Financial institutions Energy Infrastructure, mining and commodities Transport Technology and innovation Life sciences and healthcare



Pharma in brief - Canada

Supreme Court dismisses leave to appeal regarding hearsay evidence in venlafaxine s. 8 case

Case:	<i>Teva Canada Limited v Pfizer Canada Inc</i> (SCC Docket 37162).
Drug:	EFFEXOR XR® (venlafaxine hydrochloride)
Nature of case:	Application for leave to appeal decision remitting back to the Federal Court an action for damages pursuant to section 8 of the <i>Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations</i> , SOR/93-133 (the <i>Regulations</i>)
Successful party:	Pfizer Canada Inc.
Date of decision:	January 19, 2017

Summary

As we <u>reported</u>, Teva Canada Ltd. was awarded damages pursuant to section 8 of the *Regulations* after Pfizer's prohibition application under section 6 of the *Regulations* relating to an extended release formulation of venlafaxine hydrochloride (Pfizer's EFFEXOR XR®) was dismissed by the Federal Court. Pfizer successfully appealed the decision. The Federal Court of Appeal (**FCA**) overturned the decision on the basis that the Federal Court had admitted and relied on hearsay evidence. During the trial, Teva relied solely on the testimony of one of its executives to establish the capacity and willingness of a third-party supplier to provide the venlafaxine hydrochloride in Teva's product, instead of calling a witness from the supplier.

The FCA remitted the matter back to the Federal Court for redetermination, excluding the hearsay evidence.

Teva applied for leave to appeal the FCA's decision to the Supreme Court of Canada in August 2016. On January 19, 2017, the Supreme Court dismissed Teva's application. The redetermination in the Federal Court was adjourned pending a decision in the leave to appeal, and will now be rescheduled.

Links to decisions:

SCC Decision: Teva Canada Limited v Pfizer Canada Inc, SCC docket 37162.

FCA Decision: Pfizer Canada Inc v Teva Canada Limited, 2016 FCA 161

FC Decision: Teva Canada Limited v Pfizer Canada Inc, <u>2014 FC 248</u>, and subsequent reasons Teva Canada Limited v Pfizer Canada Inc, <u>2014 FC 634</u>

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, <u>click here</u>. For a complete list of our Life sciences and healthcare team, <u>click here</u>.

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.