

Pharma in brief - Canada

Innovator seeks leave to appeal to SCC on whether Minister can issue NOC without notice to first person for cross-referenced generic drug submission

Case:	<i>Janssen Inc, et al, v Hospira Healthcare Corporation, et al</i> (SCC Docket: 37342)
Drug:	REMICADE® (infliximab)
Nature of case:	Appeal of judicial review of a decision of the Minister of Health to not require notice under section 5 of the <i>Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations (Regulations)</i>
Appellants:	Janssen Inc.
Respondents:	Hospira Healthcare Corporation
Date:	December 9, 2016

Janssen filed an application for leave to appeal with the Supreme Court of Canada (**SCC**) on December 9, 2016, with respect to the Federal Court of Appeal (**FCA**) decision addressing a generic manufacturer's ability to obtain a notice of compliance (**NOC**) by way of cross-referenced drug submission.

As we [reported](#), the FCA recently held that the Minister of Health's (**Minister**) decision to issue an NOC to a generic manufacturer for a cross-referenced submission without providing notice to the innovator company was reasonable.

The Minister had issued NOCs for two generic products without the generics serving a notice of allegation. The innovator companies brought applications for judicial review, and the Minister's decisions were set aside by the Federal Court. The Minister and the respective generic manufacturers appealed. In both appeals, the issue was whether the Minister was permitted to issue NOCs to the generic companies without requiring them to address relevant patents on the patent register pursuant to section 5 of the *Regulations*.

The FCA allowed the appeals, finding that it is relevant to consider whether the generic company took advantage of the early working exception. The FCA held that the focus should be on the drug product itself and whether the changes reflected in the submission give rise to a new or different basis for asserting that a particular product is infringing. In both cases, the generic companies sought approval for products that were identical to a previously approved generic product and any potential infringement could be addressed in infringement proceedings.

Following the release of the FCA's decision, Health Canada provided notice that the decision will affect the application of section 5 of the *Regulations* with respect to administrative drug submissions (reported [here](#)).

Links:

- **SCC Docket:** [37342](#)
- **Federal Court of Appeal Decision:** [Teva Canada Limited et al v Pfizer Canada Inc et al, 2016 FCA 248](#)
- **Federal Court Decision:** [Pfizer Canada Inc v Canada \(Health\), 2014 FC 1243](#)

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.