

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

BCBSM, Inc., Health Care Service  
Corporation, Molina Healthcare, Inc., and  
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Celgene Corporation and Bristol-Myers  
Squibb Company,

Defendants.

Case No. 0:20-cv-02071-SRN-ECW

HON. SUSAN RICHARD NELSON  
HON. ELIZABETH COWAN WRIGHT

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO RULE 12(b)(6)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iv

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 2

LEGAL STANDARDS ..... 6

ARGUMENT..... 7

I. PLAINTIFFS’ ANTITRUST THEORIES FAIL ..... 9

    A. The Antitrust Theories in Counts I-IV Are Contrary To Law. .... 9

        1. Refusals to Deal. .... 9

        2. Sham Litigation. .... 11

            a. Litigations on the Thalomid Patents. .... 12

                1) Lannett Litigation..... 12

                2) Barr Litigation..... 14

            b. Litigations on the Revlimid Patents. .... 15

                1) Natco Litigation. .... 17

                2) Other patent infringement suits..... 17

            c. The Distribution Method Patents. .... 18

        3. Patent Settlements ..... 19

        4. Plaintiffs Lack Any Antitrust Injury ..... 21

            a. Plaintiffs Fail to Adequately Plead That All of Celgene’s Patent Claims are Shams ..... 22

            b. Plaintiffs Fail to Plead that Any Generic Has Obtained FDA Approval..... 22

    B. Plaintiffs’ Antitrust Claims Fail Under Several Applicable State Laws..... 23

        1. Plaintiffs Cannot Proceed under Certain States’ Antitrust Laws as Indirect Purchasers (Counts I & II). .... 23

2.	Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Specific Impacts on Intrastate Commerce (Counts I, II & III).....	24
3.	Counts III and IV Fail To Satisfy Rule 8. ....	25
4.	Plaintiffs’ Consumer Protection Claims (Count III) Do Not Satisfy Additional Requirements in Thirteen Jurisdictions. ....	26
5.	Plaintiffs’ Unjust Enrichment Claim (Count IV) Fails On Several Additional Bases. ....	28
a.	Statutory Remedies Preclude Unjust Enrichment Claims. ...	28
b.	Unjust Enrichment Claims Cannot Be Used to Circumvent the Direct Purchaser Rule.....	29
c.	Several States Require Allegations of a Direct Benefit to Sustain an Unjust Enrichment Claim. ....	29
C.	Plaintiffs’ Refusal to Deal Claims Are Untimely.....	30
1.	The Limitations Periods. ....	30
2.	The Alleged Refusal to Deal Conduct Is Many Years Old. ....	30
3.	Consumer Protection and Unjust Enrichment Claims Related to Alleged Refusals to Deal are Similarly Untimely. ....	31
II.	HCSC’S OFF-LABEL CLAIMS FAIL .....	32
A.	Background .....	32
1.	Off-Label Prescriptions. ....	32
2.	Off-Label Use of Thalomid and Revlimid. ....	33
B.	HCSC’s Off-Label Theory. ....	33
C.	HCSC States No Claim. ....	34
1.	HCSC Has Not Adequately Alleged Fraud (Count V). ....	34
a.	HCSC’s Fraud Allegations Fail Under Rule 9(b). ....	35
b.	HCSC Has Not Adequately Alleged Reliance. ....	36
2.	HCSC Has Not Adequately Alleged Negligent Misrepresentation. ....	37
3.	HCSC Has Not Adequately Alleged Unjust Enrichment.....	38

CONCLUSION ..... 39

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Amarin Pharma, Inc. v. F.D.A.</i> , 119 F. Supp. 3d 196 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) .....	33
<i>Arctic Cat v. Polaris Indus.</i> , 2014 WL 5325361 (D. Minn. Oct. 20, 2014).....	14, 17, 18
<i>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.</i> , 472 U.S. 585 (1985) .....	9, 10
<i>AvidAir Helicopter Supply, Inc. v. Rolls-Royce Corp.</i> , 663 F.3d 966 (8th Cir. 2011).....	19
<i>Bank of Montreal v. Avalon Capital Grp.</i> , 743 F. Supp. 2d 1021 (D. Minn. 2010) .....	35, 36
<i>Buckman Co. v. Plaintiffs’ Legal Comm.</i> , 531 U.S. 341 (2001) .....	32
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc.</i> , 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	13
<i>City Ctr. Realty Partners, LLC v. Macy’s Retail Holdings, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 4081896 (D. Minn. Sept. 13, 2017) .....	28
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VI LLC v. Celgene Corp.</i> , 2015 WL 7304675 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 16, 2015).....	16
<i>Evangelical Lutheran Church in Am. Bd. of Pensions v. Spherion Pac. Workforce LLC</i> , 2005 WL 1041487 (D. Minn. May 4, 2005).....	27
<i>Exergen Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14
<i>F.T.C. v. Actavis, Inc.</i> , 570 U.S. 136 (2013) .....	21
<i>GEICO Corp. v. Autoliv, Inc.</i> , 345 F. Supp. 3d 799 (E.D. Mich. 2018) .....	32
<i>Genz-Ryan Plumbing &amp; Heating Co. v. Weyerhaeuser NR Co.</i> , 352 F. Supp. 3d 901 (D. Minn. 2018) .....	39
<i>Graphic Communications Local 1B Health &amp; Welfare Fund A v. CVS Caremark Corp.</i> , 850 N.W.2d 682 (Minn. 2014) .....	27
<i>H-Quotient, Inc. v. Knight Trading Grp., Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 323750 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 9, 2005) .....	24
<i>Huff v. Pinstripes, Inc.</i> , 972 F. Supp. 2d 1065 (D. Minn. 2013) .....	28
<i>Hunt v. U.S. Tobacco Co.</i> , 538 F.3d 217 (3d Cir. 2008).....	27

# 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.