

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

OKLAHOMA FIREFIGHTERS PENSION
AND RETIREMENT SYSTEM,

Plaintiff,

v.

BIOGEN INC., MICHEL VOUNATSOS,
ALFRED SANDROCK, AND ALISHA
ALAIMO,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-10200-WGY

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL
SECURITIES LAWS

Jury Trial Demanded

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Jurisdiction and Venue.....	12
III.	Parties.....	13
IV.	Substantive Allegations	14
A.	Biogen’s Aging Line of Products and Need for a Blockbuster Replacement.....	15
B.	The Development, Failure, and Resurrection of Aduhelm	18
C.	Defendants’ Pre-Class Period Statements Primed the Market to Expect Sales of Aduhelm to Take Off Immediately Following FDA Approval	22
D.	The FDA’s Controversial Approval of Aduhelm	27
E.	Former Employees of Biogen and the Realities of Aduhelm’s Commercial Rollout.....	27
F.	Defendants’ False and Misleading Statements	48
1.	Defendants Falsely Claimed 900 Sites Were Ready to Implement Treatment After Aduhelm’s Approval	49
2.	Defendants Omitted Material Facts Concerning Logistical Bottlenecks Associated with Confirming Amyloid Beta in Potential Patients	51
3.	Defendants Falsely Characterized Medicare Coverage as Automatic Following FDA Approval	53
4.	Defendants Misleadingly Suggested that Third-Party Payors Approved Aduhelm’s \$56,000 Per Patient, Per Year Price Point	55
5.	Defendants Falsely Characterized the VA’s Willingness and Capacity to Cover and Administer Aduhelm	58
G.	The Market Slowly Learned that Aduhelm Was Not Being Readily Prescribed, That Third-Party Payors, Including Medicare, Would Not Pay For Coverage and The Entire Stock Price Increase from June 7 Was Eliminated	60

H.	Class Action Allegations.....	81
I.	Fraud on the Market.....	82
J.	No Safe Harbor	84
K.	Loss Causation.....	86
V.	Count I Violation of § 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 Promulgated Thereunder	91
VI.	Count II Violation of § 20(a) of the Exchange Act.....	93

..

1. Lead Plaintiff, Oklahoma Firefighters Pension and Retirement System (“Lead Plaintiff”), alleges the following based upon the investigation undertaken by Lead Counsel, which included, but was not limited to, the review and analysis of: (i) public filings made by Biogen, Inc. (“Biogen” or the “Company”) with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”); (ii) press releases and other public statements issued by Defendants; (iii) research reports issued by securities and financial analysts; (iv) media and news reports and other publicly available information about Biogen and Defendants; (v) transcripts of Biogen’s earnings and other conference calls with investors and analysts; (vi) publicly available presentations, press releases, and interviews by Biogen and its employees; (vii) economic analyses of the movement and pricing of Biogen’s publicly traded common stock; and (viii) interviews with former employees (“FEs”) of Biogen.

2. Lead Counsel’s investigation into the factual allegations continues, and many of the relevant facts are known only to Defendants or are exclusively within their custody or control. Lead Plaintiff believes that substantial additional evidentiary support will exist for the Complaint’s allegations after a reasonable opportunity for discovery, including access to the materials that Defendants and third parties have produced to, among others, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”), the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”), the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”), the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Reform, other federal agencies, and third-parties.

3. This matter is a securities class action brought against Biogen and three of its executives (collectively “Defendants”) for false and misleading statements made to investors in

connection with the Company's rollout of aducanumab, branded as Aduhelm¹, a monoclonal antibody treatment for Alzheimer's disease. The putative class is comprised of investors who purchased or otherwise acquired Biogen stock between June 7, 2021, and January 11, 2022, inclusive (the "Class Period"). Defendants false and misleading statements made in connection with the rollout of Aduhelm violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and 78t(a) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by the SEC, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

4. Defendants misled investors as to the commercial readiness for its new drug, Aduhelm through five categories of false and misleading statements concerning the following: (i) the number of sites ready, willing, and able to administer Aduhelm immediately after approval; (ii) the significance of logistical constraints on diagnosing patients; (iii) the degree to which Medicare's coverage of the treatment was independent of the FDA's approval of the treatment; (iv) the willingness of third-party payors to cover Aduhelm at a premium price point, or, indeed, at any price point absent peer-reviewed data supporting a determination of the treatment's clinical effectiveness; and (v) the Veterans Health Administration (the "VA" or "Veterans Administration") willingness and capacity to cover and administer Aduhelm for its beneficiaries. In addition to these categories of false and misleading statements, throughout the Class Period, Defendants misled investors as to their irregular interactions with the FDA prior to Aduhelm's approval, which later became the subject of investigations by the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, and Congress, and contributed to a significant portion

¹ For ease of reference, this complaint uses Aduhelm throughout, though prior to FDA approval both internal and public documents referring to the treatment routinely refer to the compound's unbranded name, Aducanumab.

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.