



January 2017

## ***Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.* Expected to Clarify BPCIA Obligations**

The Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 (BPCIA) established an abbreviated approval process for biosimilar applications, but that process forces drug makers to navigate uncertain obligations for an applicant's disclosure of its application and notice of commercial marketing. On Jan. 13, 2017, the U.S. Supreme Court granted *certiorari* in *Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.* to hear arguments regarding the BPCIA's notice and disclosure requirements. Specifically, the Court will determine: (1) whether the BPCIA's disclosure requirements are mandatory for biosimilar applicants; and (2) whether the BPCIA's notice requirements effectively grant certain reference products an extended exclusivity period.

The case concerns Zarxio, Sandoz's biosimilar of Amgen's Neupogen and the first commercially available biosimilar approved under the BPCIA. Pursuant to subsection (k) of the BPCIA, codified at 42 U.S.C. § 262(k), Sandoz submitted an abbreviated Biologics License Application (aBLA) to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in July 2014. The BPCIA provides specific procedures for disclosure and negotiation between the applicant and the reference product sponsor (RPS), including that subsection (k) applicants "shall provide" the RPS with the aBLA and manufacturing information in Section 262(l)(2)(A), as well as notice "not later than 180 days before the first commercial marketing of the biological product licensed" in Section 262(l)(8)(A). The parties disagreed on how to interpret these provisions, and Amgen filed suit in the Northern District of California based on alleged violations of subsection (l).

In response to Amgen's allegations of unfair competition, conversion, and patent infringement, Sandoz counterclaimed for a declaratory judgment adopting its interpretation that the BPCIA: (1) does not require a subsection (k) applicant to disclose its aBLA and manufacturing information to the reference product sponsor; and (2) allows an applicant to give effective notice of commercial marketing prior to FDA approval. The district court granted Sandoz judgment on the pleadings and dismissed Amgen's non-patent claims. Amgen appealed to the Federal Circuit.

Writing for a divided panel, Judge Lourie concluded that the district court had correctly interpreted Section 262(l)(2)(A)'s disclosure requirement but erred with respect to notice under Section 262(l)(8)(A). The court focused on the fact that the BPCIA specifies remedies—namely, patent litigation—for failure to timely disclose the aBLA and manufacturing information, but has no similar provision for inadequate notice of commercial marketing. Accordingly, the court

determined that applicants are not required to meet Section 262(l)(2)(A)—remedy provisions would be superfluous otherwise—but must satisfy Section 262(l)(8)(A) before marketing.

Relying on Section 262(l)(8)(A)'s use of the term “licensed,” the Federal Circuit further reasoned that an applicant can only market its biosimilar if it has provided sufficient notice after the product has been licensed by the FDA. Addressing Sandoz's concern that this would unconditionally and improperly extend a given reference product's exclusivity beyond the 12 years granted under Section 262(k)(7)(A), the majority dismissed the issue as limited to the unusual circumstance—present in this litigation—where the first aBLA for a given reference product is not filed until after expiration of the statutory grant.

Both parties petitioned for *certiorari*, and the Solicitor General recommended that the Supreme Court review both issues. In its brief, the Solicitor General largely supported Sandoz on both provisions, arguing that subsection (k) applicants are not required to provide information under Section 262(l)(2)(A) and that pre-licensure notice is sufficient for Section 262(l)(8)(A), injunctive relief being unavailable. While it remains to be seen whether the Supreme Court will agree, biosimilar applicants can expect much-needed clarity regarding their BPCIA obligations.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **Scott J. Bornstein** and **Cort Welch**. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > [Scott J. Bornstein](#) | +1 212.801.2172 | [bornsteins@gtlaw.com](mailto:bornsteins@gtlaw.com)
- > [Cort W. Welch](#) | +1 212.801.2252 | [welchc@gtlaw.com](mailto:welchc@gtlaw.com)
- > Or, your [Greenberg Traurig](#) attorney

<b>Albany</b> +1 518.689.1400	<b>Delaware</b> +1 302.661.7000	<b>New York</b> +1 212.801.9200	<b>Silicon Valley</b> +1 650.328.8500
<b>Amsterdam</b> +31 20 301 7300	<b>Denver</b> +1 303.572.6500	<b>Northern Virginia</b> +1 703.749.1300	<b>Tallahassee</b> +1 850.222.6891
<b>Atlanta</b> +1 678.553.2100	<b>Fort Lauderdale</b> +1 954.765.0500	<b>Orange County</b> +1 949.732.6500	<b>Tampa</b> +1 813.318.5700
<b>Austin</b> +1 512.320.7200	<b>Houston</b> +1 713.374.3500	<b>Orlando</b> +1 407.420.1000	<b>Tel Aviv<sup>^</sup></b> +972 (0) 3.636.6000
<b>Berlin<sup>-</sup></b> +49 (0) 30 700 171 100	<b>Las Vegas</b> +1 702.792.3773	<b>Philadelphia</b> +1 215.988.7800	<b>Tokyo<sup>⌘</sup></b> +81 (0)3 4510 2200
<b>Berlin-GT Restructuring<sup>-</sup></b> +49 (0) 30 700 171 100	<b>London<sup>*</sup></b> +44 (0)203 349 8700	<b>Phoenix</b> +1 602.445.8000	<b>Warsaw<sup>~</sup></b> +48 22 690 6100
<b>Boca Raton</b> +1 561.955.7600	<b>Los Angeles</b> +1 310.586.7700	<b>Sacramento</b> +1 916.442.1111	<b>Washington, D.C.</b> +1 202.331.3100
<b>Boston</b> +1 617.310.6000	<b>Mexico City<sup>+</sup></b> +52 55 5029.0000	<b>San Francisco</b> +1 415.655.1300	<b>Westchester County</b> +1 914.286.2900
<b>Chicago</b> +1 312.456.8400	<b>Miami</b> +1 305.579.0500	<b>Seoul<sup>∞</sup></b> +82 (0) 2.369.1000	<b>West Palm Beach</b> +1 561.650.7900
<b>Dallas</b> +1 214.665.3600	<b>New Jersey</b> +1 973.360.7900	<b>Shanghai</b> +86 (0) 21.6391.6633	

*This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. <sup>-</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. <sup>-</sup> Berlin - GT Restructuring is operated by Köhler-Ma Geiser Partnerschaft Rechtsanwälte, Insolvenzverwalter. <sup>\*</sup>Operates as a separate UK registered legal entity. <sup>\*\*</sup>Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. <sup>+</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. <sup>∞</sup>Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. <sup>^</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. <sup>⌘</sup>Greenberg Traurig Tokyo Law Offices are operated by GT Tokyo Horitsu Jimusho, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. <sup>~</sup>Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2017 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*