

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

GENENTECH, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMGEN INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 18-924-CFC

PUBLIC VERSION FILED: October 4, 2019

**OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF GENENTECH, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 37(b)**

Of Counsel:

Daralyn J. Durie
Adam R. Brausa
DURIE TANGRI LLP
217 Leidesdorff St.
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 362-6666

William F. Lee
Lisa J. Pirozzolo
Emily R. Whelan
Kevin Prussia
Andrew J. Danford
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(627) 526-6000

Robert J. Gunther Jr.
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007
(212) 230-8800

Michael P. Kelly (#2295)
Daniel M. Silver (#4758)
Alexandra M. Joyce (#6423)
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
Renaissance Centre
405 North King Street, 8th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 984-6300

Attorneys for Genentech, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
II. BACKGROUND.....	4
A. Amgen’s Attempts to Limit the Scope of the Privilege Waiver.....	4
B. Ms. Kwasigroch Refuses to Testify About Her Work Product Relating to the Validity of the Dosing Patents	7
III. LEGAL STANDARD	10
IV. ARGUMENT	11
A. Amgen Should Be Held in Contempt for Deliberating Violating the Court’s Discovery Order Regarding Privilege Waiver	11
B. The Court Should Deem Facts Established Relating to the Deposition Testimony That Amgen Willfully Suppressed	12
1. Amgen has acted willfully and in bad faith	14
2. Genentech is prejudiced by Amgen’s litigation misconduct	14
3. The proposed sanction of deeming certain facts established is reasonable, narrowly tailored, and lesser sanctions would not be effective	15
V. CONCLUSION	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	PAGE(S)
<i>Alexsam, Inc. v. IDT Corp.</i> , 715 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	11
<i>Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Shreveport v. Coca-Cola Co.</i> , 110 F.R.D. 363 (D. Del. 1986)	11
<i>Drone Techs., Inc. v. Parrot S.A.</i> , 838 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	9
<i>In re EchoStar Communications Corp.</i> , 448 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	3, 10
<i>Harris v. City of Philadelphia</i> , 47 F.3d 1311 (3d Cir. 1995)	9
<i>Insurance Corp. of Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee</i> , 456 U.S. 694 (1982)	8, 10, 11
<i>Schindler Elevator Corp. v. Otis Elevator Co.</i> , No. 09-cv-0560 (DMC), 2011 WL 4594225 (D.N.J. Mar. 24, 2011), <i>report</i> <i>and recommendation adopted</i> , No. 09-CV-0560 (DMC-JAD), 2011 WL 4594958 (D.N.J. Sept. 30, 2011).....	11
<i>In re Seagate Technology, LLC</i> , 497 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	10
<i>Estate of Spear v. Comm’r of Internal Revenue</i> , 41 F.3d 103 (3d Cir. 1994)	11, 12
Other Authorities	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 37	1, 8, 9, 11

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Genentech, Inc. (“Genentech”) respectfully moves for an order holding Defendant Amgen Inc. (“Amgen”) in contempt of this Court’s June 20, 2019 Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (D.I. 259) (hereinafter, the “Order”) and entering sanctions pursuant to Rule 37(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by deeming certain facts established.

Amgen asserts the advice of counsel as a defense to willful patent infringement. It seeks to use privileged communications as a sword, and the Court correctly held that it therefore cannot assert privilege as a shield. Amgen has waived privilege regarding the subject matter of its opinion letters.

The Court twice rejected Amgen’s attempt to limit the scope of its waiver to exclude in-house counsel communications and work product that were not shared with Amgen’s “decisionmakers.” The Court correctly held that Amgen seeks to use privileged communications as a sword, and Amgen—as a corporate entity—has placed its supposed good-faith reliance on such communications at issue. Amgen itself includes Amgen’s in-house counsel, and the Court thus expressly included Amgen’s in-house counsel within the scope of the waiver in its Order. The Court affirmed its ruling when it rejected Amgen’s motion for re-argument on this issue.

Amgen has deliberately defied this Court’s Order. It produced heavily redacted documents on September 4, 2019, and then began producing witnesses for depositions. During the deposition of Lois Kwasigroch—one of Amgen’s in-house counsel [REDACTED]—Amgen instructed the witness not to answer any questions to the extent they called for communications or work product not conveyed to a small set of individuals that Amgen has chosen to dub the company’s business “decisionmakers.”

These instructions violated the Court's Order. They prevented Genentech from exploring Ms. Kwasigroch's state of mind, and prevented discovery into whether *Amgen*, not merely a handful of carefully curated individuals, had a good faith belief that the asserted patents were invalid and/or not infringed. Amgen should therefore be held in contempt, and the Court should issue sanctions deeming certain facts admitted at trial relating to Ms. Kwasigroch's knowledge of and opinions regarding the validity of certain patents-in-suit that fall within the scope of the Court's Order, as set forth in the enclosed Proposed Order.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Amgen's Attempts to Limit the Scope of the Privilege Waiver

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Amgen announced its intention to rely on these opinions of counsel in an effort to defend itself from a charge of willful infringement. Genentech then requested the production of documents to test whether Amgen in fact was relying on those opinions in good faith. Declaration of Daralyn J. Durie ("Durie Decl.") Ex. 1, Letter from Danford to Rhyu (June 3, 2019). Amgen produced a limited set of documents, but refused to produce communications with and among Amgen's in-house counsel and related work product that were not provided to the specific individuals who were supposedly making the ultimate decision to launch Kanjinti. *See* Durie Decl. Ex. 2, Letter from Gardner to Danford

[REDACTED]

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.