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ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA)
Generally, 25:1 to 25:61
ANDA, generally, 25:3
Approval date, redating, infringement damages and remedies, 32:3 to 32:5
Approval matrix, 25:23
Attorney involvement in answering deficiency letters, 25:26
Bioavailability generally, 25:13
defined, 25:28
Bioequivalency of generic drug definition of bioequivalency, 25:29
differences between NDA and ANDA, 25:8
dissolution testing, 25:39, 25:40
immediate and extended release forms, 25:30, 25:31
in vitro bioequivalency testing, reasons for BE testing and biowaivers, 25:41
in vitro dissolution studies, 25:38
non-obviousness of failed biostudies as evidence, 25:37
particle size and dissolution testing, 25:40
proving bioequivalency, 25:37 to 5:40
showing bioequivalency of generic versions, 25:27
standardized testing protocols, 25:39
traditional solid oral dosage forms, 25:30, 25:60

ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA) —Cont’d
Biopharmaceutical properties, classification system generally, 25:14
pharmacokinetics, patents claiming, 25:15
Biopharmaceutical review and bioavailability, 25:13
Biostudies in human subjects generally, 25:42
fasting and fed biostudies, 25:43
food effect patents not patentable, 25:44
pilot and pivotal studies, 25:42
Brand side exclusivities, when to file ANDAs with paragraph IV certifications, 23:7
CGMP review, 25:18
Changes to application generally, 25:52
major changes, 25:53
minimal impact change documented in annual report, 25:55
minor change, 25:55
moderate changes (CBE-30), 25:54
patent issues, 25:56
Chemistry and manufacturing controls (CMC), 25:12
Citizen petition denial and ANDA approvals, implications of, 34:5
Clinical review, 25:17
Color of generic products, issues relating to, 25:61
ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA)  
—Cont’d
Competitive generic therapies, FDA waiting 75 days, 30:6
Contrasts and similarities with paper NDAs, 24:2, 24:3
Deficiency letters generally, 25:19
attorney involvement in answering, 25:26
major deficiency, 25:20
minor deficiency, 25:21
telephone amendment, 25:22
Designing around RLD patents to obtain non-infringing generic versions, 25:58
Differences between NDA and ANDA, 24:6
Dose inhalers, metered and powder, 25:48
Dry powder nose inhalers, 25:49
Excipient changes generally, 25:58, 25:59
non-solid oral dosage forms, 25:59
Extended release diffusion control system, 25:32, 25:33
dissolution control system, 25:34
ion-exchange resin system, 25:36
measuring bioequivalence, 25:30, 25:31
osmotic pump system, 25:35
types of ER, 25:32 to 25:36
Final vs. tentative approval, 25:24
Forfeiture
failure to obtain tentative approval in 30 months, forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity. Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)

ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA)  
—Cont’d
Forfeiture—Cont’d
FDA backlog possibly causing forfeitures, 29:28
filing ANDA too early, 29:34
Human subjects. Biostudies in human subjects, above
Impurity
avoiding impurity patent claims, risk of jeopardizing regulatory approval, 25:47
levels as defined by regulatory authority, 25:46
specifications, 25:45
Inhalers
dry powder nose inhalers, 25:49
metered and powder dose inhalers, 25:48
nasal sprays and inhaled solutions, 25:50
Inner workings of FDA, 25:10
In vitro bioequivalency testing, reasons for BE testing and biowaivers, 25:41
dissolution studies, 25:38
Labels
labeling review, 25:11
last minute RLD label changes to thwart generic competition, 25:7
Last minute RLD label changes to thwart generic competition, 25:7
Literal infringement
current ANDA infringement for future modifications, 16:8
infringement inquiry, ANDA specification controls, 16:7
Major changes to application, 25:53
Metered and powder dose inhalers, 25:48
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ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA) —Cont’d

Microbiology review, 25:16
Minimal impact change documented in annual report, 25:55
Minor change to application, 25:55
Moderate changes (CBE-30), 25:54
Nasal sprays and inhaled solutions, 25:50
Orange Book Patent Certifications (this index)
Paper NDAs, contrasts and similarities, 24:2, 24:3
Pediatric exclusivities, effect on ANDA filings, 23:19
Petitions, suitability, to refer to different RLDs, 25:2
Pharmacokinetics, patents claiming, 25:15
Redating approval date, infringement remedies, 32:3 to 32:5
Reference listed drug (RLD) generally, 25:1
access to RLD protected by REMS, 25:9
designing around RLD patents to obtain non-infringing generic versions, 25:58
last minute RLD label changes to thwart generic competition, 25:7
suitability petitions to refer to different RLDs, 25:2
Refusal to receive (RTR)
ANDA filing date, effect of refusal to receive, 25:60
challenging RTR decision, 25:5
impact of, 25:4
no private right of action to enforce FDCA, 25:5
Review of ANDA approval process, 25:57

ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA) —Cont’d

Samples, patent issues, 25:51
Size, shape and color of generic products, issues relating to, 25:61
Submission filing date, 25:60
Submission standards, 25:4
Telephone amendment, minor deficiency, 25:22
Tentative approval failure to obtain in 30 months, forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity. Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)
final vs. tentative approval, 25:24
reasons for getting, 25:25

AFFIDAVITS
Inequitable Conduct (this index)

ANTICIPATION
Novelty and Loss of Rights (this index)

ATTORNEYS’ FEES
Amounts, 32:36
Case studies, 32:37, 32:38
Exceptional cases generally, 32:32 to 32:38
amounts, 32:36
case studies, 32:37, 32:38
frivolous litigation by brand company, 32:38
prevailing party, who is, 32:35
steps in awarding, 32:34
when fees can be awarded, 32:33
Frivolous litigation by brand company, 32:38
Inequitable conduct, award of fees and costs, 19:5
Prevailing party, who is, 32:35
Steps in awarding, 32:34
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ATTORNEYS’ FEES—Cont’d
When fees can be awarded, 32:33

BASICS
Patent Basics (this index)

BEST MODE (§ 112)
Generally, 8:1 to 8:5
Breaking chain of priority to invalidate later patents, 14:16
Contrasting enablement and best mode, 9:13
Inequitable conduct, using to challenge best mode violations when invalidity not allowed, 8:5
Patent invalidity theories, best mode requirement, 8:4
Role of specification, 8:1
Section 112(a) (pre-AIA § 112, first paragraph) generally, 8:2
best mode requirement, 8:3

BIOEQUIVALENCY
Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)

BRAND DRUG APPROVAL AND ORANGE BOOK—Cont’d
Investigational new drug application (IND) generally, 22:3
beginning clinical trials, 22:3 contents, 22:4
Listable and nonlistable patents generally, 22:10
delisting patents, 22:12 forcible listing of unlisted patents, 22:13
listing as clerical not substantive, 22:11
polymorph patent listing, 22:17
when patents may be listed, 22:14
who may list which patents, 22:15
Medical device patents, 22:16
New drug applications (NDA) generally, 22:5
approval and approval dates, 22:22
differences between NDA and ANDA, 25:6
drug master files (DMF), 22:6
paper NDAs and § 505(b)(2) applications, below
types of new drugs, 22:7
Orange Book, patent information and generally, 22:9 to 22:13
clerical, not substantive, nature of patent listing, 22:11
delisting patents, 22:12 forcible listing of unlisted patents, 22:13
listable and nonlistable patents, 22:10
when patents may be listed, 22:14
who may list which patents, 22:15

GENERIC PHARMACEUTICAL PATENT AND FDA LAW
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BRAND DRUG APPROVAL AND
ORANGE BOOK—Cont’d
Paper NDAs and § 505(b)(2)
applications
Generally, 22:21, 24:1 to 24:9
challenge to § 505(b)(2) refer-
ence listed drug, 24:8
circumventing 180-day
exclusivity, 24:7
conclusion, 24:9
contrasting with abbreviated
(ANDA) applications, 24:2
information need to support
application, 24:5
reference listed drug, challenge
to, 24:8
similarities with abbreviated
(ANDA) applications, 24:3
strategic uses, 24:6, 24:7
types of applications, 24:4
Polymorph patent listing, 22:17
Public use patent invalidity, 22:20
Types of new drugs in NDA, 22:7

BRAND SIDE EXCLUSIVITIES
Generally, 23:1 to 23:27
ANDAs with paragraph IV
certifications, when to file,
23:7
Approval, 23:1
Clinical information. New
product/clinical information/
supplemental exclusivity,
below
Combination products
generally, 23:4
pediatric exclusivity, 23:25
DEA scheduling, NCE exclusivity
and, 23:3
Delisting patents from Orange
Book before NCE-1 date to
thwart generic filings, 23:9
Enantiomers, three-year exclusiv-
ity, 23:14
Extension of five-year exclusivity
under qualified infectious
disease products program,
23:5
Extensions of 30-month stay to
year 7.5, NCE-based
lawsuits, 23:8, 27:26
Filing, 23:1
Fixed combination products, 23:4
Generic approval of less than all
indications, working
example, 23:12
Infringement implications, 23:26
New chemical entity (NCE)
exclusivity
generally, 23:2
DEA scheduling, 23:3
delisting patents from Orange
Book before NCE-1 date to
thwart generic filings, 23:9
difference between NCE and
three-year exclusivity,
23:13
extension of five-year exclusiv-
ity under qualified infec-
tious disease products
program, 23:5
extensions of 30-month stay to
year 7.5, NCE-based
lawsuits, 23:8, 27:26
fixed combination products,
23:4
new molecules, NCE status vs.
patent term extension, 23:6
when to file ANDAs with
paragraph IV certifications,
23:7
New molecules, NCE status vs.
patent term extension, 23:6
New product/clinical information/
supplemental exclusivity
generally, 23:10
difference between NCE and
three-year exclusivity,
23:13
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BRAND SIDE EXCLUSIVITIES
—Cont’d
New product/clinical information/supplemental exclusivity
—Cont’d
generic approval of less than all indications, working example, 23:12
new clinical information exclusivity, requirements, 23:11
Orphan drug exclusivity, 23:15
Patent infringement implications, 23:26
Pediatric exclusivity generally, 23:16 to 23:25
ANDA filings, effect on, 23:19
combination products, 23:25
effect, 23:17
key points, 23:27
monetary damages not permitted, 32:24
paragraph IV based 180-day exclusivity, 28:19
thirty-month stay, effect on generally, 23:20
amlodipine, 23:24
fentanyl patch, 23:23
fluconazole, 23:22
working examples, 23:21 to 23:24
tracking, 23:18
Qualified infectious disease products program, extension of five-year exclusivity, 23:5
Supplemental exclusivity. New product/clinical information/supplemental exclusivity, above

CERTIFICATIONS
Orange Book Patent Certifications (this index)

CHEMICALS
New chemical entity (NCE),
Brand Side Exclusivities (this index)

CHEMICALS—Cont’d
Similarity. Obviousness (this index)

CITIZEN PETITIONS
Generally, 34:1 to 34:7
FDA response
time period, 34:3
what is, 34:4
Form of petition, 34:2
Generic companies, 34:7
Implications of petition denial and ANDA approvals, 34:6
Sham petitions, potential antitrust penalties, 34:5
Tentative approval, failure to obtain in 30 months, forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity, 29:26
What is, 34:1

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION IN PATENT INFRINGEMENT
Generally, 15:1 to 15:30
Basic infringement claim, 15:2
Chemical compounds, enantiomers and racemates, 15:28
Claim construction, generally, 15:3
Consistent use of claim term throughout specification, 15:11
Customary rules of construction, 15:8
Dictionaries as sources of claim meaning, 15:7
Differentiation of claims and interpreting claims of different scope, 15:24
Embodiment is invention, 15:13
Evidence considered generally, 15:4
dictionaries, 15:7
extrinsic evidence, 15:6
intrinsic evidence, 15:5
mandatory evidence, 15:5
CLAIMING PRIORITY
PROVISIONALS,
CONTINUATIONS AND
DIVISIONALS—Cont’d
Chains of priority, rolling
provisionals allow for, \textbf{14:17}
Concept of claiming priority or
benefit to earlier filing date,
\textbf{14:1}
Continuation applications
continuation-in-part applica-
tions, introducing new
matter, \textbf{14:15}
different invention using same
specification, \textbf{14:11}
Divisional applications
examiner-mandated restrictions
to different inventions,
\textbf{14:13}
safe harbor provision, \textbf{14:14}
Earlier filed foreign application,
claim for foreign priority to
include specific reference to,
\textbf{14:6}
Earliest filing dates, priority and,
\textbf{14:3}
Enablement, breaking chain of
priority to invalidate later
patents, \textbf{14:16}
Examiner-mandated restrictions to
different inventions,
divisional applications, \textbf{14:13}
Foreign priority dates to U.S. pro-
visional applications, claiming,
\textbf{14:4}
Mechanics of claiming priority
and benefits to earlier filing
dates, \textbf{14:7}
New matter, introducing, continu-
ation-in-part applications,
\textbf{14:15}
Prior art
before and after AIA, prior art
and § 119(a), \textbf{14:9}
provisional application prior art
date under pre-AIA

CLAIMING PRIORITY
PROVISIONALS,
CONTINUATIONS AND
DIVISIONALS—Cont’d
Prior art—Cont’d
§ 102(e) and 102(a)(2),
\textbf{14:5}
tool for evaluating prior art
effect, \textbf{14:8}
Provisional patent applications
generally, \textbf{14:2}
foreign priority dates to U.S.
provisional applications,
claiming, \textbf{14:4}
prior art date under pre-AIA
§ 102(e) and 102(a)(2),
\textbf{14:5}
Rolling provisionals allow for
chains of priority, \textbf{14:17}
Safe harbor provision for
divisional applications, \textbf{14:14}
Section 119
earlier filed foreign application,
claim for foreign priority
to include specific refer-
ence to, \textbf{14:6}
foreign priority dates to U.S.
provisional applications,
claiming, \textbf{14:4}
prior art and § 119(a) before
and after AIA, \textbf{14:9}
provisional application prior art
date under pre-AIA
§ 102(e) and 102(a)(2),
\textbf{14:5}
tool for evaluating prior art
effect, \textbf{14:8}
Sections 120 and 121
claiming benefit of earlier filed
applications, \textbf{14:10}
specific reference to earlier filed
application, \textbf{14:12}
Tool for evaluating prior art
effect, \textbf{14:8}
Written description, breaking
chain of priority to invalidate
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COSTS
Inequitable conduct, award of fees and costs, 19:5

COVENANTS
Declaratory Judgment (this index)

DAMAGES
Generally, 32:1 to 32:38
America Invents Act of 2011, 32:28
Attorneys’ Fees (this index)
Enhanced damages and willful infringement
generally, 32:25
factors to consider, 32:26
filing ANDA, 32:30
legal opinions, 32:27
patent in reexamination, 32:29
specifying facts in pleading, 32:31
Exceptional circumstances.
Attorneys’ Fees (this index)
Inequitable conduct, fraud-based damages, 19:6
Lost profits
generally, 32:12, 32:18
calculating, 32:22
expenses
bringing into calculus, 32:22
expense deductions, 32:23
market reconstruction, 32:19
substitutes, existence of, 32:20
substitutes and authorized generics, existence of, 32:21
Money damages
generally, 32:10, 32:12
enhanced damages and willful infringement, above
lost profits, above
pediatric exclusivity, 32:24
permanent injunction, effect on, 32:17
reasonable royalty, below

DAMAGES—Cont’d
Pediatric exclusivity, money damages not permitted, 32:24
Permanent injunction, effect on, 32:17
Post-publication of patent to patent issuance under provi-
sional rights, patent damages for, 32:11
Potential remedies for infringement, 32:2
Reasonable royalty
generally, 32:12, 32:13
factors to consider, 32:15, 32:16
generic drug infringement, factors in relation to, 32:16
Georgia Pacific test, 32:15
hypothetical negotiations, 32:14
Willful infringement. Enhanced damages and willful infringe-
ment, above

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT
Generally, 33:1 to 33:14
Confidential access, offers for
generally, 33:13
enforcement of offer as improper private right of action, 33:14
Covenants
divesting court's jurisdiction, 33:11
fear of suit, removing, 33:10
not to sue, 33:10
Exclusivity, declaratory judgment triggering
generally, 33:6
Orange Book listing and declaratory judgment juris-
diction
generally, 33:8
patents listed but statutorily
disclaimed, 33:9
tentative approval, need for before filing action, 33:7
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT
—Cont’d
Famciclovir factors allowing declaratory judgment action, 33:5
Orange Book listing and declaratory judgment jurisdiction generally, 33:8
patents listed but statutorily disclaimed, 33:9
Post-MedImmune standards, 33:4, 33:5
Purpose of Declaratory Judgment Act, 33:1
Standards post-MedImmune standards, 33:4, 33:5
traditional standards, 33:3
Updates, 33:12 to 33:14
When used in pharmaceutical patent cases, 33:2
DEFENSES
Equitable Defenses (this index)
DEFICIENCY LETTERS
Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)
DEPENDENT CLAIMS (§ 112)
Section 112(c)-(d) (pre-AIA § 112, third and fourth paragraph), 12:1
DEVELOPMENT OF DRUGS
Brand drug pathways, 1:1
Generic drug pathways, 1:2
Judges and lawyers, legal aspects of generic drug development, 1:3
DIVISIONAL APPLICATIONS
Claiming Priority Provisionals, Continuations and Divisionals (this index)
DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS (DOE) INFRINGEMENT
Generally, 17:1 to 17:25
DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS (DOE) INFRINGEMENT
—Cont’d
Applied to word “about,” 17:25
Conclusion, 17:24
Dedication to public rule, 17:8
Element-by-element analysis, 17:6
Ensnarement test for prior art, 17:7
Estoppel. Prosecution history estoppel (PHE) doctrine, below
Federal Circuit summary of equivalency factors, 17:12
Festo test, 17:12 to 17:17
Foreseeable changes, 17:14, 17:15
Function way result test, 17:5, 17:22
Hypothetical claim analysis, 17:21
Insufficient differences test, 17:4, 17:22
Other unexplained reason, 17:17
Prior art ensnarement test, 17:7
preclusions, 17:21
Prosecution history estoppel (PHE) doctrine generally, 17:9
alternate to insubstantial differences and function way result tests, 17:22
amendment-based estoppel generally, 17:10
Festo test, 17:12 to 17:17
foreseeable changes, 17:14, 17:15
other unexplained reason, 17:17
rebutting presumption of estoppel, 17:11
rebutting prosecution history estoppel, 17:13
tangential relationship, 17:16
argument-based estoppel, 17:18
detailed structure test, 17:22
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DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS (DOE) INFRINGEMENT —Cont’d
Prosecution history estoppel
(PHE) doctrine—Cont’d
Federal Circuit summary of equivalency factors, 17:12
Festo test, 17:12 to 17:17
foreseeable changes, 17:14, 17:15
hypothetical claim analysis, 17:21
other unexplained reason, 17:17
prior art preclusions, 17:21
rebutting presumption of estoppel, 17:11
rebutting prosecution history estoppel, 17:13
related applications may evoke estoppel, 17:19
scope, 17:20
tangential relationship, 17:16
Rebutting presumption of estoppel, 17:11
Rebutting prosecution history estoppel, 17:13
SmithKline Beecham and equivalency, sustained release bupropion, 17:23
Subject matter disclosed but not claimed, 17:8
Tangential relationship, 17:16
Tests for DOE
generally, 17:2
document of equivalents limitations, 17:3
element-by-element analysis, 17:6
ensnarement test for prior art, 17:7
function way result test, 17:5
insubstantial differences test, 17:4

ENABLEMENT (§ 112) —Cont’d
Generally, 9:1 to 9:13
Breaking chain of priority to invalidate later patents, 14:16
Common knowledge and inadvertent obviousness, gap filling enablement, 9:7
Contrasting enablement and best mode, 9:13
Effective amounts, patent invalidity theory, 9:12
Experimentation, undue, 9:8
How to make, patent invalidity theory, 9:9
How to use, patent invalidity theory, 9:10
In vitro and in vivo teaching, 9:11
Lack of enablement, 9:6 et seq.
Patent invalidity theories generally, 9:5 to 9:12
common knowledge and inadvertent obviousness, gap filling enablement, 9:7
effective amounts, 9:12
how to make, 9:9
how to use, 9:10
in vitro and in vivo teaching, 9:11
lack of enablement, 9:6 et seq.
undue experimentation, 9:8
Role of specification, 9:1
Section 112(a) (pre-AIA § 112, first paragraph)
generally, 9:2
basics of enablement requirement, 9:3
quick summary, 9:4
Undue experimentation, 9:8

ENANTIOMERS
Generally, 3:3
Case studies, 3:3 to 3:8
Claim construction, 15:28
Clopidogrel, 3:8
History of patentability, 3:4
Levetiracetam, 3:7
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ENANTIOMERS—Cont’d
Levofloxacin, 3:6
Obviousness and invalidity, 7:30
Racemate known, patentability, 3:5
Three-year exclusivity, 23:14

EQUITABLE DEFENSES TO PATENT INFRINGEMENT
Generally, 20:1 to 20:15
Claim preclusion, 20:2
Collateral estoppel, 20:2
Equitable Estoppel (this index)
Implied license
generally, 20:13
litigation settlement, 20:15
sales of products, 20:14
Issue preclusion, 20:2
Laches (this index)
Other defenses under 35 U.S.C.A. § 282, 20:12
Res judicata, 20:2

EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL
Generally, 20:8
Factors, 20:8
Laches compared, 20:5
Presumptions, 20:9

EQUIVALENTS
Doctrine of Equivalents
Infringement (this index)

ESTOPPEL
Doctrine of Equivalents
Infringement (this index)
Equitable Estoppel (this index)

EVIDENCE
Claim Construction in Patent
Infringement (this index)

EXCLUSIVITIES—Cont’d
Market Exclusivity (this index)
Data exclusivity and market exclusivity, difference between, 26:3.50
Declaratory Judgment (this index)
Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)

EXTENDED RELEASE FORMULATIONS
Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)
Obviousness and invalidity, 7:30

FALSE ADVERTISING
Compounding, 36:4

FORFEITURE
Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)
Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)

FRAUD
Inequitable Conduct (this index)
Patent Office, fraud on, 19:1

GENERIC COMPANIES
Citizen petitions, 34:7

GENERIC PRODUCTS
Size, shape, or color
generally, 35:1 to 35:3
cases, 35:3
functionality, infringement defense, 35:2

GENUS AND SPECIES
Generally, 13:1 to 13:5
Anticipation of patents, 13:2
Case study, Zyprexa (Olanzapine), 4:11, 13:5
Interpretation, 4:10
Obviousness, 13:3
What is, 13:1
GENUS AND SPECIES—Cont’d
Written description, 4:12
Written description support for
genus in view of disclosure
of species, 13:4

IMPLIED LICENSE
Equitable Defenses (this index)

INDEFINITENESS (§ 112)
Generally, 11:1 to 11:5
Ability to measure and testing,
failure of, 11:3
Claim amendments to avoid ambi-
guity, indefiniteness and
rebuttable presumption, 11:5
Claim precision and boundaries,
11:1, 11:2
Rebuttable presumption and
indefiniteness in claim
amendments to avoid ambi-
guity, 11:5
Section 112(b) (pre-AIA § 112,
second paragraph), 11:1, 11:2
What inventor regards as inven-
tion, 11:4

INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT
Contributor and Inducement
Infringement (this index)

INDUCEMENT
INFRINGEMENT
Contributor and Inducement
Infringement (this index)

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT
Generally, 19:1 to 19:39
Affidavits
affiant’s relationship to
applicant, failure to dis-
close, 19:16
false or misleading, 19:34
Asserting inequitable conduct,
19:9, 19:10
Attorneys’ fees and costs, award-
ing, 19:5

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT—Cont’d
Best mode violations when inva-
validity not allowed, using
inequitable conduct to chal-
lenge, 8:5
Burying critical reference, 19:32
Common situations, 19:2
Conclusion, 19:39
Corrective measures, 19:36
Cultivated ignorance, 19:31
Curing inequitable conduct, 19:8
Damages, fraud-based, 19:6
Deception. Intent to deceive,
below
False or misleading affidavits,
19:34
False statements, 19:15
Foreign language documents,
obtaining translations, 19:31
Foreign office actions, failure to
disclose, 19:33
Fraud
damages, fraud-based, 19:6
Patent Office, fraud on, 19:1
private enforcement, 19:7
Walker Process fraud, 19:6
Gross negligence, 19:26, 19:27
Heightened pleading standards,
19:10
Infectious unenforceability, 19:4
Inference of intent, mere denial
never enough to overcome,
19:28
Intent to deceive
generally, 19:24 to 19:35
affidavits, false or misleading,
19:34
burying critical reference, 19:32
cultivated ignorance, 19:31
false or misleading affidavits,
19:34
foreign language documents,
obtaining translations,
19:31
INDEX

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT —Cont’d
Intent to deceive—Cont’d
foreign office actions, failure to disclose, 19:33
gross negligence, 19:26, 19:27
inference of intent, mere denial never enough to overcome, 19:28
patterns of misrepresentations or omissions, 19:30
prior art, below
proper inventors, failure to name, 19:35
single actions, 19:30
submitted prior art, stressing importance, 19:25
totality, including gross negligence, 19:27
Litigation misconduct as patent unenforceability, 19:38
Materiality threshold generally, 19:11 et seq.
affiant’s relationship to applicant, failure to disclose, 19:16
corrective measures, 19:36
current and past tests, 19:11
false statements, 19:15
information does not have to be claimed, 19:12
information does not have to be verbatim, 19:14
information not updated, 19:18
petitions to make special, 19:18
pitfalls for applicants, 19:36
practice tips, 19:36
presumption that data is material, 19:17
section 112(1), failure to comply, 19:13
unfavorable test results, failure to provide, below
Mere denial never enough to overcome inference of intent, 19:28

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT —Cont’d
Patterns of misrepresentations or omissions, 19:30
Penalties
attorneys’ fees and costs, awarding, 19:5
fraud, above unenforceability, 19:4
Pitfalls for applicants, 19:36
Pleading inequitable conduct under heightened pleading standards, 19:10
Post-Therasense cases, recap, 19:37
Practice tips, 19:36
Presumption that data is material, 19:17
Prior art
failure to disclose, 19:33
searching for, 19:29
submitted prior art, stressing importance, 19:25
Private enforcement of fraud, 19:7
Proper inventors, failure to name, 19:35
Section 112(1), failure to comply, 19:13
Single actions, 19:30
Test results. Unfavorable test results, failure to provide, below
Types of inequitable conduct test, 19:2
Unenforceability
infectious unenforceability, 19:4
litigation misconduct, 19:38
Unfavorable test results, failure to provide generally, 19:19
affirmative misrepresentations, 19:23
claim for priority, 19:21
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INEQUITABLE CONDUCT—Cont’d
Unfavorable test results, failure to provide—Cont’d
issues examiner focuses on, 19:22
test conditions, accurate description, 19:20
Walker Process fraud, 19:6

INFRINGEMENT
Brand side exclusivities, patent infringement implications, 23:26
Claim Construction in Patent Infringement (this index)
Contributor and Inducement Infringement (this index)
Damages (this index)
De minimis infringement, 21:12
Doctrine of Equivalents Infringement (this index)
Equitable Defenses (this index)
Future infringement, enjoining, 32:6, 32:8
Injunctive Relief (this index)
Literal Infringement (this index)
Remedies (this index)
Safe Harbor Exemptions (this index)

INHALERS
Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF—Cont’d
Thirty-Month Stay, this index

INTENT
Enhanced damages and willful infringement. Damages (this index)
Intentional forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity, 29:35
Intent to deceive. Inequitable Conduct (this index)
Specific intent, pleading and proving, contributory and induce-
ingment infringement, 18:4, 18:6

INTER PARTES REVIEW (IPR)
Claim construction in patent infringement, 15:19.50
Cleaning up patent quality before or after patent issues, 31:1
Interjecting into pending application, preissuance submis-
sions, 31:2
Invalidating patent, post-issuance procedures, 31:3
Parallel patent litigation, potential impacts of IPRs
generally, 31:5 to 31:12
causing forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity by getting court decision for failure to mar-
ket, 31:12
denial of IPR petition and subjective effect of perceptual estoppel, 31:7
instituted IPR to deny TRO or preliminary injunction, 31:9
patentee losing at PTAB, 31:11
petitioner losing at PTAB, 31:10
timing of IPR, appeals and standing to appeal, 31:6
using denied IPR petition as roadmap to correct or sum-
INDEX

INTER PARTES REVIEW (IPR)
—Cont’d
Parallel patent litigation, potential impacts of IPRs—Cont’d
mary judgment if no invalidity, 31:8
Pending review, impact on 30-month stays, 27:27
Post-grant review (PGR) and inter partes review, 31:4
Pre-issue submissions and post-issuance IPR with impacts on court litigation
generally, 31:1 to 31:12
cleaning up patent quality before or after patent issues, 31:1
interjecting into pending application, preissuance submissions, 31:2
invalidating patent, post-issuance procedures, 31:3
parallel patent litigation, potential impacts of IPRs, above
post-grant review (PGR) and inter partes review, 31:4

INVALIDITY
Clinical trials, public use patent invalidity, 22:20
Enablement, patent invalidity theories, Enablement (this index)
Validity and Invalidity, Foundations of (this index)

INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG APPLICATION (IND)
Brand Drug Approval and Orange Book

JURISDICTION
Declaratory Judgment (this index)

LACHES
Generally, 20:3
LACHES—Cont’d
Equitable estoppel compared, 20:5
Factors, 20:6
Post-SCA Hygiene, 20:4
Presumptions, 20:7
Prosecution laches, 20:10, 20:11

LICENSES
Implied license, Equitable Defenses (this index)

LISTABLE AND NONLISTABLE PATENTS
Brand Drug Approval and Orange Book

LITERAL INFRINGEMENT
Generally, 16:1 to 16:8
ANDA
current ANDA infringement for future modifications, 16:8
infringement inquiry, ANDA specification controls, 16:7
Federal Circuit review of record, 16:2
Generic drug application, literal infringement as based on, 16:6
Impact of SmithKline v. Apotex on infringement, 16:4
Litigating more than one claim construction at trial, 16:2
Proving, 16:5
Single crystal theory, inherent infringement under generally, 16:3
impact of SmithKline v. Apotex on infringement, 16:4

LITIGATION
Frivolous litigation by brand company, award of attorneys’ fees, 32:38
Implied license by litigation settlement, 20:15
Parallel patent litigation, potential impacts of IPRs, Inter
LITIGATION—Cont’d
Partes Review (this index)
Pre-issue submissions and post-
issuance IPR with impacts on
court litigation. Inter Partes
Review (this index)
Unenforceability, litigation
misconduct, 19:38

LOSS OF RIGHTS
Novelty and Loss of Rights (this
index)

LOST PROFITS
Damages (this index)

MATERIALITY
Inequitable Conduct (this index)

MEANS PLUS FUNCTION
CLAIMS (§ 112)
Section 112(f) (pre-AIA § 112,
sixth paragraph), 12:2

MEDICAID
Best price law, 28:13

MISCONDUCT
Litigation misconduct as patent
unenforceability, 19:38

NEW CHEMICAL ENTITY
(NCE)
Brand Side Exclusivities (this
index)

NEW DRUG APPLICATIONS
Abbreviated New Drug Applica-
tion (ANDA) (this index)
Brand Drug Approval and
Orange Book (this index)

NOTICE LETTER
Orange Book Patent Certifica-
tions (this index)

NOVELTY AND LOSS OF
RIGHTS (§ 102)—Cont’d
Anticipation, inherent
generally, 6:20
element-by-element analysis,
6:18
hypothetical, 6:21
SmithKline v. Apotex revisited,
6:22
Anticipation by equivalency, 6:19
Conclusion, 6:16
Element-by-element analysis, 6:18
Equivalency, anticipation by, 6:19
Express anticipation, 6:18
Inherent anticipation. Anticipation,
inherent, above
Invalidating patent, invention not
new, 6:17
Joint inventorship, 6:15
New AIA, novelty under, 6:2
New inventions, 6:1
Old § 102(a), 6:3
Old § 102(b)
generally, 6:4
on-sale bar, 6:5
public use bar, 6:6
Old § 102(c), 6:8
Old § 102(d), 6:9
Old § 102(e)
example and time lines,
understanding § 102(e)
through, 6:11
utopian-world patent issuance
in USPTO, 6:10
Old § 102(f), inventor is not
inventor, 6:12
Old § 102(g)
contrasting § 102(g)(1) vs.
102(g)(2), 6:14
prior invention by another, 6:13
Public use by selling/testing
samples via technology
transfer and licensing, 6:7
SmithKline v. Apotex revisited,
6:22
**OBVIOUSNESS (§ 103)**
Generally, **7:1 to 7:39**
Active ingredient, **7:12**
Analogue of compound, attacking, **7:38**
Benign factor in obviousness, **7:11**
Breaking compound patents, **7:35**
Chemical similarity
- generally, **7:18**
- homology, isomerism and structural similarity, **7:18**
- isomers and obviousness, **7:20**
- structural obviousness of chemical compounds, **7:19**
Combination of references, **7:5**
Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results, **7:24**
Commercial success, generic drug infringement cases, **7:15**
Common sense, role of, **7:29**
Conclusion, **7:21**
Copying by others
- generally, **7:11**
- active ingredient, **7:12**
- benign factor in obviousness, **7:11**
- formulation, **7:13**
Design considerations, **7:31**
Failure of others to make invention, **7:10**
Finite number of items, choosing from, **7:28**
Formulation, **7:13**
Genus and species, **13:3**
Graham v. Deere factors, **7:2**
Hindsight, guarding against, **7:4**
Homology, isomerism and structural similarity, **7:18**
Invalidity, obviousness and, **7:22 to 7:39**
Isomers and obviousness, **7:20**

**OBVIOUSNESS (§ 103)—Cont’d**
Known techniques
- applying to yield predictable results, **7:27**
- improving similar devices, methods or products, **7:26**
Lansoprazole vs. raberprazole, structural obviousness, **7:37**
Lead compound analysis
- generally, **7:35, 7:36**
- copying lead compound test, **7:39**
- new lead formulation test, **7:39**
- pioglitazone case study, **7:36**
Licensing by others, **7:14**
Long felt need for invention, **7:9**
Market forces, **7:31**
Motivation, suggestion, teaching (MST) in prior art, **7:4, 7:32**
Obviously to try
- generally, **7:28**
- common sense, role of, **7:29**
- enantiomers, salt selection and extended release formulations, applicability to, **7:30**
- finite number of items, choosing from, **7:28**
Person of ordinary skill in the art (POSTA), **7:33, 7:34**
Pioglitazone case study, structural obviousness, **7:36**
Praise and awards from third parties, **7:17**
Predictable results
- combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results, **7:24**
- known techniques, applying to yield predictable results, **7:27**
- simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results, **7:25**
OBVIOUSNESS (§ 103)—Cont’d
Primary factors, 7:2
Prior art
combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results, 7:24
flowing from prior art, 7:5
motivation, suggestion, teaching (MST), 7:4, 7:32
References
combination of references, 7:5
from nature of problem to be solved, 7:6
Secondary indicia, 7:7
Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results, 7:25
Skepticism by others and proof of nonobviousness, 7:16
Structural obviousness
generally, 7:35 to 7:38
analogue of compound, attacking, 7:38
breaking compound patents, 7:35
chemical compounds, 7:19
lansoprazole vs. rabeprazole, 7:37
lead compound analysis, 7:35, 7:36
pioglitazone case study, 7:36
Third-party praise and awards, 7:17
Timing of inquiry, 7:3
Trivial variations, inventions more than, 7:1
Unexpected results of invention, 7:8
USPTO guidelines, 7:23

ORANGE BOOK PATENT CERTIFICATIONS
ANDA certifications
amendments to pending ANDA trigger obligations to update certifications, 26:40
current RLD itself referred to previous RLD, 26:6
data exclusivity and market exclusivity, difference between, 26:3.50
impact on ANDA approval, 26:7
no Orange Book patent existing during NCE five year exclusivity, 26:4
paragraph IV certification, adding in pending ANDA, 26:41
updating paragraph IV certification when changes occur to ANDA formulation, 26:37
when to file, 26:3, 26:4

Brand Drug Approval and Orange Book (this index)
Carve outs. Section viii state- ments, below
Combining paragraph I certification in lieu of section viii statement, 26:16
Data exclusivity and market exclusivity, difference between, 26:3.50
Declaratory judgment jurisdiction, Orange Book listing, 33:8, 33:9
Delisting patents from Orange Book
before NCE-1 date to thwart generic filings, 23:9
date-certain forfeiture event, delisting to create, case studies, 29:9 to 29:11

Exclusivity
data exclusivity and market exclusivity, difference
ORANGE BOOK PATENT CERTIFICATIONS—Cont’d
Exclusivity—Cont’d between, 26:3.50
Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)
FDA
tracking paragraph IV certifications on FDA web site,
26:36
updating on notice letters, 26:30
Hypothetical patent certifications, 26:8
Mechanics of Orange Book patent certifications and notice letters, 26:1 et seq.
New or rollover patents requiring new certifications, 26:31, 26:32
Notice letter. Paragraph IV certification and notice letter requirements, below
Offer for confidential access (OCA)
generally, 26:33
issues with Officer for Confidential Access, 26:35
where invalidity alleged, 26:34
Paragraph IV certification and notice letter requirements generally, 26:17
antitrust injury, predicate to, 26:25
appending letter to complaint, 26:24
claims not normally listable, details on, 26:22
content and sufficiency of notice letter, 26:20
detail requirements, 26:21 to 26:23
exclusivity (180-day), paragraph IV based.
Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)

ORANGE BOOK PATENT CERTIFICATIONS—Cont’d
Paragraph IV certification and notice letter requirements—Cont’d
filing split section viii carve outs and paragraph IV certifications in single patent, 26:38
form of letter of detailed statement, 26:23
how to send notice letter, 26:26
identifying patents in notice letter, 26:19
just one claim of just one patent, 26:18
pending ANDA, adding paragraph IV certification, 26:41
sending letter before ANDA is officially submitted/received, 26:29
sending letter not a waiver of privilege, 26:39
tracking paragraph IV certifications on FDA web site, 26:31
updating FDA on notice letters, 26:30
updating when changes occur to ANDA formulation, 26:37
when to send notice letter, 26:28
where to send notice letter, 26:27
Patent certifications and Orange Book listing generally, 26:2, 26:5
late listed patents, 26:5.50
paragraph I, II, III or IV certifications, 26:5
pop up certifications, 26:5.50
Patent information and Orange Book. Brand Drug Approval and Orange Book (this index)
ORANGE BOOK PATENT CERTIFICATIONS—Cont’d
Reissue patents, 26:31, 26:32
Section viii statements carve outs
generally, 26:11
filing split section viii carve outs and paragraph IV certifications in single patent, 26:38
indications to unlisted patents, 26:13
suitability petitions, using to allow carve out, 26:15
combining paragraph I certification in lieu of section viii statement, 26:16
currently unlisted method of use patent, requesting listing of, 26:14
indications to unlisted patents, carving out, 26:13
omitting patented methods of use, 26:9, 26:10
one and only indication, 26:12
Sertraline, 26:11
suitability petitions, using to allow carve out, 26:15
use codes, patent infringement and carve-outs, 26:10
working example, 26:11
Thirty-month stay, frozen Orange Book, 27:3
Tracking paragraph IV certifications on FDA web site, 26:36
Updating FDA on notice letters, 26:30
Viagra case study, 26:8

ORPHAN DRUGS
Exclusivity, 23:15

OVER THE COUNTER (OTC) DRUGS—Cont’d
ANDA filing against OTC NDA drug product, 37:3
Orange book, 37:2
Prescription to OTC switches, 37:4
ANDA commercial issues, 37:5

PAPER NDA
Brand Drug Approval and Orange Book (this index)

PARAGRAPH IV BASED 180-DAY EXCLUSIVITY
Generally, 28:1 to 28:19
Adding new para. IV certification, immediate forfeiture, 29:19
Against whom 180-day exclusivity applies, 28:3
Court decision to trigger exclusivity now part of forfeiture scheme, 28:9.50
Creating 180-day exclusivity, 28:2
Delisting Orange Book patents to create date-certain forfeiture event, case studies, 29:9 to 29:11
Failure to market generally, 29:3
forfeiture provisions, 29:3
little (aa), 29:4, 29:8
little (bb) generally, 29:5
court decision triggering, 29:5.50 to 29:5.70, 31:12
New America Invents Act procedures, 29:7
rationale for little (bb)’s patent position vs. little (aa)’s regulatory position, 29:8
no delisting and no litigation, 29:12

Index-22
Forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity —Cont’d
tentative approval, failure to obtain in 30 months generally, 29:17
calculating 30 months, 29:20
et seq.
case study, 29:25
changed conditions, 29:26, 29:27
citizen petitions, 29:26
concurrent qualification and forfeiture, 29:19
impact of GMP compliance, 29:18
new FDASIA law, 29:21, 29:22
no forfeiture due to changed conditions, 29:27
policy considerations, 29:24
vacation of judgment to avoid estoppel, 29:6
vested property rights, 29:33
withdrawal of application, 29:15
Generics, authorized
generally, 28:12
curbing by Medicaid Best Price law, 28:13
Little (bb), Failure to market,
above
Mechanics of selective waiver and total relinquishment, 28:16
Medicaid best price law, 28:13
Natural expiration with underlying patent, 28:6
Patent-by-patent approach to patent certifications in pre-MMA December 2003, 28:4
Pediatric exclusivity and ability to obtain almost 12-months exclusivity, 28:19
PARAGRAPH IV BASED
180-DAY EXCLUSIVITY
—Cont’d
Pop-up patents, effect on ANDA filers, 28:18
Product-by-product approach to exclusivity, 28:5
Reissue patents and new 180-day exclusivities, 28:11
Relinquishment. Waiver or relinquishment of exclusivity, below
Settling lawsuits but maintaining paragraph IV to avoid forfeit, 29:13, 29:14
Strategy to file with split paragraph III/IV, converting to paragraph IV later and sharing co-exclusivity, 28:17
Tentative approval, failure to obtain in 30 months. Forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity, above
Tracking 180-day exclusivity, 28:10
Triggering 180-day clock generally, 28:7
court decision to trigger exclusivity now part of forfeiture scheme, 28:9
post-MMA rules, 28:9
pre-December 2003 MMA rules, 28:8
Waiver or relinquishment of exclusivity generally, 28:14
joint exclusivity holders, 28:15
mechanics of selective waiver and total relinquishment, 28:16
multiple first applicants, 28:15

PATENT BASICS—Cont’d
Claims generally, 2:4 to 2:10
conclusion, 2:10
importance of patent claims, 2:4
organizational structure, below person of ordinary skill in the art (POSITA), 2:5
Common statutory provisions, 2:11
Importance of patent claims, 2:4
Organizational structure of claim generally, 2:6
body of claim, 2:9
preamble, 2:7
transition phase, 2:8
Person of ordinary skill in the art (POSITA), 2:5
Preamble, 2:7
Statutory provisions, 2:11
Structural organization of patent, 2:3
Transition phase, 2:8
Types of patents. Pharmaceutical Patents, Common Types, this index
Validity and Invalidity, Foundations of (this index)

PEDIATRIC EXCLUSIVITY
Brand Side Exclusivities (this index)

PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (POSITA)
Generally, 2:5
Obviousness and invalidity generally, 7:33
ordinary skilled artisan not inventor, 7:34

PETITIONS
Citizen Petitions (this index)
Orange Book, using suitability petitions to allow carve outs, 26:15
INDEX

PETITIONS—Cont’d
Parallel patent litigation. *Inter Partes Review* (this index)

PHARMACEUTICAL PATENTS, COMMON TYPES
Generally, 3:1 to 3:17
Base chemical/compound claims, 3:1
Combination of APIs, 3:11
*Enantiomers* (this index)
Esters, 3:2
Formulations, 3:12
Method of manufacture or process claims, 3:14
Methods of use, 3:13
Polymorphs
generally, 3:9
amorphous to crystal form conversion and implications, 3:10
Product-by-process claims
generally, 3:15
infringement and invalidity, steps for, 3:16
Release profiles, 3:17
Salts, 3:2
Solvates, 3:2

POLYMORPHS
Generally, 3:9
Amorphous to crystal form conversion and implications, 3:10

PRESUMPTIONS
DOE infringement, rebutting presumption of estoppel, 17:11
Equitable estoppel, 20:9
Laches, 20:7
Materiality of data, 19:17

PRIOR ART
Generally, 4:3 to 4:9

PRIOR ART—Cont’d
Burdens of proof, prior art considered or not considered by examiner
generally, 4:3 to 4:7
cited but not vetted, 4:6
fully presented and vetted, 4:5
not cited, 4:7
sources, 4:4
Claiming Priority Provisionals, Continuations and Divisionals (this index)

Doctrine of Equivalents
Infringement (this index)
Inequitable Conduct (this index)
Obviousness (this index)
Practicing prior art defense to infringement, 4:8
replicating examples, inherent anticipation, 4:9

PRIORITY
Claiming Priority Provisionals, Continuations and Divisionals (this index)

PROSECUTION HISTORY
Claim Construction in Patent Infringement (this index)
Estoppel. *Doctrine of Equivalents Infringement* (this index)

RECALL
Generic products in marketplace, 32:9

REFERENCE LISTED DRUG
Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)

REFUSAL TO RECEIVE (RTR)
Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)

RELINQUISHMENT
Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)
REMEDIES
ANDA and remedies for patent infringement
impact of loss on ANDA approval status, 32:3
redating ANDA approval date generally, 32:3
infringing activities under § 271(a), (b) and (c), 32:4
old antibiotics, 32:5
Damages (this index)
Declaratory Judgment (this index)
Injunctive Relief (this index)
Potential remedies, 32:2
Recall of generic products in marketplace, 32:9

ROYALTIES
Damages (this index)

SAFE HARBOR EXEMPTIONS
Generally, 21:1 to 21:14
Ancillary activities, 21:10
Chain of exemption generally, 21:8 to 21:10
ancillary activities, 21:10
generic drug development, 21:9
Common law research exemption, 21:12
Congressional action on scope, effect of, 21:7
De minimis infringement, 21:12
Divisional applications, 14:14
Generic drug development chain of exemption, 21:9
exemption not limited to, 21:13
Genesis of exemption, 21:2
Hatch Waxman Act, 21:3
Information development and information submission to FDA, 21:4
Inventory, stockpiling, 21:14
Medical devices, 21:6

SAFE HARBOR EXEMPTIONS — Cont’d
Ostensibly unrelated activities, 21:6
Recourse for patent holders, 21:11
Research exemption, common law, 21:12
Roche v. Bolar, 21:2
Scope of exemption generally, 21:3
ancillary activities, 21:10
chain of exemption, 21:8 to 21:10
congressional action on scope, effect of, 21:7
generic drug development, 21:9
medical devices, 21:6
ostensibly unrelated activities, 21:6
reasonable scope, 21:5 to 21:10
Stockpiling inventory, 21:14

SAMPLES
ANDA, patent issues in samples, 25:51

SECTION 112
Best Mode (this index)
Dependent and means plus function claims, 12:1, 12:2
Enablement (this index)
Indefiniteness (this index)
Written Description (this index)

SPECIES
Genus and Species (this index)

STAYS
Thirty-Month Stay, this index

SUBJECT MATTER AND UTILITY (§ 101)
Generally, 5:1 to 5:18
Data comparisons with mental steps or analogous human mental work,
SUBJECT MATTER AND
UTILITY (§ 101)—Cont’d
pharmaceuticals and concepts
related to, 5:7
Diagnostic claims treatment, sum-
mary, 5:16
Diagnostics v. method claims,
5:15
Litigation strategies for § 101
invalidity, 5:13
Mayo two-part test, 5:2
Method of preparation claims,
summary, 5:18
Method of treatment claims, sum-
mary, 5:17
Organizing or analyzing informa-
tion, pharmaceuticals and
concepts related to, 5:8
Patentable subject matter
generally, 5:1 et seq.
Mayo two-part test, 5:2
pharmaceutical patent subject
matter, below
printed matter doctrine, 5:3, 5:4
Pharmaceutical patents
generally, 5:5 et seq.
USPTO guidelines, 5:6
Pharmaceutical patent subject
matter
data comparisons with mental
steps or analogous human
mental work,
pharmaceuticals and
concepts related to, 5:7
organizing or analyzing infor-
mation, pharmaceuticals
and concepts related to,
5:8
selected cases, 5:14
Pharmaceutical patent utility
generally, 5:9 to 5:12
enablement, 5:11
priority application dates,
benefits of, 5:12
SUBJECT MATTER AND
UTILITY (§ 101)—Cont’d
Pharmaceutical patent utility
—Cont’d
specific methods of use of
compound, 5:10
Printed matter doctrine
generally, 5:3
two-part test, 5:4
USPTO guidelines for pharma
patents, 5:6
TENTATIVE APPROVAL
Abbreviated New Drug Appli-
cation (ANDA) (this index)
Failure to obtain in 30 months,
forfeiture of 180-day
exclusivity. Paragraph IV
Based 180-Day Exclusivity
(this index)
THIRTY-MONTH STAY
Generally, 27:1 to 27:27
Cases extending or shortening
stay, 27:13, 27:15
Counting days, 27:2
Court decision
court made no decision, stay
extended, 27:10
stay of decision pending appeal
to maintain 30-month stay
intact, 23:8, 27:25
termination of stay, 27:6
Creating stay, 27:2
December 2003 rules, earning
stays under, 27:20
Delays, effect of, 27:17
Extending stay
cases extending stay, 27:13
court made no decision, 27:10
generic company filed too early,
request to elongate stay to
avoid forfeiture, 27:14
lack of cooperation, 27:12
Frozen Orange Book, 27:3

Index-27
THIRTY-MONTH STAY—Cont’d
Inter partes review, pending, impact on stays, 27:27
Lack of cooperation, lengthening or shortening due to, 27:12
Missing 45-day window, 27:17
NCE exclusivity, extending stay to year 7.5, 27:26
New stays, earning generally, 27:18 to 27:23
December 2003 rules, 27:20
pop-up (newly issued) patents, 27:21
reformulation, 27:22
repetitive stays under old rules, 27:19
working examples, 27:23
Notifying FDA of lawsuit, 27:4
Patentee delays, 27:9
Pop-up (newly issued) patents, effect of, 27:21
Qualifying patents, 27:3
Reformulation and new stay, 27:22
Reinstatement after wrongful termination, 27:11
Repetitive stays under old rules, 27:19
Shortening stay, 27:15
Staggered expirations generally, 27:24 to 27:27
extending stay to year 7.5 after NCE exclusivity, 27:26
inter partes review, pending, impact on stays, 27:27
multiple applicants 30-month stay, 27:24
stay of court decision pending appeal to maintain 30-month stay intact, 23:8, 27:25
Stay not altered despite request, 27:16
Termination of stay generally, 27:5 to 27:9

THIRTY-MONTH STAY—Cont’d
Termination of stay—Cont’d
appeal, generic company wins, 27:8
court decision, 27:6
normal termination, 27:5
patentee delays, 27:9
reinstatement after wrongful termination, 27:11
staggered expirations, above trial level, generic company wins, 27:7
Working examples, 27:23

TYPES OF PATENTS
Pharmaceutical Patents, Common Types (this index)

UNENFORCEABILITY OF PATENT
Inequitable Conduct (this index)

USPTO
Fraud on Patent Office, 19:1
Guidelines
obviousness, 7:23
pharma patents, 5:6
Utopian-world patent issuance in USPTO, 6:10

UTILITY
Subject Matter and Utility (this index)

VALIDITY AND INVALIDITY, FOUNDATIONS OF
Generally, 4:1 to 4:12
Claim construction breadth and invalidity, 4:2
Genus and species case study, Zyprexa (Olanzapine), 4:11
interpretation, 4:10
Prior Art (this index)

WAIVER
Paragraph IV Based 180-Day Exclusivity (this index)