

Index

A

- Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA), litigation, 59–73
- ACIP. *See* Advisory Council on Intellectual Property
- Acromed Corp. v. Sofamor Danek Group, Inc.*, 84, 87–88
- Advisory Council on Intellectual Property (ACIP), 232
- Aerospace America, Inc. v. Abatement Technologies, Inc.*, 3
- AIA. *See* America Invents Act
- Ajinomoto Co., Inc. v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 6
- Akamai Technologies, Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.*, 186
- Altana PharmaAG v. Tevs Pharms. USA, Inc.*, 112
- America Invents Act (AIA)
- CREATE Act expansion, 23–27
 - disclosure and claiming requirements
 - claim requirements in Section 112, 12–13
 - overview, 10
 - specification requirements in Section 112, 10–12
 - first-inventor-to-file, 16–17
 - inventorship, 90
 - nonobviousness of invention, 9–10, 104
 - novelty of invention, 7–9
 - overview, 15–16
 - patent recipient eligibility, 6–7
 - prior art
 - definition
 - implications, 22
 - Section 102(a)(1), 17–18
 - Section 102(a)(2), 19–21
 - exceptions
 - implications, 22–23
 - Section 102(b)(1), 21–22
 - Section 102(b)(2), 22
 - prior user rights, 29–31
 - supplemental examination and reissue, 31–33
 - third-party proceedings, 33–36
 - transition provisions in Sections 3(n)(1) and 3(n)(2), 27–29
- American Fruit Growers v. Brogdex Co.*, 131
- Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.*, 131
- Amgen, Inc. v. International Trade Commission*, 197
- ANDA. *See* Abbreviated New Drug Application
- Anderson v. General Hospital Corp.*, 87
- Anderson v. Piepper*, 88
- Andrx, 64
- APO. *See* Australia Patent Office
- Apotex, Inc. v. Wellcome Foundation, Ltd.*, 130
- Arbitron, Inc. v. Kiefl*, 87
- Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 11, 93–95
- Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Sequenom, Inc.*, 173
- Arkansas Carpenters Health & Welfare Fund v. Boyer AG*, 64
- Association for Molecular Pathology et al. v. Myriad Genetics*, 127–128, 132–136, 139–140, 149–150, 157, 164, 167–170, 172–173, 176–179, 210–212, 241–242
- The Association for Molecular Pathology & Ors v. United States Patent and Trademark Office and Myriad Genetics*, 157
- Association for Molecular Pathology v. United States Patent and Trademark Office and Myriad*, 241
- Astra Aktiebolag v. Adrx Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 119, 124
- Atlas Powder, Co. v. Ireco, Inc.*, 116
- Australia Patent Office (APO)
- genetic material patents
 - activity, 154
 - consideration, 153–154
 - debate, 154–155
 - example claims, 160
 - infringement of the term “isolated”, 157–158
 - legislative change proposals, 158–159
 - manner of manufacture, 156–157
 - Myriad litigation, 155–156, 158
 - Patents Act amendments, 159
 - prospects, 160–161
 - patentable inventions, 151–153, 227–229
 - stem cell. *See* Stem cell patentability
- Authorship, inventorship comparison, 88–89

B

- Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. v. W.I. Gore & Associates, Inc.*, 6
- Bayh–Dole Act, 253
- Bilski v. Kappos*, 240
- Biological Diversity Act, India, 248–250
- Biotechnology Directive, European Patent Office impact, 39–41
- Biotechnology licensing agreement
 - enforcement and remedies, 263–264
 - intellectual property rights management
 - exclusive versus nonexclusive rights, 257
 - research and publication rights, 259–260
 - purpose, 254–255
 - structuring, 255–256

Index

- Biotechnology licensing agreement (*Continued*)
 technology versus intellectual property, 254
 term sheets, 256–258
 types, 256
 valuation and payment structures
 milestone payments, 262
 practical aspects, 263
 royalties, 260–262
 upfront fees, 260
- BMC Research, Inc. v. Paymentech, L.P.*, 186
Boston Scientific Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson, 96–97
Bounce, 128
Bowman v. Monsanto, 238
BRCA, 54, 127, 132–135, 147–149, 155–156, 169, 173, 177, 241
Brenner v. Manson, 95
Brüistle case, 40, 220–221, 223
Brüistle v. Greenpeace, 219, 222
Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Laboratories, 6, 81, 90
Business method, patent eligibility, 240
- ### C
- Canada Patent Register. *See* Patent Register, Canada
Canada trade secrets. *See* Trade secret
Cancer Voices Australia v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 155–156, 228, 232
Capon v. Eshar, 97
CBD. *See* Convention on Biological Diversity
Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, 95–96
CETA. *See* Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement
CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l Corp., 11
Checkpoint Systems, Inc. v. All-Tag Security S.A., 6
Chen v. Bouchard, 7
Chymosin, 146
Claims
 America Invents Act Section 112, 12–13
 Canada eligible claims and relevance requirements, 76–77
 drafting
 diagnostic claims, 182–183
 divided infringement avoidance, 186–187
 gene therapies, 183–184
 Mayo rejection avoidance, 185
 novel genes lacking introns, 184–185
 prior art avoidance, 186
 therapeutic proteins and antibodies, 184
Classen Immunotherapies, Inc. v. Biogen IDEC, 50, 195–197
Clayton Act, 63
Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments, 53–54
Coca Cola, 3, 268, 280
Coleman v. Dines, 81, 87
Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), 77
Connecticut Uniform Trade Secrets Act (CUTSA), 268
Consumer Watchdog v. Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, 214
Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 116
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 243, 246–248, 250
Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement (CREATE) Act, 23–28
C.R. Bard Co. v. M3 Systems, Inc., 80
CREATE Act. *See* Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act
Culturing Stem Cells/TECHNION case, 223
CUTSA. *See* Connecticut Uniform Trade Secrets Act
- ### D
- Daichi Sankyo Co. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 107
D'Arcy v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 157
Diagnostic testing. *See* Genetic diagnostic testing
Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 5, 131, 164–165, 176, 210, 237–238
Diamond v. Diehr, 7, 164, 170, 209
DNA
 Apotex, Inc. v. Wellcome Foundation, Ltd., 130
 Australia patents, 151–161
 claims drafting. *See* Claims
 European Union patentability of genes
 industrial applicability, 143–144
 inventive step, 145–148
 novelty, 144–145
 overview, 139–140
 patent eligibility, 140–143
 priority and added subject matter, 148–149
 prospects, 149–160
 Mayo Collaborative Services et al. v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc., 130
 Myriad Genetics Litigation, 127–128, 130–136, 139–140, 149–150, 155–156, 158, 167–170, 176–179, 241–242
 nonobviousness in patents, 105–107
 patentability, 238–239
 products of nature, 130–131
 Unilever PLC v. Proctor & Gamble, Inc., 128
 Wells v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp., 129
Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act, 47
- ### E
- Economic Espionage Act (EEA), 267
EEA. *See* Economic Espionage Act
EFD. *See* Effective filing date
Effective filing date (EFD), 17, 23, 25

- Eibel Process Co. v. Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.*, 124
Eisai Co. Ltd. and Eisai, Inc. v. Dr. Reddys Laboratories, Ltd., 112
Electro-Craft Corp. v. Controlled Motion, Inc., 269
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Aradigm Corp., 84
Eli Lilly & Co. v. Medtronic, Inc., 48, 193
Eli Lilly v. Emisphere, 268
Embrex, Inc. v. Service Engineering Corp., 190–192
Embryonic stem cell. *See* Stem cell patentability
EMI Group North America, Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp., 5, 115
Enoxaparin, 196
EPC. *See* European Patent Convention
EPO. *See* European Patent Office
Erythropoietin, 131
Ethicon, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp., 80, 84–85
European Patent Convention (EPC)
 inventive step, 41–42
 member states and contracting states, 217–218
 novelty, 40–41
 patentable subject matter, 37–39
 research use exemption. *See* Experimental use exemption
 scope, 37
European Patent Office (EPO)
 amendment permissibility, 42–43
 Biotechnology Directive influences, 39–41
 Board of Appeal, 38
 gene patentability
 industrial applicability, 143–144
 inventive step, 145–148
 novelty, 144–145
 overview, 139–140
 patent eligibility, 140–143
 priority and added subject matter, 148–149
 prospects, 149–160
 limitation and revocation proceedings, 44–45
 opposition period for patents, 43–44
 stem cell. *See* Stem cell patentability
Ex parte Deuel, 106
Ex parte Francis Y.F. Lee, 109
Ex parte Theobald et al., 110
Ex parte Treacy et al., 110
Ex parte Francis Y.F. Lee, 109
Ex parte Perc, 108
Ex parte Treacey et al., 109
Experimental use exemption
 European Union
 France
 Bolar exemption, 206
 experimental use exemption, 206
 Germany
 Bolar provision, 204–205
 legal basis, 200–201
 reach and limitation, 202–204
 requirements, 201
 Italy, 207
 Netherlands, 207
 overview, 199–200
 Spain, 206–207
 United Kingdom
 Bolar exemption, 205–206
 experimental use exemption, 205
 Hatch–Waxman Act safe harbor provision
 biologics license applications, 197
 overview, 192–193
 postapproval experiments, 195–197
 preclinical experiments, 194–195
 research tools, 197–198
 scope of products, 193–194
 judicially created exemption
 business or commercial aims and failure, 192
 generic drug approvals, 190–192
 origins, 190
 overview, 189–190
 prospects, 198
- F**
- Federal Trade Commission (FTC), Abbreviated New Drug Application litigation, 60–63, 66–67, 70–73
Federal Trade Commission v. Watson Pharmaceuticals, 66 Field v. Knowles, 87
Fina Oil and Chemical Co. v. Ewen, 6, 88
Forest Laboratories, Inc. v. Pillsbury Company, 3
Frank's Casing Crew & Rental Tools, Inc. v. PMR Technologies, Ltd., 6, 80, 90
FTC. *See* Federal Trade Commission
FTC v. Actavis, Inc., 70, 73
Funk Brothers Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co., 180, 242
- G**
- Garret Corp. v. United States*, 84
Gemstar-TV Guide Int'l, Inc. v. ITC, 6
Genes. *See* DNA; *specific genes*
Genetic diagnostic testing, federal regulation, 53–56
Genetic Technologies Limited (GTG), 155
Genetics Institute, Inc. v. Kirin-Amgen, Inc., 153
Gibson-Homans Co. v. Wall-Tite Inc., 3
GlaxoSmithKline v. Classen Immunotherapies, Inc., 53
Global Patent Holdings, LLC v. Panthers BRHC LLC, 186
Golden Hour Data Systems, Inc. v. ems Charts, Inc., 186
Graham v. John Deere Co., 9, 107
GTG. *See* Genetic Technologies Limited
Gunter v. Stream, 81
- H**
- Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. v. M-I LLC*, 13
Harvard/OncoMouse case, 38, 216

Index

Hatch–Waxman Act, 47–53, 60–63, 71, 74, 175, 189,
192–198
Hess v. Advanced Cardiovascular Systems, Inc., 85
Hilmer doctrine, 19–20
Hobbs v. U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 84
Hoechst Aktiengesellschaft v. Quigg, 18
Huang v. California Institute of Technology, 86
Human embryonic stem cell. *See* Stem cell patentability
HUMIRA, 95–96
Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., 6, 11–12

I

India. *See* Traditional knowledge
Inherent anticipation
 inherency rejections, prevention and response,
 123–124
 inherent properties, 118–120
 intended use, 120–123
 standard, 116–118
Innova, 198
Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd. v. Merck KGaA, 49
Inter partes review (IPR), 33–36
*International Stem Cell Corporation v. Comptroller
 General of Patents*, 220
In re Antor Media Corp., 9
In re Bell, 105–106
In re Bergstrom, 131
In re Bergy, 210
In re Best, 124
In re Bilski, 121, 240
In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litigation, 63–64
In re Ciprofloxacin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litigation, 66
In re Gosteli, 148
In re Grasselli, 116
In re Greenfield and Dupont, 110
In re Katz, 89
In re K-Dur Antitrust litigation, 62, 69
In re King, 117
In re Linder, 110
In re Marden, 131
In re May, 117
In re Montgomery, 122
In re Oelrich, 116
In re Omeprazole Litigation, 119, 123
In re Rijckaert, 124
In re Seaborg, 119
In re Spada, 117
In re Sullivan, 108
In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litigation, 65
In re Tiffin, 110
Inventorship
 America Invents Act, 90
 authorship comparison, 88–89
 collaborations, 86–88
 correction in pending applications, 90–91

 corroboration, 88–89
 experimentation and conceptions, 82–83
 general concepts, 80–81
 knockout gene, 89–90
 overview, 79–80
 quality of contribution, 84–86
 timing of inventive contribution, 81–82
IP Innovation v. Red Hat, Inc., 86
IPR. *See* *Inter partes* review

J

Jamesbury Corp. v. United States, 80
Jansen v. Rexall Sundown, Inc., 111
Jedi Master Mixer (JMM), 27–29
*J.E.M. Ag Supply, Inc., dba Farm Advantage, Inc. et al. v.
 Pioneer Hibred International, Inc.*, 238
JMM. *See* Jedi Master Mixer
Joint research agreement (JRA), 16, 24, 26
JRA. *See* Joint research agreement
Juicy Whip, Inc. v. Orange Bang, Inc., 5

K

*Kimberly-Clark Corp. v. Proctor & Gamble Distributing
 Co.*, 84, 86
King Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eon Labs, Inc., 120, 123
*Kingdom of the Netherlands v. Council of the European
 Union*, 141
*Kirin-Amgen, Inc. v. Board of Regents of University of
 Washington and Genetics Institute, Inc.*,
 153
KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 9, 104–106

L

Larisey v. U.S., 2
Limelight Networks, Inc. v. Akamai Technologies, Inc., 186
Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 11
Loratadine, 119

M

Madey v. Duke University, 190, 192
MAGE-C1, 160
MAGE-C2, 160
Manny v. Garlick, 88
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), 4, 116,
179
*Mayo Collaborative Services et al. v. Prometheus
 Laboratories, Inc.*, 130, 164, 167–168,
170–173, 176–177, 185, 210–213,
240–241
McKesson Technologies, Inc. v. Epic Systems Corp., 186
Medimmune Ltd. v. Novartis Pharmaceuticals, 146
Mehl/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum, 124

Memry Corp. v. Kentucky Oil Technology, 87
Merck & Co. v. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., 166
Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd.,
48–50, 194
*Metabolite Laboratories, Inc. v. Laboratory Corp. of
America Holdings*, 117
*Metallizing Engineering Co. v. Kenyon Bearing & Auto
Parts Co.*, 18
Mikus v. Wachtel, 88
*Momenta Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Amphastar
Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 50–53, 196–197
Monsanto Co. v. Kamp, 84
Monsanto Co. v. Stauffer Chemical Co., 205
Monsanto Technology v. Cargill International, 157
MPEP. *See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure*
Muniauction, Inc. v. Thomson Corp., 186

N

NAIL, 106
*National Research Development Corporation v.
Commissioner of Patents*, 156–157,
227–228
Nonobviousness
DNA patents, 105–107
new indications for old drugs, 111
obvious versus nonobvious invention, 107–108
overview, 9–10, 103–105
person having ordinary skill, 107
small molecule obviousness, 111–113
unexpected results, 109–110
Novelty
European Patent Convention, 40–41
European Union patentability of genes, 144–145
patent, 7–9
Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS,
98–99

O

Obviousness. *See* Nonobviousness
Oka v. Youssefyeh, 82–83
Optical spray analyzer (OSA), 198
O'Reilly v. Morse, 85
*Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. v. Mylan
Laboratories, Inc.*, 112
OSA. *See* Optical spray analyzer

P

p38. *See* NAIL
Pacesetter, Inc. v. Nervicon Co., 265
Pannu v. Iolab Corp., 6, 84
Parke-Davis & Co. v. H.K. Mulford Co., 128, 165
Paroxetine, 118
Patent

definition, 3–4
disclosure and claiming
claim requirements in Section 112, 12–13
overview, 10
specification requirements in Section 112, 10–12
eligible products, 5, 164
eligible recipients, 5–7
federal law and jurisdiction, 4–5, 235–236
nonobviousness. *See* Nonobviousness
novelty of invention, 7–9
research use exemption. *See* Experimental use
exemption
self-replicating technologies, 235–242
stem cell. *See* Stem cell patentability
trade secret comparison, 3, 279–281
types, 4
Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), 19, 149
Patent Register, Canada
Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, 77
generic products, 77
listing of patents
eligible claims and relevance requirements, 76–77
eligible drug submissions, 76
timing requirements, 76
Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance)
Regulations, 75–77
Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), 34–36
Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance)
Regulations. *See* Patent Register, Canada
Patents (Amendment) Act, India, 247–248
Patents Act, Australia, 159, 227, 229–231
PCT. *See* Patent Cooperation Treaty
Perricone v. Medicis Pharmaceutical Corporation,
121–122, 124
Personal Genomic Services (PGS), 24–25
PGR. *See* Post-grant review
PGS. *See* Personal Genomic Services
Pioglitazone, 112
Plant Patent Act, 236–237
Plant Variety Protection Act (PVPA), 236–238
Post-grant review (PGR), 33–36
Pozzoli v. BDMO, 145
Price v. Symsek, 88
Prior art
America Invents Act
definition
implications, 22
Section 102(a)(1), 17–18
Section 102(a)(2), 19–21
exceptions
implications, 22–23
Section 102(b)(1), 21–22
Section 102(b)(2), 22
avoidance in claim drafting, 186
Prohibition of Human Cloning Act, 230
Prometheus Labs, Inc. v. Mayo Collaborative Services, 5

Index

Protonix, 112

Proveris Scientific Corp. v. InnovaSystems, Inc., 198

PTAB. *See* Patent Trial and Appeal Board

Purdue Pharma LP v. Faulding, Inc., 11

PVPA. *See* Plant Variety Protection Act

R

Rapoport v. Dement, 111

The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 94

Restatement of the Law of Unfair Competition, 2

Rey-Bellet v. Engelhardt, 83

RGD peptides, 194

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 3

Roche Products, Inc. v. Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., 48, 190

Roche v. Bolar, 190–192

Rockwell Graphic Systems, Inc. v. DEV Industries, Inc., 268–269

Roundup Ready soybeans, 238

Rubin v. General Hospital Corp., 87

S

Sandt Technology, Ltd. v. Resco Metal & Plastics Corp., 87

Sanofi-Aventis v. Pfizer Inc., 83, 99–100

Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, 117, 124

Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 116–118

Schering-Plough Corporation v. Federal Trade Commission, 60, 66

Seagate Technology, LLC v. Western Digital Corp., 265

SEC. *See* Service Engineering Corp.

Service Engineering Corp. (SEC), 191

Shatterproof Glass Corp. v. Libbey-Owens Ford Co., 84

Sherman Act, 63

SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp., 118

State Street Bank & Trust v. Signature Financial Group, 239–240

Stem cell patentability

Australia

embryonic stem cell, 225–226

adult stem cell, 226–227

patentable inventions, 227–220

statutory conclusions, 229–231

prospects, 231–232

Europe

human embryonic stem cells, 218–224

law development, 216–218

overview, 215–216

prospects, 224

United States

changing landscape, 210–211

legal challenges, 213–214

statutory framework, 209–210

USPTO guidance, 211–213

Symantec Corp. v. Computer Associates, Int'l, Inc., 6

T

Takeda Chemical Industries v. Alphapharm Pty, Ltd., 112

TBGRI. *See* Tropical Botanical Garden and Research Institute

TFP. *See* Tissue factor protein

Therasense Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co., 13, 117

Tilghman v. Proctor, 124

Tissue factor protein (TFP), 147

TK. *See* Traditional knowledge

Tol-o-matic, Inc. v. Proma Product-und Marketing Gesellschaft, 5

Topiramate, 112

Trade secret

Canada

duration of trade secret and loss of rights, 277

employees

absent agreement, 278–279

express agreement, 279

incoming employees and collaborations, 279

enforcement

damages, 281–282

injunction, 282

overview, 275–276

patent comparison, 279–281

rights, 277–278

trade knowledge comparison, 276–277

defenses, 271–274

definition, 1–2, 266–269

misappropriation, 269–271

overview, 265–266

patent comparison, 3

protection, 2–3

remedies, 271

Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 140–141, 150, 181, 217, 232, 243

Traditional knowledge (TK)

Biological Diversity Act, 248–250

overview, 243–244

Patents (Amendment) Act, 247–248

protection as property

defensive protection, 247–248

disclosure of geographic origin of biological material, 248

positive prevention, 246–247

prospects, 250

rationale, 245–246

Traditional Knowledge Digital Library, 247–248

traditional cultural expressions, 244–245

TRIPS. *See* Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

Tropical Botanical Garden and Research Institute (TBGRI), 244–245

Trovan, Ltd. v. Sokyamat SA, 88

23andMe, 24–26

U

- Ultra-Precision Manufacturing, Ltd. v. Ford Motor Co.*, 86
- Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA), 2–3, 266–267, 270–271
- Unilever PLC v. Procter & Gamble, Inc.*, 128
- United Carbon v. Binney & Smith Co.*, 12
- University of Pittsburgh v. Hedrick*, 81–82
- University–industry partnership. *See* Biotechnology licensing agreement
- Use of Embryos/Warf* case, 219
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), 3–4, 13, 17–18, 21, 28, 31–32, 34, 83, 88, 90–91, 104–106, 115, 123, 168, 176, 178–182, 211–213
- USPTO. *See* U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
- Utility patents
 - living things, 237
 - plants, 238
- UTSA. *See* Uniform Trade Secrets Act

V

- Valley Drug Company v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 64
- Viagra, 111
- Vioxx, 129
- Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Solutions, Inc.*, 18

W

- WARF. *See* Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation
- WARF/*Thompson* case, 40
- WDR. *See* Written description requirement
- Wells v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.*, 129
- Windsurfing v. Tabaur Marine*, 145
- Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF), 213–214
- Woodland Trust v. Flowertree Nursery, Inc.*, 88
- Written description requirement (WDR)
 - Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 93–95
 - Boston Scientific Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson*, 96–97
 - Centocor Ortho Biotech, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories*, 95–96
 - evolution, 100–101
 - Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS*, 98–99
 - Sanofi-Aventis v. Pfizer Inc.*, 99–100
 - Wyeth v. Abbott Laboratories*, 97–98
- Wyeth v. Abbott Laboratories*, 97–98

Y

- Yield Dynamics, Inc. v. Tea Systems Corp.*, 269
- Yvonne D'Arcy v. Myriad Genetics Inc. & Anor*, 157

This is a free sample of content from Intellectual Property in Molecular Medicine.
[Click here](#) for more information on how to buy the book.