ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

Patent issues Related to ANDA Approval

Received: 23 October 2022, **Revised:** 25 November 2022, **Accepted:** 29 December 2022

Kartik M. Shah[1], Prathmesh S. Pawar[1], Dr. Girish A. Kashid[1], Dr. Gowtham Menon[1], Dr. Sarita S. Pawar[1], Dr. Kishor S. Salunkhe[1]
1Sanjivani College of Pharmaceutical Education & Research Kopargoan

Keywords
Patent, ANDA, Infringement, Case study, Hatch Waxman act

Abstract
The study provides information on the laws governing patents, the revisions made under the Hatch Waxman Act, and the application procedure for US patents. The case 01, involving an ANDA violation brought about by an unlawful venue, involves Valeant Pharmaceuticals and Mylan Laboratories. In the Hatch Waxman instances, the location of the ANDA submission is irrelevant; anybody can submit an ANDA from anywhere in the world. The court took notice of this observation, dismissed Valeant Pharmaceuticals' argument, and authorised Mylan Laboratories to submit an ANDA. Thus, the case gave us the impression that the location of an ANDA filing is irrelevant.
The case 02 involving ANDA infringement between Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. and Amneal Pharmaceuticals. The MFM patent is held by the Merck corporation, and when Amneal wishes to submit an ANDA for MFM, Merck claims that this is an act of infringement. Merck testified in court that three peak analyses were required to determine the amount of MFM present in Amneal's product. One peak analysis is also adequate to diagnose MFM, Amneal testified in court. Then the court instructed both firms to form an expert committee, conduct the study, and submit the report. The court dismissed Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.'s argument after examining the report and concluding that one peak analysis is adequate and that Amneal's ANDA would not violate any patents

1. Introduction

1.1) Patent: The US Patent and Trademark Office has the rights to grant inventor a property right when it issues a patent for an innovation. When the applicant pays maintenance costs, the life of a new patent which is 20 years from the date the patent application which was submitted in the United States or, in other circumstances, from the date an earlier related application was filed. Only in the United States, and its territories, and its jurisdiction the U.S. patent grants is valid. Patent term changes or extensions may be possible in some situations.

Patent consist of three types: -

1) **Utility patent** is granted to someone who invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, article of production, or matter composition, or any new and useful improvement.
2) **Design patent** is granted to someone who creates a new, original, and ornamental design for a manufactured item.
3) **Plant patents** is granted to someone who invents or discovers a different and novel variety of plant and asexually reproduces it.

1.2) Hatch Waxman Act framework [2,3]

A business can apply to the FDA for permission to market a generic drug prior to the expiration of patents connected to the

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

brand-name drug that the generic intends to imitate under the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984, often known as the Hatch-Waxman Amendments.

When the legal proceeding takes place against the patent the applicant who has submitted paragraph IV certification must inform the brand product sponsor and any other patent owners about the submission of ANDA and patent challenge.

If a branded product sponsor or patent owner brings an infringement action against a generic drug registrant within 45 days of ANDA's notice**,** FDA approval of the generic drug Market entry is usually delayed for 30 months, except where a patent expires, is found to be invalid, or is not infringed before that time.

Prior to a generic competitor's application being granted and the drug being put on the market, the brand product sponsor and patent holder are given a set length of time to legally claim their patent rights. This 30-month deferral is also known as the "30-month stay."

As part of ongoing efforts to assist generic drug applicants in preparing their applications, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA or the Agency) frequently publishes data pertaining to the 180-day exclusivity for drug candidates provided under section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act).

The majority of the medications on this list have been given a "paragraph IV" (PIV) patent certificate and have been the subject of one or more comprehensive abbreviated new drug applications (ANDAs) to the FDA.

2. USA Patent Filing Procedure

A) **Determine which type of intellectual property protection you need:** You might require a patent, trademark, copyright, marketing strategy, trade secret, or some combination of these to safeguard your creation. Find out if you actually require a patent or another type of intellectual property protection before you start drafting a patent application.

B) **Understand if your invention is patentable**: If the invention is already public, you cannot obtain a patent. Therefore, a search of all prior disclosures to the public should be done. It should also be done a search of printed publications and foreign patents.

C) **Get ready to Apply**: When choosing the kind of patent, you must develop an application plan and may seek the advice of a qualified legal counsel. To file a patent application, you must pay a minimum cost as well as extra charges including a search fee, an inspection fee, and an issue fee. Depending on your application, excess claims fees can also be applicable.

While inventors are free to create their own applications, submit them to the USPTO, and manage the processes themselves, they may encounter significant difficulties if they are unfamiliar with these issues or have not thoroughly studied them. Even while people who are not experienced in this field can often obtain patents, there is no guarantee that the patent would appropriately protect the specific idea.

D) **Prepare and submit your initial Application:** Utility patent applications, provisional applications, and a number of other office communications can all be sent electronically to the USPTO via EFS-Web.

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

EFS-Web is the name of the patent application filing system used by the USPTO. Make sure you have read the published specifications and claims before signing your application. Once the application has been submitted to the USPTO, revisions cannot be made to it.

E) **Work with the Advisor**: The USPTO will notify you of the inaccuracies in a formal letter known as an Office Action if the application form is incomplete. After that, you'll have time to complete and submit your application (a surcharge may be required). If the omission is not fixed in a specific length of time, the application will be returned or discarded. A handling charge as specified in the fee schedule will be deducted from any filing fees that were paid.

The examiner will provide an explanation if they find that your application does not meet the standards (s). You will have the ability to address the examiner's concerns or make modifications. The application will be denied if the applicant does not answer to the examiner's request within the allotted period. You can appeal the application's rejection to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board if it is turned down twice (PTAB)

F) **Receive the approval:** The applicant will be informed of the decision when the examiner determines that it is correct and meets the standards. After the issue fee and any necessary publication fee have been received at the office, utility and reissue patents are granted in about four weeks. An application is assigned a patent number and issue date once the USPTO receives and processes the issue fee, and an Issue Notification is sent.

On the day a patent is issued, a letter announcing the award is sent. It contains any allusions to earlier patents, the inventor(s)' names, the specification, and the claims (to name a few). It is exquisitely presented with a gold seal on the front and a red ribbon. Order certified documents with the USPTO ribbon, seal, and certifying officer's signature.

G) **Maintain the patent:** After 4, 8, and 12 years from the issue date, utility and reissue utility patents need maintenance fees to stay in force. The patent will expire if the maintenance fee and any applicable premium are not paid on time. Except for things sealed under secrecy orders or related to unpublished patent applications, the records and associated paperwork are not secret after the information is recorded and are available for public examination

3. Methodology

3.1) Case: 01

VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICA LLC, VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS IRELAND DOW PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES INC KAKEN PHARMACEUTICAL CO, LTD

(Appellants)

VS

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC, MYLAN LABORATORIES LTD

(Defendants)

A) **Background:** The parties' places of incorporation are significant since the main issue on appeal is one of venue. Significantly less, Valeant Pharmaceuticals

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

Ireland and Valeant Pharmaceuticals North America LLC Kaken Pharmaceuticals Co., Ltd., Dow Pharmaceutical Sciences, Inc. ("Dow"), and Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc.("plaintiffs") are located all throughout the world, including Japan, Delaware and Ireland. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. ("MPI"), a West Virginia corporation with its main office in Morgantown, Pennsylvania-based Mylan Inc., a Pennsylvania corporation with its main office in Canonsburg, and Mylan Laboratories Ltd. are the defendants.

Jublia a brand-name medication, was given FDA approval on June 6, 2014, and Dow now holds the New Drug Application No. 203567 for it. Onychomycosis, a fungal infection of the toenails, is treated with Jublia. Efinaconazole is the substance that makes Jublia effective. There are nine patents for Jublia included in the Orange Book.

In order to obtain authorization to market a less expensive version of Jublia, a generic drug company by the name of MPI submitted an ANDA in June 2018. The MPI forwarded the ANDA to the FDA in White Oak, Maryland, from its corporate headquarters in West Virginia. The Orange-Book mentioned patents for Jublia were deemed invalid, unenforceable, or not to be violated by the ANDA product under Paragraph IV of the ANDA. In August 2018, MPI notified Valeant of the filing of an ANDA. On September 26, 2018, Valeant filed a lawsuit against Mylan in the District of New Jersey, alleging that Mylan violated Dow's Orange Book patents under the Hatch-Waxman Act and requesting an assessment of the validity of the patents.

The defendant does business in New Jersey and he is registered to do that business. According to information, New Jersey and other locations will be the aim of MPI's generic medication, which the company requested FDA approval for. The ANDA filings made by [MPI] are official actions that invariably show intentions to commercialise the suggested generic medications. Following FDA approval, MPI wants to market and sell its generic products in New Jersey.

In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b), Mylan filed a move in January 2019 to dismiss Valeant's lawsuit against MPI and Mylan Inc. in the New Jersey District Court for improper venue (3). The majority of the allegations in Valeant's case regarding venue were not disputed by Mylan. Instead, it argued that the ANDA's lone alleged act of infringement did not occur in New Jersey and that Mylan does not have regular and established places of business there, hence the venue was improper under 1400(b).

In response, Valeant argued that it is excessively restrictive to define "an act of infringement" under 1400(b) as the act of filing the ANDA. Mylan claimed that because MPI was the only business named in the lawsuit as having submitted the ANDA, MPI was the only corporation that qualified to be sued under the Hatch-Waxman Act. According to Valeant, the submission of the ANDA is not solely the responsibility of the company that submits the final ANDA to the FDA.

The court agreed to Mylan's request to dismiss the complaint against all defendants due to improper venue in August 2019. The court determined that because the ANDA

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

was submitted from West Virginia, the location was appropriate.

B) **Analysis:** In order to determine whether venue is suitable in a district other than the one in which a defendant is incorporated, a court must consider, among other things, "where the defendant has committed acts of infringement." The Hatch-Waxman Act defines submitting [an ANDA] for a drug with a patent claim or a patent for its use as "an act of infringement" if the intent is to obtain permission to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, or sale of the drug with the patent claim or the patent for its use prior to the patent's expiration.

According to 35 U.S.C. 271, the patent holder may file a case for infringement after the act of infringement took place. 6 The discussion then turns to whether any upcoming distribution of the identified generic will violate a valid patent claim. A court must determine that the defendant "has a regular and established place of business" in the district before it may rule that the site is appropriate. 28 U.S.C. § 1400 (b) (b) (b). Additionally, the court has not taken into account whether Mylan operates a regular, well-equipped place of business in New Jersey. As a result, we put off solving the problem.

The FDA's ability to approve the manufacture and sale of the generic product mentioned in the ANDA is postponed for thirty months if the patent holder files an action within 45 days of the ANDA's submission. This allows the litigation to start before these actions take occur. Determining whether the act of infringement described in 1400(b) happens solely when an ANDA-filer files its ANDA with the FDA or anyplace future distribution of the generic is anticipated is necessary in this appeal.

C) **Court's observations:** Finally, the court understood that because the major emphasis of the ANDA case is not on the FDA papers, but rather on whether hypothetical future activity would breach a legitimate patent, such prospective future acts must be relevant to the venue analysis. According to court, the submission of an ANDA "serves to advance in time the infringement and invalidity concerns that would otherwise come later in time, such as following approval or marketing of the generic medicament."

We concur with the court that MPI and Mylan Inc. do not have adequate venue in New Jersey. We maintain that location in Hatch Waxman instances should be based on previous acts of violations means acts that happened before the infringement was filed—for the reasons stated below. And we maintain that those measures only take place in the areas where the generic submission is being handled.

First, Valeant argues that the Hatch-Waxman act of infringement is "artificial," making it necessary to employ anticipated future behaviour to identify what is actually infringing. The Supreme Court, as well as our court and district courts, have referred to the ANDA submission as a "artificial act of infringement."

Valeant's argument ignores the reality that the second clause applies in every other kind of patent infringement case and that it will do so in a Hatch-Waxman case when the application is submitted from somewhere other than the submitter's place of business. Valeant continues to argue that we should decide that an ANDA

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

submission counts as a national act of infringement based on a "conceptual" aspect that goes beyond the specific act described in the legislation.

No comparable common law exists in this situation that would force the judgement that submitting a generic application will result in infringement in other parts of the United States. Without a textual basis in the law, it would be impossible to reach such a broad interpretation of the unlawful behaviour. From a policy point of view, Valeant's interpretation of the law is correct. A generic firm, for instance, might "game" the system in some jurisdictions to avoid venue.

Pharmaceutical companies with a well-known brand name may "have to file and maintain nearly similar claims in various districts," delaying the case's resolution process, raising expenses, and "resulting in contradictory outcomes." We contend that, in light of this, not all court districts where a generic product named in an ANDA is anticipated to be delivered are acceptable venues in Hatch-Waxman cases. Districts where actions occurred that would qualify people taking them as "submitters" under Section 271—districts that are appropriate and connected to the ANDA submission—are the only places where it is appropriate.

The court reached the conclusion that there was no activity connected to the ANDA submission that occurred in New Jersey. Valeant doesn't challenge that judgement in the appeal. As a result, we support the district court's ruling that MPI and Mylan Inc.'s lawsuit was improperly filed in the incorrect place. According to Mylan, Valeant explicitly indicated that MPI is exclusively responsible for filing the ANDA, which is supported by paragraph 29 of the complaint.

Despite the phrasing in paragraph 29, the court may decide that the paragraphs are sufficient to state a claim against MLL or that permission to amend would be appropriate to resolve any apparent ambiguity. We thus reverse the district court's venue-based denial of MLL and remand the case for additional proceedings.

D) **Court's Conclusion:** As previously said, political factors surrounding the Hatch Waxman case's restricted jurisdiction, particularly in light of the legal system's inefficiencies in addressing similar cases, which often include several defendants, have motivated us to Despite the fact that we concur, we are forced. Our analysis of the two statutes in question leads us to this conclusion.

In addition, the court dodged the question of whether Mylan Inc. has been named as a defendant in a 271(e) claim. We haven't reviewed the court's refusal to take the motion as to that entity under Rule 12(b)(3) because we uphold Mylan Inc.'s dismissal under Rule 12(b)(3) (6).

Therefore, we support the court's decision to exclude MPI and Mylan Inc. from Valeant's lawsuit on improper venue. We reverse the district court's decision to dismiss the action against MLL and remand it because the foreign defendant has a proper venue in New Jersey.

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

3.2) Case: 02[7,8]

MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP
(Appellant)
VS
AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS LLC
(Defendant)

A) **Background:** Mometasone furoate monohydrate, the key ingredient of Merck's Nasonex nasal medicine, is covered by U.S. Patent No. 6,127,353, which is owned by Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. ("Merck"). Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC ("Amneal") requested permission from the U.S. Food & Drug Administration to market a generic version of mometasone furoate nasal spray ("FDA"). Merck filed a case for patent infringement in the District of Delaware on the grounds that Amneal's proposed generic drug will infringe the patent if approved by the regulatory body.

After a bench trial, the court found that Merck had not established beyond a reasonable doubt that Amneal's generic product would infringe upon the patent. The court misused his or her discretion by refusing to force Amneal to give more samples of their generic medicine for testing ahead of trial as requested by Merck. Merck also argues that the court's noninfringement decision needs to be reversed since it was made without consideration of Amneal's final commercial product. According to the district court's fact-finding, which Merck contests, a three-peak analysis of Raman spectroscopy is required to demonstrate the presence of mometasone furoate in the product from Amneal that violates the law.

For the following reasons, we come to the judgement that the district court did not abuse its discretion when it denied Merck's request for more samples and a new trial. We further hold that, contrary to Merck's claims, Amneal's generic product, which formed the basis of the court's noninfringement decision, was not a representation of Amneal's finished product. This judgement was rendered by the court, and it was sound.

We come to the conclusion that court's decision that three peaks are needed to establish infringement was not manifestly incorrect. The corticosteroid anhydrous mometasone furoate, also known as "MFA," was discovered and synthesised by Merck scientists in the early 1980s. Merck eventually discovered a solvent that allowed it to develop MFA for the treatment of psoriasis after initially having difficulties dissolving MFA in water and pharmaceutical formulations.

The creation of Merck's nasal medication, which is presently approved to treat chronic and seasonal allergic rhinitis, nasal polyps, and congestion brought on by allergic rhinitis symptoms, was made possible by the discovery of MFM. The MFM and MFM-containing pharmaceutical formulations are covered by the patent. In order to get authorization to market a generic mometasone furoate nasal spray containing MFA, Amneal submitted ANDA No. 207989 in November 2014. (Rather than MFM). Amneal informed Merck of their ANDA submission in February 2015 and confirmed in a letter to Merck that the patent was invalid and that its intended product would not infringe.

Even though Amneal's generic medication included MFA, Merck said that it can ultimately change into the illegal MFM

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

form. The question of whether Amneal's generic medication will include any patented MFM during its two-year shelf life is what the court is worried about in terms of infringement. Three 100-kilogram batches of generic product were produced by Amneal (referred to as the "Exhibit Batches"), and Amneal provided the FDA with information on these samples, which are pertinent to the current dispute. A district court decision from December 10, 2015 said that the litigation would be put on hold until Amneal filed a declaration stating that the Exhibit Batch that Merck was given was representative of Amneal's generic product.

In their response to the FDA on February 29, 2016, Amneal supplied information on samples from the Day 1 and Day 4 batches of the necessary bulk-hold study. Data pertaining to samples from the A Batch were not provided by Amneal to the FDA. On January 12 and February 11, Amneal sent samples from the Day 1 Batch to Merck, indicating that they were an identical replica of the company's finished product.

Amneal completed the documentation for Merck on March 10 of this year, which included its February 29 letter to the FDA describing the results of the bulk-hold trial. In a rebuttal expert report on infringement issued on April 25, 2016, Amneal's expert evaluated samples from the Day 4 Batch. Merck claims that previous to this, they were unaware of the Day 4 and A Batch samples.

B) **Analysis:** On May 9 and 13, 2016, six weeks before trial, Merck asked the district court for emergency relief, arguing Amneal should have submitted samples from the Day 4 and A Batches. Since the Day 4 and A batches received further mixing that would have aided MFA conversion to the prohibited MFM form, Amneal was supposed to give samples from those batches for testing, according to Merck. If the Day 4 and A Batch sample were made public and Merck was given a full opportunity to study those samples prior to the trial, the subsequent trial would need to be significantly delayed.

Amneal's violation of discovery was brought up in court after two hearings on the matter, and it was decided that Amneal had to provide samples of Day 4 and A Batches. The court acknowledged that at the time it lacked sufficient knowledge to decide whether the Day 4 and A Batch sample was distinct from the Batch findings. The district court stated in its decision: "I'm not convinced sitting here that mixing creates a major influence, and if it doesn't, it doesn't matter that Amneal didn't supply [Merck] with a sample of both [the Day 4 and A Batches] [and] only gave [Merck] with the Day 1 Batch.

The trial was not delayed by the court either. Instead, the court gave Merck the opportunity to prove that the Day 4 and A Batch sample were fundamentally different from the Day 1 Batch sample, and if Merck was successful, it issued a cost-related notice to Amneal. Dr. Matzger, the expert witness for Merck at trial, testified that he examined samples of Amneal's generic medication using Raman spectroscopy. When Dr. Matzger looked at samples from Amneal's batches, he didn't discover any MFM crystals. But he also looked at samples from the batch, and he testified in court that he found a single peak there that

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

is typical of MFM and was seen at 1709 cm-1.

Dr. Marquardt, an expert on Amneal, asserted that Dr. Matzger erroneously determined that MFM was present in samples from Amneal's Day 1 Batch even though MFM was not discovered in the company's final generic product. Dr. Marquardt followed by stating that three peaks were required to demonstrate the existence of MFM rather than just one. Dr. Matzger's evaluation of the worth of the Day 4 and A Batches was rejected by Dr. Rogers, Amneal's extra expert. The Court summarised the arguments of the parties and came to the following factual conclusions based on conflicting testimony regarding sample manufacturing and whether the samples from the Day 1 Batch were indicative of Amneal's ANDA product.

The parties disagree on whether Amneal was required to provide samples from [the Day 4 and A Batches] to Merck (referred to as "additional samples"). According to Amneal, the further samples will be combined with the ones that have previously been provided ([the Day 1 Batch] and other Batches). Merck requests that the judge rule that there was a higher likelihood of MFM being present in the additional samples due to the greater mixing. Based on the expert testimony, the court determines that greater (or quicker) mixing frequently facilitates the switch from MFA to MFM.

The court concludes from the evidence that Merck has not established that a larger sample size will result in different findings. Merck's alternative motion for [the Day 4 and A Batch] sample production and a fresh trial is thus denied by the court.

C) **Court's observations:** The court agreed with Amneal's expert that three peaks are necessary to detect MFM in Amneal's generic product when assessing whether there has been a breach. By not proving that MFM is present in Amneal's ANDA product, Merck failed to meet its burden of proof. Amneal was mandated to "immediately make accessible to Merck samples of any subsequent representative commercial batches supplied to the FDA" in accordance with the court's ruling. Merck claims that by refusing to order Amneal to submit samples from its Day 4 and A Batches and by not postponing the trial, the court exceeded its authority.

Due to Amneal's disrespect for the standing discovery order, the trial environment was unfavourable. The district court was in a tough position since Amneal failed to provide Day 4 and A Batch test with barely six weeks till trial. The district court attempted to assess if there were any appreciable differences between the Day 4 and A Batch sample and the Day 1 Batch samples obtained over the course of two sessions. After finding that Merck had not proven that the Day 1 Batch samples were insufficient to adequately represent Amneal's final generic product, the district judge allowed the trial to proceed but also provided Merck the opportunity to submit new evidence on the matter during the trial. The trial did not affect Merck since the court followed the right processes. We are unable to argue that the district court erred in allowing the trial to proceed since Merck was given the opportunity to demonstrate at trial that the Day 4 and A Batch sample

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

were distinct from the Day 1 Batch samples for the purposes of infringement. legitimate offer from the district court to Merck. According to Dr. Matzger's evidence, the thermodynamic stability research he conducted for Merck indicated the conversion of MFA to MF.

Additionally, Dr. Matzger testified at trial that he was aware of Amneal's Day 4 and A Batches and wished he had samples from those batches to analyse since, as a consequence of the additional mixing, they were "more typical" of Amneal's final product. Dr. Matzger would have expected to detect MFM in the Day 4 and A Batch sample based on his analysis of the extra mixing methods.

Merck's second consultant, acknowledged that the likelihood of polymorphic conversion to MFM increased as mixing levels rise. Dr. Trout's research shows that industrial-scale violent mixing improves the possibility of polymorphic conversion by adding more energy to the system. Neither the samples from the Day 1 Batch nor Dr. Trout's evaluation of Amneal's product was performed.

The Day 4 and A batch sample's thorough mixing would have raised the possibility of conversion, according to Dr. Rogers, Amneal's specialist. According to Dr. Rogers, empirical studies on a separate medicine that had nothing to do with MFM or MFA corroborated the claims made by Dr. Trout. According to Dr. Rogers, it would be difficult and time-consuming to convert MFA into Amneal's ANDA product.

The court's determination that the trial evidence did not properly demonstrate that Amneal's further mixing would have caused the MFA in his product to shift to MFM was not clearly incorrect, in our opinion. This is because the facts in the accessible record contradict. The court found that Merck's assertion that the Day 4 and A Batch sample had higher conversion rates than the Day 1 Batch samples was only supported by speculative evidence. Merck's study just demonstrated that MFA and MFM could be blended repeatedly.

We disagree with Merck's assertion that conversion could not be demonstrated without looking at the Day 4 and A Batch samples. Merck did not try to test Amneal's generic product for conversion by extra mixing and time alone, much less by mimicking the mixing Amneal undertook to obtain the Day 4 and A Batch samples, even though it possessed samples of Amneal's Exhibit and Day 1 Batches (in terms of both speed and duration).

On the basis of such a shortage of reliable information, we cannot conclude that the district court plainly erred in determining that Merck had not proved that the Day 4 and A Batch sample were distinct from the Day 1 Batch samples. We are not "left with a firm and substantial conclusion that the court was in mistake" if we overturn the court's fact-finding.

Amneal had been directed to provide samples of the products that ANDA filers are asking clearance for to the FDA. Uncertainties in the pharmaceutical industry are adequate cause for this. But considering the measures the district court took to allow Merck to demonstrate that Amneal's discovery violation was detrimental in this instance, we believe the court acted appropriately.

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

Merck claims that the district court's noninfringement determination must be reversed as a matter of law since it was made using Amneal's intermediate product (the Day 1 Batch samples) rather than its final, commercial-sized product (the A Batch samples). The focus of an ANDA infringement investigation's appropriate adjudication, according to Merck, must be on what will or is likely to be marketed.

As the sole final commercial ANDA product, Merck contends that Amneal's A Batch samples should have been the subject of the infringement dispute. According to Merck, the court erred in failing to recognise the proper object of the infringement investigation in accordance with this court's prior decisions and 35 U.S.C. 271(e)(2), which resulted in a complete misapplication of the law in terms of the Hatch-Waxman Act's framework. The court's error, Merck claims, began with a dispute over discovery.

We don't agree with Merck in this case that the samples from Amneal's Day 1 Batch were a realistic depiction of the company's ultimate commercial product but rather only a step in the production process. The samples from the Day 1 Batch were a true depiction of the product, Amneal notified the FDA and the court. Amneal's ANDA standard also permits a batch-hold time of up to four days. As a result, Day 1 Batch samples met ANDA specifications and faithfully represented Amneal's generic product.

D) **Court's Conclusion:** Amneal's expert testimony was "at least as consistent and trustworthy" as Merck's, according to the court, therefore it was determined that Merck had not shown infringement by a preponderance of the evidence. We determine that the district court's determination of noninfringement was not obviously wrong since the record supported it.

According to Merck, who is appealing the decision, the court's determination that three peaks were required to show the presence of MFM in Amneal's ANDA product was manifestly erroneous. According to Merck, who maintains that MFM may be distinguished by a single peak at 1705 cm-1, the court was disregarded in accordance with Amneal's representation to the FDA.

Even while a single peak can occasionally be employed, Dr. Marquardt, an expert witness for Amneal, stated during his testimony before the district court that three Raman peaks are routinely used to detect compounds in complicated mixes like MFM. We infer that the district court did not clearly mistake when it determined that three peaks were required to identify MFM since Dr. Marquardt's testimony supports that view.

The same debate over whether MFM might be recognised by a single peak or by three peaks took place in that situation. Based on the evidence presented, the court's fact finding that three peaks were required and that Amneal's generic product would not violate the patent did not appear to be plainly wrong.

After careful consideration, we do not find the remaining arguments of the parties to be persuasive. For the reasons mentioned above, we agree

ISSN: 2309-5288 (Print)
ISSN: 2309-6152 (Online)
CODEN: JCLMC4
Journal of Coastal Life Medicine

4. Conclusion

The information above provides an overview of patents, the Hatch Waxman Act's laws and regulations, and the procedures for filing a US patent. We further explored the issues and case studies under the Hatch-Waxman Act in the review. The first case pitted Mylan labs against Valeant pharmaceuticals and its affiliates. Due to inappropriate venue, the defendant was accused of violating the ANDA by the appellant. The court then stated that in the hatch Waxman instances, the location is irrelevant. The ANDA can be submitted by the filer from any place. As a result, the court denied the appellant's argument and authorised Mylan Laboratories to submit an ANDA.

In the second lawsuit, Amneal Pharmaceuticals is the defendant and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. When Amneal attempted to submit an ANDA for a product for which Merck had registered the MFM, Merck deemed it to be an act of infringement. Merck said in court that three Raman peak analyses are necessary to determine whether MFM is present in Amneal's product. Amneal said that MFM may also be identified via single peak analysis. The court denied Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.'s application after reviewing the report and concluding that one peak analysis is adequate and that Amneal's ANDA would not violate any patents.

References

[1] https://www.uspto.gov/patents/basics
[2] https://www.fda.gov/drugs/abbreviated-new-drug-application-anda/patent-certifications-and-suitability-petitions
[3] https://www.law.ua.edu/lawreview/files/2011/07/Hatch-Waxman-Patent-Litigation-and-Inter-Partes-Review.pdf
[4] https://www.uspto.gov/patents/basics/patent-process-overview
[5] https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/court-decisions-anda-approvals-and-180-day-exclusivity-under-hatch-waxman-amendments-federal-food
[6] http://cafc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/opinions-orders/19-2402.OPINION.11-5-2020_1681030.pdf
[7] https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/federal/17-1560_1.pdf
[8] https://www.fda.gov/files/drugs/published/180-Day-Exclusivity-When-Multiple-ANDAs-Are-Submitted-on-the-Same-Day.pdf
[9] https://katten.com/files/110116_How_Amending_ANDA_Specifications_Can_Win_Or_Lose_Pharmaceutical_Patent.pdf
[10] https://www.bakerlaw.com/files/uploads/News/Articles/LITIGATION/FDA/Shea-ANDA-Litigation-02-08-2016.pdf