

No. 20-2402

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

UFCW Local 1500 Welfare Fund, et al.,
Plaintiffs-Appellants

v.

AbbVie Inc., et al.,
Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Illinois
Case No. 19-cv-1873
The Honorable Judge Manish S. Shah

**BRIEF FOR AMICI CURIAE STATES OF WASHINGTON, CALIFORNIA,
COLORADO, CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, IDAHO, ILLINOIS, MAINE,
MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, NEBRASKA,
NEW MEXICO, NEW YORK, NORTH CAROLINA, OREGON, RHODE
ISLAND, VIRGINIA, AND WISCONSIN
SUPPORTING PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS AND REVERSAL**

Robert W. Ferguson
Attorney General of Washington

Nathaniel M. Hopkin
Assistant Attorney General
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98164
(206) 464-7030
nathaniel.hopkin@atg.wa.gov

Counsel for amici curiae

(Additional counsel listed on signature
page)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	ii
Interest of Amici Curiae	1
Summary of Argument	3
Argument	5
I. The District Court Misapplied <i>Actavis</i> to AbbVie’s Humira Agreements.....	5
A. Agreements granting entry before patent expiration are not automatically free from antitrust scrutiny.	5
1. Courts have rejected claims that <i>Actavis</i> categorically exempts certain forms of settlement agreement from antitrust scrutiny.....	8
2. The district court’s approach will further embolden pharmaceutical companies to fashion illegal settlements to more creatively to evade scrutiny.....	12
B. Procompetitive effects do not justify dismissal here because they depend on disputed facts and are not linked to the restraint alleged.	14
1. The district court erred in concluding that procompetitive effects justified the challenged agreements at the pleading stage.....	14
2. None of the procompetitive effects the district court identified offset the harm alleged.....	16
C. Contrary to the Supreme Court’s directive in <i>Actavis</i> , the decision below gave undue weight to the desirability of encouraging settlement and wrongly shifted the burden of proof to plaintiffs.	19
II. The Seventh Circuit Should Follow the Majority of Courts of Appeals and Apply the <i>California Motor Transport</i> Rule to Serial Sham Petitioning.	20
Conclusion.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>1-800 Contacts, Inc.</i> , 166 F.T.C. 274 (2018)	6
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	15
<i>Ass'n for Accessible Med. v. Becerra</i> , No. 20-15014, 2020 WL 4251776 (9th Cir. July 24, 2020)	1
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	15
<i>Cal. Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited</i> , 404 U.S. 508 (1972)	20, 21
<i>E.R.R. Presidents Conf. v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc.</i> , 365 U.S. 127 (1961)	21
<i>FTC v. AbbVie Inc.</i> , No. 18-2621, 2020 WL 5807873 (3d Cir. Sept. 30, 2020)	passim
<i>FTC v. Actavis</i> , 570 U.S. 136 (2013)	passim
<i>Hanover 3201 Realty, LLC v. Village Supermarkets, Inc.</i> , 806 F.3d 162 (3d Cir. 2015)	21, 22
<i>In re Cipro Cases I & II</i> , 348 P.3d 845 (Cal. 2015)	1
<i>In re Humira (Adalimumab) Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 19-cv-1873, 2020 WL 3051309 (N.D. Ill. June 8, 2020)	passim
<i>In re Lipitor Antitrust Litig.</i> , 868 F.3d 231 (3d Cir. 2017)	passim
<i>Livingston Downs Racing Ass'n Inc. v. Jefferson Downs Corp.</i> , 192 F. Supp. 2d 519 (M.D. La. 2001)	21
<i>Ohio v. Am. Express Co.</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018)	20
<i>Picone v. Shire PLC</i> , No. 16-cv-12396, 2017 WL 4873506 (D. Mass Oct. 20, 2017)	7, 8, 9, 12
<i>Polygram Holding, Inc. v. FTC</i> , 416 F.3d 29 (D.C. Cir. 2005)	16
<i>Polygram Holding, Inc.</i> , 136 F.T.C. 310 (2003)	16
<i>PrimeTime 24 Joint Venture v. Nat'l Broad. Co.</i> , 219 F.3d 92 (2d Cir. 2000)	21
<i>Prof'l Real Estate Invs., Inc. v. Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 49 (1993)	21

Sergeants Benevolent Ass’n Health & Welfare Fund v. Acta Vis, PLC,
 No. 15-cv-6549, 2016 WL 4992690 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 13, 2016) 7

Staley v. Gilead Sci., Inc.,
 446 F. Supp. 3d 578 (N.D. Cal. 2020) passim

Total Renal Care, Inc. v. W. Nephrology & Metabolic Bone Disease, P.C.,
 No. 8-cv-00513, 2009 WL 2596493 (D. Colo. Aug. 21, 2009)..... 21

U.S. Futures Exchange LLC v. Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, Inc.,
 953 F.3d 955 (7th Cir. 2020) 22, 23

United States v. Topco Assocs.,
 405 U.S. 596 (1972) 16, 17

Waugh Chapel S., LLC v. United Food & Commercial Workers Union Local 27,
 728 F.3d 354 (4th Cir. 2013) 21

Statutes

15 U.S.C. § 15c(a)(1) 1

Other Authorities

AbbVie Inc., Annual Report (From 10-K) (Feb. 21, 2020),
https://investors.abbvie.com/sec-filings?items_per_page=10&page=9..... 18

AbbVie Inc., Quarterly Report (Form 10-Q) (Aug. 4, 2020),
https://investors.abbvie.com/sec-filings?items_per_page=10&page=0..... 18

Michael A. Carrier, *Solving the Drug Settlement Problem: The Legislative Approach*,
 41 Rutgers L.J. 83, (2009) 13

Susan A. Creighton et al., *Cheap Exclusion*,
 72 Antitrust L.J. 975, (2005)..... 22

Robin C. Feldman & Prianka Misra, *The Fatal Attraction of Pay-for-Delay*,
 18 Chi.-Kent J. Intell. Prop. 249, (2019)..... 13

Laura Karas, Gerard F. Anderson, & Robin Feldman, *Pharmaceutical “Pay-for-Delay” Reexamined: A Dwindling Practice or a Persistent Problem?*,
 71 Hastings L.J. 959, (2020) 13

Rules

Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2)..... 1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)..... 3, 15

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Amici are the States of Washington, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Amici States file this brief under Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2). The States have a strong interest in this case both as healthcare consumers and government antitrust enforcers. The States spend millions annually on prescription drugs by reimbursing patients' purchases through Medicaid and other programs. Patients, employers, and insurers within our jurisdictions spend billions of dollars on prescription drugs. Biologic drugs like Humira represent a large and growing share of that spending. Anticompetitive conduct that raises biologic drug prices and eliminates competitive choice substantially harms the States and their residents.

The States also enforce federal and state antitrust laws.¹ See 15 U.S.C. § 15c(a)(1). The States have a long history of actively challenging anticompetitive conduct in the pharmaceutical industry, and have a strong interest in the development and proper application of the antitrust laws to conduct in this

¹ Amici States note here that dismissal of federal antitrust claims does not automatically require dismissal of state antitrust claims challenging the same conduct. Not all state antitrust statutes mirror federal antitrust law and some have been explicitly recognized as broader than federal law. *E.g.*, *In re Cipro Cases I & II*, 348 P.3d 845, 872 (Cal. 2015) (“The Cartwright Act is broader in range and deeper in reach than the Sherman Act.”) (cleaned up). Further, some states have enacted laws specifically addressing certain forms of anticompetitive conduct. For example, a California statute that became effective January 1, 2020, creates a presumption that certain reverse-payment agreements are anticompetitive and, where that presumption is not rebutted, imposes a civil penalty. See *Ass’n for Accessible Med. v. Becerra*, No. 20-15014, 2020 WL 4251776, at *1 & n.1 (9th Cir. July 24, 2020) (describing the statute).

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.