

Pharma in brief - Canada

Federal Court consolidates s. 6 PM(NOC) application with patent impeachment action addressing same patent

Case:	<i>Apotex Inc v Shire LLC</i> , 2016 FC 1099 (Court File Nos. T-1056-16 & T-998-16), appeal dismissed on February 6, 2017
Drug:	VYVANSE®
Nature of case:	Motion to partially consolidate action for patent impeachment under the <i>Patent Act</i> , RSC 1985, c P-4 (Patent Act) and prohibition application pursuant to section 6 of the <i>Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations</i> , SOR/93-133 (the Regulations).
Successful party:	Shire LLC
Date of decision:	October 3, 2016

Summary

The court granted Shire's motion to partially consolidate an application pursuant to section 6 of the *Regulations* and an impeachment action with respect to the same patent.

Background

Ten days after Shire started a prohibition application against Apotex relating to VYVANSE® and Canadian Patent No. 2,527,646, Apotex brought an action seeking a declaration that the same patent is invalid and not infringed by Apotex's proposed generic version of VYVANSE®.

Shire moved to partially consolidate these two proceedings so they would be heard simultaneously by the same judge, on common *viva voce* evidence, but maintaining the parties' ability to argue the admissibility or relevance of evidence to one or the other proceeding. Apotex asserted that both proceedings should continue in parallel, as the consolidation would be prejudicial to Apotex.

Just, most expeditious and least expensive determination of both proceedings

The court allowed Shire's motion, holding that proceeding in this manner would eliminate duplication and save significant time and expense. The court also noted that a similar procedure had been previously adopted in [*Novartis Pharmaceuticals Canada Inc v Apotex Inc*, 2013 FC 142](#).

Although Apotex's grounds for invalidity and non-infringement were the same in both proceedings, the court acknowledged that the different burdens of proof and procedural rules applicable to each proceeding would result in added complexity if the two proceedings were consolidated. However, the court held that the difficulty and the time required to address the complexity "pales in comparison" with the efficiencies and savings gained from eliminating parallel proceedings.

The court also held that the use of *viva voce* evidence would eliminate the need for the parties to prepare separate affidavits and conduct cross-examinations in the application, as well as require attendance of the inventors only twice,

for discovery and trial. Further, although not a factor in the decision, *viva voce* evidence would likely assist the court in assessing expert evidence.

The court rejected all of Apotex's assertions of prejudice. Further, as Shire acknowledged that it would have no automatic right to an extension of the statutory stay under the *Regulations* if the consolidated proceedings could not be heard within 24 months, the court was satisfied that all of Apotex's rights would be protected.

Link:

[Apotex Inc v. Shire LLC, 2016 FC 1099](#)

For more information, please contact your IP/Life sciences or healthcare practice professional at Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP.

For a complete list of our IP team, [click here](#). For a complete list of our Life sciences and healthcare team, [click here](#).

Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP, Norton Rose Fulbright LLP, Norton Rose Fulbright Australia, Norton Rose Fulbright South Africa Inc and Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP are separate legal entities and all of them are members of Norton Rose Fulbright Verein, a Swiss Verein. Norton Rose Fulbright Verein helps coordinate the activities of the members but does not itself provide legal services to clients.

References to "Norton Rose Fulbright", "the law firm", and "legal practice" are to one or more of the Norton Rose Fulbright members or to one of their respective affiliates (together "Norton Rose Fulbright entity/entities"). No individual who is a member, partner, shareholder, director, employee or consultant of, in or to any Norton Rose Fulbright entity (whether or not such individual is described as a "partner") accepts or assumes responsibility, or has any liability, to any person in respect of this communication. Any reference to a partner or director is to a member, employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications of the relevant Norton Rose Fulbright entity.

The purpose of this communication is to provide general information of a legal nature. It does not contain a full analysis of the law nor does it constitute an opinion of any Norton Rose Fulbright entity on the points of law discussed. You must take specific legal advice on any particular matter which concerns you. If you require any advice or further information, please speak to your usual contact at Norton Rose Fulbright.