1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
3	NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS
4	CORPORATION, : CIVIL ACTION :
5	Plaintiff, : v :
6	: APOTEX INC. and APOTEX CORP., :
7	: Defendants. : NO. 18-1038-LPS
8	NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS
9	CORPORATION, : CIVIL ACTION NO. :
10	Plaintiff, : : v :
11 12	TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC. and : ACTAVIS ELIZABETH LLC, :
13	Defendants. : 18-1039-LPS
14	NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS
15	CORPORATION, : CIVIL ACTION :
16	Plaintiff, : : v :
17	SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES LTD, :
18	et al., : NO. 18-1040-LPS
19	Wilmington, Delaware
20	Tuesday, October 16, 2018 Discovery and Scheduling Telephone Conference
21	
22	BEFORE: HONORABLE LEONARD P. STARK, Chief Judge
23	
24	(Captions continued on Page 2)
25	Brian P. Gaffigan Official Court Reporter

2.3

2.4

25

1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)
2	
3	YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP BY: ADAM WYATT POFF, ESQ.
4	and
5	KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR, LLP BY: BENJAMIN A. KATZENELLENBOGEN, ESQ.
6	Counsel for Glenmark Pharmaceuticals Inc.
7	USA, and Glenmark Pharmaceuticals Limited
8	
9	SMITH, KATZENSTEIN & JENKINS, LLP BY: KATHLEEN MILLER, ESQ.
10	and
11	BUDD LARNER, P.C. BY: LOUIS H. WEINSTEIN, ESQ.
12	Councel for Aggord Healthgame Inc
13 14	Counsel for Accord Healthcare, Inc., Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd., Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc., Torrent Pharma Inc., and Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd.
15	SHAW KELLER, LLP
16	BY: DAVID FRY, ESQ.
	and
17 18	KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP BY: AMANDA J. HOLLIS, ESQ., and
19	SARA TSOU, ESQ.
20	Counsel for Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., and Actavis Elizabeth LLC
21	MORRIS JAMES, LLP
22	BY: KENNETH L. DORSNEY, ESQ.
	and
23	TAFT STETTINIUS
24	BY: STEPHEN R. AUTEN, ESQ.
25	Counsel for Alkem Laboratories Ltd.

Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

1	ADDEADANCEC (Continued)
1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)
2	RICHARDS LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.
3	BY: KELLY E. FARNAN, ESQ., and SARA METZLER, ESQ.
4	
5	and
6	BRECKENRIDGE PHARMACEUTICAL INC. BY: ROBERT VROOM, ESQ.
7	Counsel for Breckenridge Pharmaceutical Inc.
8	
9	PHILLIPS GOLDMAN McLAUGHLIN & HALL, P.A. BY: JOHN C. PHILLIPS, JR., ESQ., and MEGAN C. HANEY, ESQ.
10	
11	and
12	GOODWIN PROCTER, LLP BY: CINDY CHANG, ESQ.
13	Counsel for Emcure Pharmaceuticals and Heritage Pharmaceuticals Inc.
14	nerreage marmaceuerears me.
15	STAMOULIS & WEINBLATT, LLC BY: STAMATIOS STAMOULIS, ESQ.
16	
17	and
18	McANDREWS HELD & MALLOY LTD. BY: AARON F. BARKOFF, ESQ.
19	Counsel for Ezra Ventures, LLC
20	
21	STAMOULIS & WEINBLATT, LLC BY: STAMATIOS STAMOULIS, ESQ.
22	and
23	SKIERMONT DERBY, LLP
24	BY: STEVEN J. UDICK, ESQ.
25	Counsel for HEC Pharm Co., Ltd. and HEC Pharm USA Inc.

2.3

paragraph 16, if plaintiffs come to believe there is a specific concern later on, they can raise that with us. And if we can't agree, we will go to Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So in the proposed protective order, and I will give you a week, so the same deadline as next, as the other, as the scheduling to get your revised submission in, in that proposal next week, I do authorize the inclusion of something along the lines of what the defendants have proposed in paragraph 16, but I have a little bit more guidance for you on that.

I'm more comfortable with something along the lines of the first sentence, the "without prior written approval, no party may disclose the protected information of any defendant to another defendant." I'm more comfortable with that than the second sentence which talks about "use" and "reliance" and "introducing into evidence," all of which strike me as concepts more relating to summary judgment if we were to have it and, more importantly, trial. I don't think in a protective order I should really be addressing what is going to happen at trial and what evidence could be admitted. We can evaluate all of that much better, much more concretely in and around the time of the pretrial conference when, among other things, we'll know which defendants are still here and are actually going to trial.

2.3

In addition, I think paragraph 16 needs to explicitly say something about a court order could, of course, modify this, and should expressly reference that the parties do need to meet and confer if the plaintiffs are making a request to have some particular exception from paragraph 16.

I think you all, with that guidance, can write language that will reasonably balance the competing interests here. It's always a difficult balance, but I don't think plaintiffs should be per se precluded with no ability to ask for an exception to use one defendant's information even against another.

On the other hand, the defendants I recognize are competitors with one another, and there is a real risk of competitive harm to their information falling into the hands of competitors, even outside counsel who might inadvertently misuse that in advising their own client.

It seems that this is not really going to be a ripe dispute until around the time expert reports are being prepared. The parties should be meeting and conferring on numerous issues between now and then, and plaintiffs reasonably should be able to see this coming. And so I don't think this is going to lead to an inordinate number of emergent disputes in front of me, and I certainly hope not.

I've got to run in a minute, but are there any

1	questions about that from plaintiff?
2	MR. TRENCHARD: No, Your Honor. Thank you very
3	much.
4	THE COURT: And from defendants?
5	MR. KATZENELLENBOGEN: No, Your Honor. Thank
6	you very much.
7	THE COURT: Thank you very much. We'll look for
8	your submissions next week.
9	
10	(Telephone conference ends at 4:07 p.m.)
11	
12	I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.
13	cranscrips resulting to should result and proceeding.
14	<u>/s/ Brian P. Gaffigan</u> Official Court Reporter
15	U.S. District Court
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	