

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, and
LILLY USA, LLC

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 1:21-cv-81-SEB-MJD

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND2

I. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND2

II. PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES UNILATERALLY RESTRICT ACCESS TO 340B DISCOUNTS FOR SAFETY-NET PROVIDERS.....7

III. PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES SUE TO PREVENT HHS’s ENFORCEMENT OF THE 340B STATUTE10

STANDARD OF REVIEW10

ARGUMENT.....11

I. LILLY CANNOT SUCCEED ON THE MERITS13

A. ADR Board Members Are Inferior Officers13

B. The ADR Process Does Not Infringe the Power of the Judiciary19

C. The ADR Rule is Procedurally Compliant With The APA.....25

1. HHS did not terminate the ADR Rulemaking in advance of issuing the final rule.....25

2. The ADR Rule is a logical outgrowth of the NPRM.27

D. The ADR Rule is Substantively Compliant with the APA.....29

1. The ADR Rule does not exceed HHS’s statutory authority.....29

2. The ADR Rule is not arbitrary and capricious.30

II. LILLY HAS NOT ESTABLISHED IRREPARABLE HARM34

A. Allegations of structural constitutional harms are insufficient to support a preliminary injunction.34

B. Litigation Expenses Are Not Irreparable Harm.35

III. THE BALANCE OF THE EQUITIES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST WEIGH AGAINST THE REQUESTED INJUNCTION.....37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**CASES**

<i>Alto Dairy v. Veneman</i> , 336 F.3d 560 (7th Cir. 2003).....	28, 29
<i>Am. Med. Ass'n v. United States</i> , 887 F.2d 760 (7th Cir. 1989).....	27, 29
<i>Am. Petroleum Inst. v. Jorling</i> , 710 F. Supp. 421 (N.D.N.Y. 1989).....	35
<i>Amundsen v. Chi. Park Dist.</i> , 218 F.3d 712 (7th Cir. 2000).....	31
<i>Ariz. Hosp. & Healthcare Ass'n v. Betlach</i> , 865 F. Supp. 2d 984 (D. Ariz. 2012).....	37
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	18
<i>Association of American Railroads v. U.S. Department of Transportation</i> , 821 F.3d 19 (D.C. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>Astra USA, Inc. v. Santa Clara Cty.</i> , 563 U.S. 110 (2011).....	4, 24, 38
<i>Bader v. Wernert</i> , 178 F. Supp. 3d 703 (N.D. Ind. 2016).....	36
<i>Bank of N. Shore v. Fed. Deposit Ins. Corp.</i> , 743 F.2d 1178 (7th Cir. 1984).....	30
<i>Baskin v. Bogan</i> , 983 F. Supp. 2d 1021 (S.D. Ind. 2014).....	35
<i>Bernard v. Individual Members of Ind. Med. Licensing Bd.</i> , 392 F. Supp. 3d 935 (S.D. Ind. 2019).....	34
<i>Cal Pharmacists Ass'n v. Maxwell-Jolly</i> , 596 F.3d 1098 (9th Cir. 2010), <i>vacated & remanded sub nom</i> , <i>Douglas v. Indep. Living Ctr. of S. Cal., Inc.</i> , 565 U.S. 606 (2012).....	37
<i>CFTC v. Schor</i> , 478 U.S. 833 (1986).....	24
<i>Cierco v. Lew</i> , 190 F. Supp. 3d 16 (D.D.C. 2016)	26

..

City of Portland v. EPA,
507 F.3d 706 (D.C. Cir. 2007)33

Clinton v. Jones,
520 U.S. 681 (1997)31

Cnty. Pharmacies of Ind. v. Ind. Family & Social Servs. Admin.,
801 F. Supp. 2d 802 (S.D. Ind. 2011)36

Cook Cty. v. Wolf,
962 F.3d 208 (7th Cir. 2020)33

Cornish v. Dudas,
540 F. Supp. 2d 61 (D.D.C. 2008)37

CoverDyn v. Moniz,
68 F. Supp. 3d 34 (D.D.C. 2014)37

Crowell v. Benson,
285 U.S. 22 (1932)24

Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin.,
710 F.2d 842 (D.C. Cir. 1983)26

Dinner Bell Mkts., Inc. v. United States,
116 F. Supp. 3d 905 (S.D. Ind. 2015)36

E. St. Louis Laborers’ Local 100 v. Bellon Wrecking & Salvage Co.,
414 F.3d 700 (7th Cir. 2005)36

Edmond v. United States,
520 U.S. 651 (1997) 13, 14, 18

FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.,
556 U.S. 502 (2009)30

Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.,
626 F.2d 966 (D.C. Cir. 1980)31

Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board,
561 U.S. 477 (2010) 14, 17, 18

Freytag v. Comm’r of Internal Revenue,
501 U.S. 868 (1991)31

FTC v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal.,
449 U.S. 232 (1980)36

...

GEFT Outdoors, LLC v. City of Westfield,
 922 F.3d 357 (7th Cir. 2019), *cert. denied*, 140 S. Ct. 268 (2019)11

Gill v. Whitford,
 138 S. Ct. 1916 (2018).....38

In re Grand Jury Invest.,
 916 F.3d 1047 (D.C. Cir. 2019) 15, 16, 17, 18

Indus. & Fin. Mkts. Ass’n v. U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n,
 67 F. Supp. 3d 373 (D.D.C. 2014)34

Intercollegiate Broad. Sys., Inc. v. Copyright Royalty Bd.,
 684 F.3d 1332 (D.C. Cir. 2012) 15, 17, 18

Int’l Union, United Mine Workers of Am. v. U.S. Dep’t of Labor,
 358 F.3d 40 (D.C. Cir. 2004)26

Kalaris v. Donovan,
 697 F.2d 376 (1983) 17, 23, 24, 25

Long Island Care at Home, Ltd. v. Coke,
 551 U.S. 158 (2007)29

Lucia v. Securities and Exchange Commission,
 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....31

Madsen v. Women’s Health Ctr., Inc.,
 512 U.S. 753 (1994)38

Mazurek v. Armstrong,
 520 U.S. 968 (1997)11

Michigan v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs,
 667 F.3d 765 (7th Cir. 2011).....36

Minerva Dairy, Inc. v. Brancel,
 No. 17-cv-299-jdp, 2017 WL 3575710 (W.D. Wis. Aug. 18, 2017)35

Mobil Oil Expl. & Producing Se. Inc. v. United Distrib. Cos.,
 498 U.S. 211 (1991)33

Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.,
 463 U.S. 29 (1983)30

Munaf v. Geren,
 553 U.S. 674 (2008)11

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.