



Loeb & Loeb adds Knowledge.

## Supreme Court Declines Opportunity to Clarify Scope of Hatch-Waxman Safe Harbor

The U.S. Supreme Court on Jan. 14, 2013, denied GlaxoSmithKline's petition for certiorari seeking review of the Federal Circuit's interpretation of the Hatch-Waxman safe-harbor provision at 35 USC 271(e)(1) in *Classen Immunotherapies, Inc. v. Biogen Idec*, 659 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011). GSK sought reversal of the Federal Circuit's holding that the scope of the safe harbor is limited to activities conducted to obtain pre-marketing approval of generic counterparts of patented inventions, and that 271(e)(1) "does not apply to information that may be routinely reported to the FDA, long after marketing approval has been obtained."

The Court's decision follows the Solicitor General's advice that the *Classen* case was not a good vehicle for review of the scope of the safe harbor, given its facts and in light of the Federal Circuit's subsequent decision in *Momenta Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Amphastar Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 686 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2012). The Solicitor General endorsed the Federal Circuit's narrow construction of *Classen* in the *Momenta* decision, as well as the court's observation in *Momenta* that the "plain language of [35 USC 271(e)(1)] is not restricted to pre-approval activities." In light of the Solicitor General's brief, the Supreme Court's decision to deny certiorari should not be taken as endorsement of the *Classen* court's argument that the safe harbor is limited to pre-approval activities.

The Solicitor General's arguments in its brief filed in the *Classen* case also suggest that further Supreme Court guidance may be needed regarding the scope of activities covered by the 271(e)(1) safe harbor for infringement "solely for uses reasonably related to the development and submission of information" to the FDA. The *Momenta* case squarely addressed this issue, and following the Federal Circuit's Nov. 20, 2012, decision denying rehearing en banc in *Momenta*, further development of this issue is likely in 2013.

Further discussion of the briefing in connection with the petition for certiorari in *Classen* is provided [here](#).

This alert is a publication of Loeb & Loeb and is intended to provide information on recent legal developments. This alert does not create or continue an attorney client relationship nor should it be construed as legal advice or an opinion on specific situations.

**Circular 230 Disclosure:** To assure compliance with Treasury Department rules governing tax practice, we inform you that any advice (including in any attachment) (1) was not written and is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding any federal tax penalty that may be imposed on the taxpayer, and (2) may not be used in connection with promoting, marketing or recommending to another person any transaction or matter addressed herein.

© 2013 Loeb & Loeb LLP. All rights reserved.

*This publication may constitute "Attorney Advertising" under the New York Rules of Professional Conduct and under the law of other jurisdictions.*

## Patent Litigation Department

---

BRIAN G. ARNOLD	BARNOLD@LOEB.COM	310.282.2160
LANA CARNEL	LCARNEL@LOEB.COM	312.464.3191
KATHLEEN M. GERSH	KGERSH@LOEB.COM	212.407.4287
JOHN M. GRIEM, JR.	JGRIEM@LOEB.COM	212.407.4182
JOSHUA H. HARRIS	JHARRIS@LOEB.COM	212.407.4275
ADAM G. KELLY	AKELLY@LOEB.COM	312.464.3138
WILLIAM J. KRAMER	WKRAMER@LOEB.COM	312.464.3350
EVELYN M. KWON	EKWON@LOEB.COM	212.407.4038
JULIE L. LANGDON	JLANGDON@LOEB.COM	312.464.3196

---

---

LEILY LASHKARI	LLASHKARI@LOEB.COM	212.407.4962
WARREN K. MACRAE	WMACRAE@LOEB.COM	212.407.4098
JORDAN A. SIGALE	JSIGALE@LOEB.COM	312.464.3109
JENNIFER B. STRONG	JSTRONG@LOEB.COM	212.407.4111
CHRIS M. SWICKHAMER	CSWICKHAMER@LOEB.COM	312.464.3136
WILLIAM J. VOLLER III	WVOLLER@LOEB.COM	312.464.3143
MARK E. WADDELL	MWADDELL@LOEB.COM	212.407.4127
LAURAA. WYTSMA	LWYTSMA@LOEB.COM	310.282.2251

---