinide, used to treat non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus in combination with metformin). View the complaint <u>here</u>.

"Patent Docs" does not contain any legal advice whatsoever. This weblog is for informational purposes only, and its publication does not create an attorneyclient relationship. In addition, nothing on "Patent Docs" constitutes a solicitation for business. This weblog is intended primarily for other attorneys. Moreover, "Patent Docs" is the personal weblog of the Authors; it is not edited by the Authors' employers or clients and, as such, no part of this weblog may be so attributed. All posts on "Patent Docs" should be double-checked for their accuracy and current applicability.