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What Does “Pay-for-Delay” (aka “Reverse Payment”) Settlement Mean?

- FTC created this terminology

- Context:
  - Brand-Generic Paragraph IV patent settlement

- Parties settle their case whereby:
  - Generic agrees to refrain from going to market until an agreed-upon date, and
  - Brand makes “payment” to generic or provides other consideration (e.g., “side deals”, no authorized generic agreement)
The FTC’s View:
Incentives to Pay to Delay Generic Entry
FTC/Plaintiffs’ Theory of Anticompetitive Harm

- Parties should be able to reach settlement with patent split based upon their objective views of the patent merits
- If compensation to generic is introduced into the settlement, the entry date (the patent split) must move to a later date in exchange for the compensation
- This delays generic entry and results in consumer harm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Patent Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The History of “Pay-For-Delay”

- FTC Starts Investigating (Late 90s)
- First Private Suit (Cardizem) (August 1998)
- FTC v. Cephalon Filed (April 2008)
- FTC v. Actavis Filed (Jan. 2009)
- FTC Schering Decision (Dec. 2003)
- 6th Cir. Cardizem “Per Se” Decision (June 2003)
- 2nd Cir. Tamoxifen “Scope of Patent” Decision (May 2005)
- 3rd Cir. K-Dur “Presumption of Illegality” Decision (July 2012)
- 11th Cir. Schering “Scope of Patent” Decision (March 2005)
- Supreme Court Actavis Decision (June 2013)
Edith Ramirez, Chairwoman (Democrat)

“We look forward to moving ahead with the Actavis litigation and showing that the settlements violate antitrust law. We also are studying the Court’s decision and assessing how best to protect consumers’ interests in other pay for delay cases. Fighting anticompetitive patent settlements has been a priority for the Commission beginning under the Chairmanships of Robert Pitofsky, through Timothy J. Muris, Deborah Platt Majoras, William E. Kovacic, and culminating under the leadership of Chairman Jon Leibowitz.”

Statement of FTC Chairwoman Edith Ramirez on the U.S. Supreme Court’s Decision in FTC v. Actavis, Inc.

“The Actavis decision is an important milestone, but the commission's work is hardly over . . . Pay-for-delay settlements will not disappear.”

Statement of FTC Chairwoman Edith Ramirez while testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee as part of a panel entitled “Pay-for-Delay Deals: Limiting Competition and Costing Consumers,” July 23, 2013.

“The Supreme Court’s decision in Actavis confirms that [reverse payment] settlements harm consumers and competition, and the Commission will continue to aggressively prosecute these anticompetitive settlements.”

Written testimony of FTC Chairwoman Edith Ramirez before the Senate Judiciary Committee, July 23, 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Year of Suit</th>
<th>Plaintiff</th>
<th>Size of Market*</th>
<th>Size of Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTC v. Actavis</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FTC/Private</td>
<td>$400 M</td>
<td>$100 M (approx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In re Modafinil</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>FTC/Private</td>
<td>$800 M</td>
<td>$200 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTC v. Schering-Plough</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>FTC/Private</td>
<td>$220 M</td>
<td>$60 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In re Lamictal</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$2 B</td>
<td>“No AG” agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In re Lipitor Antitrust Litigation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$10.7 B</td>
<td>Sales Outside US and other payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In re Effexor Antitrust Litigation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$537 M</td>
<td>“No AG” agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Re Nexium</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$3 B</td>
<td>Supply agreement and other compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niaspan</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$1.03 B</td>
<td>Supply and promotion agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loestrin 24</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$389 M</td>
<td>Unknown Amount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Annually at the time of the settlement.