

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE: DIRECT PURCHASER
INSULIN PRICING LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:

All Actions

Civil Action No. 20-03426
(BRM)(LHG) (Consolidated)

**ORAL ARGUMENT
REQUESTED**

Motion return date: May 3, 2021

**MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS' BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR
MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

(Counsel Listed on Next Page)

REED SMITH LLP

Melissa A. Geist
506 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
Princeton, NJ 08540
Tel.: (609) 514-5978

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Shankar Duraiswamy
Henry Liu (*admitted pro hac vice*)
One CityCenter
850 Tenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
Tel.: (202) 662-6000

Attorneys for Defendant Eli Lilly and Company

**WALSH PIZZAI O'REILLY
FALANGA LLP**

Liza M. Walsh
Katelyn O'Reilly
William T. Walsh, Jr.
Three Gateway Center
100 Mulberry Street, 15th Floor
Newark, NJ 07102
Tel.: (973) 757-1100

JONES DAY

Michael R. Shumaker*
William D. Coglianese*
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
Tel.: (202) 879-3939

**pro hac vice pending*

Attorneys for Defendant Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC

GIBBONS P.C.

Michael R. Griffinger
Michael R. McDonald
Christopher Walsh
One Gateway Center
Newark, NJ 07102
Tel.: (973) 596-4500

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP

James P. Rouhandeh[†]
David B. Toscano[†]
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
Tel.: (212) 450-4000

Neal A. Potischman[†]
Andrew Yaphe[†]
1600 El Camino Real
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Tel.: (650) 752-2000

[†]pro hac vice forthcoming

Attorneys for Defendant Novo Nordisk Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	4
A. The Parties	4
B. Plaintiffs’ Claims.....	7
STANDARD OF REVIEW	10
ARGUMENT	11
I. Plaintiffs’ Robinson-Patman Act Claims Should Be Dismissed.....	11
A. Plaintiffs Lack Antitrust Standing to Assert a Section 2(c) Claim.	11
B. Plaintiffs Fail to Plead Basic Elements of a Section 2(c) Claim.....	13
II. Plaintiffs’ Sherman Act Claims Should Be Dismissed.	17
A. Plaintiffs’ Price-Fixing Claim Against the Manufacturer Defendants Should Be Dismissed.	19
1. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Parallel Conduct Suggestive of a Price-Fixing Agreement.....	19
2. Plaintiffs’ “Plus Factors” Do Not Raise a Plausible Inference of a Price-Fixing Agreement.	22
B. Plaintiffs’ Pricing-Fixing Claim Against All Defendants Should Be Dismissed.....	24
III. Plaintiffs’ RICO Claims Should Be Dismissed.....	26
A. Plaintiff FWK Lacks Standing to Assert RICO Claims.....	26
B. Plaintiffs Cannot Predicate RICO Liability on Alleged Violations of the Anti-Kickback Statute.	28

C. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Any Mail or Wire Fraud Predicate. 31

D. Plaintiffs Do Not Allege that the Manufacturer Defendants
Directed the Affairs of Any RICO Enterprise..... 33

E. Plaintiffs Do Not Allege a RICO Conspiracy. 34

V. Plaintiffs’ Claims Are Partially Time-Barred..... 35

A. Plaintiffs Do Not Allege that Defendants Prevented Them From
Recognizing the Validity of Their Claims. 36

B. Plaintiffs Do Not Allege that They Exercised Due Diligence. 38

VI. Plaintiff PDC’s Claims Should Be Dismissed. 39

CONCLUSION 40

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>2660 Woodley Rd. Joint Venture v. ITT Sheraton Corp.</i> , 369 F.3d 732 (3d Cir. 2004)	11, 12, 13, 15
<i>Agency Holding Corp. v. Malley-Duff & Assocs.</i> , 483 U.S. 143 (1987).....	35
<i>Allen v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 399922 (D.N.J. Jan. 31, 2019).....	23, 24
<i>In re Allergan ERISA Litig.</i> , 975 F.3d 348 (3d Cir. 2020)	2, 22, 24
<i>Animal Sci. Prods., Inc. v. China Minmaterials Corp.</i> , 34 F. Supp. 3d 465 (D.N.J. 2014).....	11
<i>Arthur v. Guerdon Indus.</i> , 827 F. Supp. 273 (D. Del. 1993).....	33
<i>In re Baby Food Antitrust Litig.</i> , 166 F.3d 112 (3d Cir. 1999)	20, 21
<i>Baglio v. Baska</i> , 940 F. Supp. 819 (W.D. Pa. 1996).....	28, 29
<i>Baraka v. McGreevey</i> , 481 F.3d 187 (3d Cir. 2007)	10
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Benak ex rel. Alliance Premier Growth Fund v. Alliance Capital Mgmt. L.P.</i> , 435 F.3d 396 (3d Cir. 2006)	37
<i>Blue Tree Hotels Inv. (Canada), Ltd. v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc.</i> , 369 F.3d 212 (2d Cir. 2012).....	17
<i>Burtch v. Milberg Factors, Inc.</i> , 662 F.3d 212 (3d Cir. 2011)	18

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.