Doc. 624

Dockets.Justia.com

Genentech, Inc. et al v. Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GMBH et al

1		
1 2	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP	FOLEY HOAG LLP Donald R. Ware (pro hac vice)
3	Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151) charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com	dware@foleyhoag.com
	50 California Street, 22nd Floor	Claire Laporte ( <i>pro hac vice</i> ) claporte@foleyhoag.com
4	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 875-6600	Jeremy A. Younkin (pro hac vice)
5	Facsimile: (415) 875-6700	jyounkin@foleyhoag.com
6	Victoria F. Maroulis (Bar No. 202603)	Seaport World Trade Center West
O	victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com	155 Seaport Boulevard Boston, MA 02210-2600
7	Gabriel S. Gross (Bar No. 254672)	Telephone: (617) 832-1180
8	gabegross@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor	Facsimile: (617) 832-7000
8	Redwood Shores, California 94065-2139	
9	Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100	Attorneys for Defendant Biogen Idec Inc.
10	Attorneys for Defendant Genentech, Inc.	HARVEY SISKIND LLP D. Peter Harvey (Bar No. 55712)
11	Attorneys for Defendant Genericen, inc.	pharvey@harveysiskind.com
1.0	KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON	Naomi Jane Gray (Bar No. 230171)
12	LLP	ngray@harveysiskind.com Four Embarcadero Center, 39th Floor
13	James G. Gilliland (Bar No. 107988) jgilliland@kilpatricktownsend.com	San Francisco, California 94111
1.4	Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor	Telephone: (415) 354-0100
14	San Francisco, CA 94111	Facsimile: (415) 391-7124
15	Telephone: (415) 576-0200	FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER &
1.0	Facsimile: (415) 576-0300	SCINTO
16	A M.D. 1:(D. M. 104754)	William E. Solander (admitted pro hac vice) wsolander@fchs.com
17	Anne M. Rogaski (Bar No. 184754) arogaski@kilpatricktownsend.com	Dominick A. Conde (admitted pro hac vice)
1.0	379 Lytton Avenue	dconde@fchs.com
18	Palo Alto, CA 94301	Peter D. Shapiro (admitted pro hac vice) pshapiro@fchs.com
19	Telephone: (650) 326-2400	Joshua A. Davis (admitted pro hac vice)
20	Facsimile: (650) 326-2422	jdavis@fchs.com
20		1290 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10104
21		Telephone: 212-218-2100
22		Facsimile: 212-218-2200
22		Attorneys for Plaintiff Sanofi-Aventis
23		Deutschland GmbH
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

01731.51443/4118152.1

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-1 and 6-2, Plaintiff Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH ("Sanofi") and Defendants Genentech, Inc. ("Genentech") and Biogen Idec Inc. ("Biogen") respectfully request that the Court enter the following stipulation regarding proceedings on costs, attorneys' fees, and sanctions. The parties now AGREE AND STIPULATE to enlarge time on these proceedings until after disposition of both Sanofi's appeal of this Court's final judgment of non-infringement and Defendants' counterclaims of invalidity and unenforceability.

## 1. Reason for the Request

On April 21, 2011, the Court granted Sanofi's motion for entry of final judgment of non-infringement as to Rituxan® and Avastin® under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b). (D.N. 621.) The Court stayed further proceedings, including Defendants' counterclaims of invalidity and unenforceability, pending the outcome of any appeal of the Court's final judgment of non-infringement. (Id.) Under Civil Local Rule 54-1, Defendants must file a bill of costs within 14 days of the Court's entry of final judgment, or by May 5, 2011. Under Civil Local Rule 54-5, motions for awards of attorneys' fees are also due within 14 days of entry of judgment. Under Civil Local Rule 7-8(d), motions for sanctions also must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment. The parties now seek to stay these proceedings on costs and fees, as well as any proceedings on sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 and Civil Local Rule 7-8(d) and on whether this is an "exceptional case" under 35 U.S.C. § 285, until after disposition of Sanofi's appeal of this Court's final judgment of non-infringement and Defendants' counterclaims of invalidity and unenforceability. An order staying these proceedings will conserve judicial resources in the event that any aspect of the Court's Rule 54(b) judgment is reversed and remanded on appeal and because further proceedings on Defendants' pending counterclaims are required.

## 2. Prior Time Modifications

The time for Sanofi to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint was previously extended. The briefing and hearing schedule for Motions to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction brought by Sanofi and its former co-defendants was temporarily vacated. The briefing and hearing schedule for Genentech's Motion To Disqualify McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert and Berghoff LLP was extended by four weeks. The briefing and hearing schedule for Sanofi's Motion for Leave to

1	Amend Its Pleadings and Infringement Contentions was previously extended by five weeks and ther	
2	extended again by seven weeks. The Markman hearing and tutorial were previously continued by	
3	45 days. The date for Sanofi's oppositions to Defendants' motions for summary judgment was	
4	extended by approximately three weeks. The date for Defendants' replies to Sanofi's summary	
5	judgment oppositions was extended by one week. The deadline to conduct ADR was originally	
6	extended by about 40 days. The deadline for conducting ADR was again extended by two months.	
7	The schedule for the Further Case Management Conference was previously vacated and rescheduled	
8	for five weeks later and then extended again by two weeks. The hearing schedule for the Motion for	
9	Summary Judgment, Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Lack of Written Description,	
10	Motion to Compel, Motion to Amend/Correct Infringement Contentions, and Motion to Strike was	
11	extended by two weeks. The deadline for filing dispositive motions was extended three weeks and	
12	the deadline for the last day on which dispositive motions could be heard was extended four weeks.	
13	The Court expedited the schedule for considering Sanofi's Motion for Entry of Final Judgment by	
14	two weeks.	
15	3. <u>Effect of Requested Modification</u>	
16	The requested modification will have no effect on the rest of the schedule in this action.	
17	So Stipulated.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

01731.51443/4118152.1

1	
2	DATED: April 29, 2011 HARVEY SISKIND LLP FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
3	
4	By <u>s/ William E. Solander</u> William E. Solander
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH
6	Deutsemand Gmori
7	
8	DATED: April 29, 2011 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
9	
10	By s/ Victoria F. Maroulis Victoria F. Maroulis
11	Attorneys for Defendant Genentech, Inc.
12	
13	DATED: April 29, 2011 TOWNSEND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP FOLEY HOAG LLP
14	FOLEY HOAG LLP
15	By_s/Claire Laporte
16	Claire Laporte Attorneys for Defendant Biogen Idec Inc.
17	
18	
19	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.
20	
21   22	DATED: May 2 2010
22	DATED. Way_, 2010
23	Susan Illston United States District Court Judge
25	
26	
27	
28	
01731.51443/4118152.1	5 Case Nos. 08-cv-4909-SI (BZ); 09-cv-4919-SI
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ENLARGING TIME ON PROCEEDINGS ON COSTS, ATTORNEYS' FEES, AND SANCTIONS