

No. 15-

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

CUBIST PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

HOSPIRA, INC.,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

WILLIAM MCELWAIN
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 663-6000

WILLIAM F. LEE
Counsel of Record
LISA J. PIROZZOLO
MARK C. FLEMING
JOHN C. POLLEY
STEPHANIE T. NEELY
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 526-6000
william.lee@wilmerhale.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

In *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966), this Court recognized the relevance of “objective indicia” of nonobviousness (also known as “secondary considerations”)—including the long-felt need for the patented invention, the failure of others to arrive at the invention, and the invention’s subsequent commercial success—in determining whether a patent’s claims were obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. In this case, the district court created, and the Federal Circuit affirmed, two categorical limitations on the consideration of objective indicia of nonobviousness that exist nowhere in the Patent Act or this Court’s jurisprudence.

The questions presented are:

1. Whether a court may categorically disregard objective indicia of a patent’s nonobviousness merely because the considerations apply to one commercial embodiment of a patented invention, rather than all embodiments.
2. Whether a court may categorically disregard objective evidence of a long-felt need for a patented invention merely because the need is not expressly recited in the patent claims.

(i)

RULE 29.6 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Cubist Pharmaceuticals LLC (formerly known as Cubist Pharmaceuticals, Inc.) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Merck & Co., Inc. Merck & Co., Inc. is not owned by any parent corporation and, to its knowledge, no other publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of its stock.

(ii)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED | i |
| RULE 29.6 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT..... | ii |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | v |
| OPINIONS BELOW | 1 |
| JURISDICTION..... | 2 |
| INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| STATEMENT | 5 |
| A. Cubist’s Inventions And The Development Of Cubicin | 5 |
| 1. Invention Of The Method of Administration Patents | 6 |
| 2. Invention Of The High Purity Patents..... | 9 |
| B. District Court Proceedings..... | 11 |
| C. Federal Circuit Proceedings | 13 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION..... | 14 |
| I. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT CERTIORARI TO RESTORE THE PROPER ROLE OF OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS | 14 |
| A. Evaluation Of Objective Indicia Of Nonobviousness Is A Critical And Required Step In The Obviousness Analysis | 15 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

| | Page |
|---|------|
| B. Contrary To The Federal Circuit’s Holding, It Is Error To Disregard Objective Indicia Of Nonobviousness Merely Because They Do Not Apply To All Embodiments | 17 |
| II. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT CERTIORARI TO DISAPPROVE THE ERRONEOUS REQUIREMENT THAT LONG-FELT NEED IS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED UNLESS EXPRESSLY RECITED IN A PATENT’S CLAIMS | 22 |
| CONCLUSION | 26 |
| APPENDIX A: Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, dated November 12, 2015..... | 1a |
| APPENDIX B: Erratum to the November 12, 2015 Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, dated December 23, 2015..... | 35a |
| APPENDIX C: Memorandum Opinion of the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, dated December 8, 2014..... | 37a |
| APPENDIX D: Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit denying petition for panel rehearing and rehearing en banc, dated January 22, 2016..... | 97a |

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.