



---

<sup>1</sup> This written statement represents the views of the Federal Trade Commission. My oral presentation and responses to questions are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission or of any Commissioner.

<sup>2</sup> Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984, Pub. L. No. 98-417, 98 Stat. 1585 (1984) (codified as amended 21 U.S.C. § 355 (1994)). For a discussion of the Act's statutory background, see "Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs: The Benefits of a Legislative Solution to Anticompetitive Settlements in the Pharmaceutical Industry," FTC Testimony before the Subcommittee on Trade, Commerce, and Consumer Protection, Committee on Energy and Commerce (May 2, 2007) at 8-9, *available at* [http://ftc.gov/os/testimony/P859910%20Protecting\\_Consume\\_%20Access\\_testimony.pdf](http://ftc.gov/os/testimony/P859910%20Protecting_Consume_%20Access_testimony.pdf).

to the Hatch-Waxman setting, threaten to extinguish that benefit. Therefore, congressional action to prohibit these costly and anticompetitive settlements is both appropriate and timely.

The FTC has sought to use antitrust enforcement to stop “pay-for-delay settlements” (also known as “exclusion payment” or “reverse payment” settlements). These are settlements of patent litigation in which the brand-name drug firm pays its potential generic competitor to abandon a patent challenge and delay entering the market with a lower cost, generic product. Such settlements effectively buy more protection from competition than the assertion of the patent alone provides. And they do so at the expense of consumers, whose access to lower-priced, generic drugs is delayed, sometimes for many years.

Agreements to eliminate potential competition and share the resulting profits are at the core of what the antitrust laws proscribe, and for that reason these pay-for-delay settlements should be prohibited under the antitrust laws. But since 2005, court decisions have taken a lenient approach to such agreements in drug patent settlements. As a result, it has become increasingly difficult to bring antitrust cases to stop pay-for-delay settlements, and such settlements have become a common industry strategy. As one investment analyst report put it, the courts’ permissive approach to exclusion payments has “opened a Pandora’s box of settlements.”<sup>3</sup>

The implications of these developments are extremely troubling. The increased costs resulting from anticompetitive agreements that delay generic competition harm all those who pay for prescription drugs: individual consumers, the federal government, state governments

---

<sup>3</sup> Stephanie Kirchgaessner & Patti Waldmeir, *Drug Patent Payoffs Bring a Scrutiny of Side-Effects*, FINANCIAL TIMES UK, Apr. 25, 2006, 2006 WLNR 6910048 (quoting S.G. Cowen & Co. analyst’s report describing the Eleventh Circuit’s opinion in *Schering-Plough Corp. v. FTC*, 402 F.3d 1056 (11th Cir. 2005), *cert. denied*, 548 U.S. 919 (2006)).

trying to provide access to health care with limited public funds, and American businesses striving to compete in a global economy. The federal government is particularly affected: Federal dollars accounted for an estimated 31 percent of the \$235 billion spent on prescription drugs in 2008, and that share is expected to rise to 40 percent by 2018.<sup>4</sup>

To be sure, the development of new drugs is risky and costly, and preserving incentives to undertake this task is critically important. Due regard for patent rights is thus a fundamental premise of the Hatch-Waxman Act's framework. But the court decisions allowing pay-for-delay settlements grant holders of drug patents the ability to buy protection from competition based only on an allegation of infringement – more protection than congressionally-granted patent rights afford. These rulings disrupt the careful balance between patent protections and encouraging generic drug entry that Congress sought to achieve in the Hatch-Waxman Act.

For these reasons, the Commission strongly supports H.R. 1706, which would prohibit these anticompetitive settlements.<sup>5</sup> And we are encouraged that the list of those speaking out against pay-for-delay settlements is growing. President Obama's budget proposal expresses the Administration's opposition to these anticompetitive deals,<sup>6</sup> and Assistant Attorney General

---

<sup>4</sup> Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Office of the Actuary, Table 11, *Prescription Drug Expenditures; Aggregate and per Capita Amounts, Percent Distribution and Annual Percent Change by Source of Funds: Calendar Years 2003-2018* (2009), available at <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NationalHealthExpendData/downloads/proj2008.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate. See *Preserve Access to Affordable Generics Act*, S. 369, 111<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2009).

<sup>6</sup> President Obama explained in his recent budget that “The Administration will prevent drug companies from blocking generic drugs from consumers by prohibiting anticompetitive agreements and collusion between brand name and generic drug manufacturers intended to keep generic drugs off the market.” OFFICE OF MGMT. & BUDGET, EXEC. OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, FISCAL YEAR 2010 (2009) (proposed), at 28, available at [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/fy2010\\_new\\_era/A\\_New\\_Era\\_of\\_Responsibility2.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/fy2010_new_era/A_New_Era_of_Responsibility2.pdf).

Christine Varney has testified that she supports stopping them.<sup>7</sup> In addition, this past summer the American Medical Association House of Delegates adopted a resolution announcing its opposition to pay-for-delay settlements.<sup>8</sup>

As is discussed below, the Commission is continuing to bring cases challenging pay-for-delay settlements despite the difficulties created by several recent court decisions. But we believe there are compelling reasons for Congress to act to stop such anticompetitive agreements and that the approach taken in H.R. 1706 is sound.

## I. The Need for a Legislative Solution

Legislation can provide a comprehensive solution to a problem that is prevalent, extremely costly, and subverts the goals of the Hatch-Waxman Act.

### A. Permissive court decisions have made pay-for-delay settlements commonplace in Hatch-Waxman patent cases

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals held in 2003 that a branded drug firm's exclusion payments to a generic firm that had filed a patent challenge were per se unlawful, noting:

it is one thing to take advantage of a monopoly that naturally arises from a patent, but another thing altogether to bolster the patent's effectiveness in inhibiting competitors by paying the only potential competitor \$40 million per year to stay out of the market.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> In response to a question in her recent confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Ms. Varney testified that she supported opposition to "reverse payments" and would work to "align" the positions of the Department of Justice and the FTC. *Executive Nominations: Hearing Before the S. Judiciary Comm.*, 111th Cong. 38-39 (2009) (exchange between Sen. Herb Kohl, Member, S. Judiciary Comm., and Christine Anne Varney, Nominee, Assistant Att'y Gen., Antitrust Division, Department of Justice).

<sup>8</sup> At its 2008 annual meeting, the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association adopted Resolution 520 concerning "'Pay for Delay' Arrangements by Pharmaceutical Companies" and resolved "that our American Medical Association support the Federal Trade Commission in its efforts to stop 'pay for delay' arrangements by pharmaceutical companies," *available at* <http://www.ama-assn.org/ama1/pub/upload/mm/38/a08resolutions.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> *In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.*, 332 F.3d 896, 908 (6th Cir. 2003).

---

until patent expiration.<sup>15</sup> Plaintiffs have asked the Supreme Court to review the *Cipro* decision, and we believe the Court should do so.<sup>16</sup>

The Commission believes that the courts' permissive approaches in *Cipro*, *Tamoxifen*, and *Schering* are misguided and not supported by the law. These holdings disrupt the carefully balanced patent system by overprotecting weak and narrow patents; allowing patent holders to buy protection that their patents cannot provide; and ignoring consumers' interests in competition safeguarded by the antitrust laws. The Commission is not the only advocate to voice concern about the harmful effects of these decisions. Former Solicitor General Paul Clement criticized the standard set forth in *Tamoxifen* as "erroneous" and "insufficiently stringent . . . for scrutinizing patent settlements."<sup>17</sup> The Solicitor General observed that "[t]he interests in consumer welfare protected by the antitrust laws militate against adoption of a legal standard that would facilitate a patent holder's efforts to preserve a weak patent by dividing its monopoly profits with an alleged infringer."<sup>18</sup> Forty-one legal scholars, economics professors, and other academics likewise deemed the *Tamoxifen* standard to be "far outside the mainstream

---

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 1336. Bayer had settled patent litigation with the manufacturer of a generic counterpart, Barr, by making periodic payments to Barr ultimately totaling almost \$400 million in exchange for Barr's agreement to delay marketing its generic version of Cipro for almost seven years. The Commission filed an amicus brief in *Cipro* that urged the Federal Circuit to allow an antitrust challenge to the patent settlement to proceed to trial, *available at* <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2008/01/ciprobrief.pdf>.

<sup>16</sup> *See Ark. Carpenters Health & Welfare Fund, et al., v. Bayer AG, et al.*, \_\_\_ U.S.L.W. \_\_\_ (U.S. Mar. 23, 2009) (No. 08-1194).

<sup>17</sup> Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae at 17, *Joblove v. Barr Labs., Inc.*, 127 U.S. 3001 (2007) (No. 06-830) ("U.S. Tamoxifen Br."), *available at* <http://www.usdoj.gov/osg/briefs/2006/2pet/6invt/2006-0830.pet.ami.inv.pdf>.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 11.

---

<sup>19</sup> Brief Amici Curiae of 41 Professors of Economics, Business and Law in Support of Granting the Petition at 2, *Joblove v. Barr Labs, Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 3001 (2007) (No. 06-830), available at [http://www.orangebookblog.com/Tamoxifen\\_20cert\\_20final\\_20brief.pdf](http://www.orangebookblog.com/Tamoxifen_20cert_20final_20brief.pdf).

<sup>20</sup> At the time the agency testified before you on May 2, 2007, the Commission had already challenged the following patent settlements: *Abbott Labs.*, Dkt. No. C-3945 (May 22, 2000) (consent order), complaint available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2000/05/c3945complaint.htm>; *Geneva Pharms., Inc.*, Dkt. No. C-3946 (May 22, 2000) (consent order), complaint available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2000/05/c3946complaint.htm>; *Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.*, Dkt. No. 9293 (May 8, 2001) (consent order), complaint available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2000/03/hoechstadrxcomplaint.htm>; *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, Dkt. No. C-4076, (April 18, 2003), complaint available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/caselist/c4076.htm>. The consent order in *Abbott Laboratories* is available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2000/03/abbot.do.htm>. The consent order in *Geneva Pharmaceuticals* is available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2000/03/genevad&o.htm>. The consent order in *Hoechst/Andrx* is available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2001/05/hoechstdo.htm>. The consent order in *Bristol-Myers Squibb* is available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2003/04/bristolmyerssquibbdo.pdf>. See also *Schering-Plough Corp.*, 2003 FTC LEXIS 187 (FTC Dec. 8, 2003), *vacated*, 402 F.3d 1056 (11 Cir. 2005), *cert. denied*, 126 S. Ct. 2929 (2006); *Schering-Plough Corp., Upsher-Smith Labs., and American Home Products Corp.*, Dkt. No. 9297 (Apr. 2, 2002) (consent order as to American Home Products).



collectively to settle patent litigation with four manufacturers of generic versions of Provigil to induce them to abandon their plans to sell generic Provigil for six years, until 2012. Cephalon's CEO observed shortly after entering these agreements: "We were able to get six more years of patent protection. *That's \$4 billion in sales that no one expected.*"<sup>22</sup> Cephalon has asked the court to dismiss the case based on the permissive standard adopted by appellate decisions in other circuits. There has been no action on the motion to dismiss, which was fully briefed in June 2008. In the meantime, Cephalon has instituted two price increases on Provigil since the Commission filed its complaint.

In the second case, the Commission has challenged patent settlement agreements in which Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc. agreed to pay generic drug makers Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Par Pharmaceutical Companies, Inc., to delay generic competition to Solvay's branded drug AndroGel.<sup>23</sup> According to the February 2009 complaint, Solvay promised payments of hundreds of millions of dollars collectively to induce the generic companies to abandon their patent challenges and agree to forbear bringing a generic AndroGel product to market for nine years, until 2015. Although the case was filed in California, where one of the four defendants is headquartered, at the request of the defendants the California court transferred the case to the Northern District of Georgia. As a result, the law of the Eleventh Circuit, which issued the *Schering* decision, will govern the case.

Despite the Commission's ongoing antitrust enforcement efforts to stop pay-for-delay settlements, the appellate court decisions upholding their legality have prompted a resurgence in

---

<sup>22</sup> John George, *Hurdles Ahead for Cephalon*, PHILADELPHIA BUSINESS JOURNAL, March 17, 2006 (quoting Cephalon CEO Frank Baldino) (emphasis added).

<sup>23</sup> *FTC v. Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, No. 09-00598 (C.D. Cal. first amended complaint filed Jan. 12, 2009), available at <http://www2.ftc.gov/os/caselist/0710060/090212amendedcmpt.pdf>.

settlements in which the parties settle with a payment to the generic company and an agreement by the generic company not to market its product. Settlements with payments to the generic patent challenger had essentially stopped in the wake of antitrust enforcement by the FTC, state attorneys general, and private parties during 2000 through 2004. But the recent appellate court decisions have triggered a disturbing new trend.

After a five-year hiatus in payments to generics following the initiation of Commission enforcement actions aimed at pay-for-delay settlements, they have become commonplace.<sup>24</sup> By the end of fiscal year 2005, the year of the Eleventh Circuit's decision in *Schering*, there were three such settlements. In the years after the *Schering* and *Tamoxifen* rulings came out, there were significantly more. The staff's analysis of settlements filed under the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 during the fiscal year ending in September 2007 found that almost half of all of the final patent settlements (14 of 33) involved compensation to the generic patent challenger and an agreement by the generic firm to refrain from launching its product for some period of time.

Moreover, the findings concerning settlements with first generic filers – that is, settlements that can serve to block FDA approval of later applicants<sup>25</sup> – are even more striking. Since 2005, 69 percent (22 of 32) of the settlements with first generic filers involved a payment to the generic challenger and a restriction on generic entry.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Bureau of Competition Report, Federal Trade Commission, *Agreements Filed with the Federal Trade Commission under the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003: Summary of Agreements Filed in FY 2005: A Report by the Bureau of Competition* (Apr. 2006), available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2006/04/fy2005drugsettlementsrpt.pdf>.

<sup>25</sup> Further discussed, *infra*, Section IV.

<sup>26</sup> Bureau of Competition Report, Federal Trade Commission, *Agreements Filed with the Federal Trade Commission under the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003: Summary of Agreements Filed in FY 2007: A Report by the Bureau of Competition* (May 2008), available at

- B. The profitability of delaying generic entry means that these agreements will become more prevalent

In the current legal climate, there is every reason to expect the upsurge in such settlements to continue, and early entry of generics under Hatch-Waxman to decline. Why? Because pay-for-delay settlements are highly profitable for both brand-name and generic firms. If such payments are permissible, companies have compelling incentives to use them.

Although patent challenges have the potential for substantial consumer savings, the competitive dynamic between brand-name drugs and their generic equivalents creates an incentive for brand and generic manufacturers to conspire to avoid competition and share the resulting profits. The reason is simple: in nearly any case in which generic entry is contemplated, the profit that the generic anticipates will be much less than the amount of profit the brand-name drug company stands to lose from the same sales. This is because the generic firm sells at a significant discount off the price of the brand-name product. The difference between the brand's loss and the generic's gain is the money consumers save.

Consequently, it will typically be more profitable for both parties if the brand-name manufacturer pays the generic manufacturer – an amount less than the brand-name manufacturer would have lost and more than the generic would have gained – to settle the patent dispute and the latter agrees to defer entry. As is illustrated below, by eliminating the potential for competition, the parties can share the consumer savings that would result if they

---

<http://www.ftc.gov/os/2008/05/mmaact.pdf>; Bureau of Competition Report, Federal Trade Commission, *Agreements Filed with the Federal Trade Commission under the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003: Summary of Agreements Filed in FY 2006: A Report by the Bureau of Competition* (Apr. 2007), available at <http://www.ftc.gov/reports/mmaact/MMAreport2006.pdf>; Bureau of Competition Report, Federal Trade Commission, *Agreements Filed with the Federal Trade Commission under the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003: Summary of Agreements Filed in FY 2005: A Report by the Bureau of Competition* (Apr. 2006), available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2006/04/fy2005drugsettlementsrpt.pdf>.

were to compete. In other words, these settlements are harmful because the parties are resolving their dispute at the expense of consumers. Although both the brand-name companies and generic firms are better off with such settlements, consumers lose the possibility of earlier generic entry, which may occur either because (1) the generic company would have prevailed in the lawsuit (as noted in Section I.C., *infra*, the FTC's Generic Drug Study found generic challengers enjoyed a success rate in excess of 70 percent), or (2) because the parties would have negotiated a settlement with an earlier entry date absent the payment (i.e., the payment

C. Pay-for-delay settlements impose enormous costs on consumers and the health care system

Generic drugs play a crucial role in containing rising prescription drug costs by offering consumers therapeutically-identical alternatives to brand-name drugs at a significantly reduced cost. Although it is well known that the use of generic drugs – which are priced 20 to 80 percent or more below the price of the branded drug<sup>27</sup> – provides substantial savings, what is not so well known is the important role that generic drug firms’ patent challenges play in delivering savings to consumers.

One of the key steps Congress took in the Hatch-Waxman Act to promote more rapid introduction of generics was establishing special rules and procedures to encourage firms seeking approval of generic drugs to challenge invalid or narrow patents on branded drugs. Experience has borne out the premise of the Hatch-Waxman patent challenge framework: that

---

<sup>27</sup> See Congressional Budget Office, *How Increased Competition from Generic Drugs Has Affected Prices and Returns in the Pharmaceutical Industry* (July 1998), available at <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=655&sequence=0> (hereinafter “CBO Study”).

<sup>28</sup> See, e.g., *Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Amphastar Pharms., Inc.*, No. 2007-1280, 2008 WL 2039065 (Fed. Cir. May 14, 2008) (patents covering blood-clotting drug Lovenox held unenforceable), *petition for cert. filed*, 77 U.S.L.W. 3441 (U.S. Jan. 23, 2009) (No. 08-937); *Aventis Pharma Deutschland GmbH v. Lupin Ltd.*, 499 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (patent covering high blood pressure drug Altace found invalid); *Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Apotex Inc.*, 501 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (patent covering method of treating ear infections with ofloxacin held invalid); *Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.*, 480 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (patent covering hypertension drug Norvasc held invalid); *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 439 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (product-by-process patent covering anti-depressant drug Paxil was invalid); *Alza Corp. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.*, 464 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (claims of patent related to extended release urinary incontinence drug Ditropan XL held invalid and not infringed).



spent on prescription drugs in 2008, a share that is expected to rise to 40 percent by 2018.<sup>33</sup> Many of the top-selling prescription drugs in the United States – including such blockbusters as the asthma/allergy drug Singulair, the deep vein thrombosis (blood clot) and pulmonary embolism treatment Lovenox, and the schizophrenia, bipolar, and depression drug Abilify – are currently the subject of patent challenges by generic firms seeking to enter the market under the provisions of the Hatch-Waxman Act. The prospective cost savings to consumers and taxpayers from such challenges is enormous, to the extent that they lead to early, non-infringing generic entry. But given the lenient case law in some circuits, the parties have a strong economic incentive to enter into highly profitable anticompetitive settlements that deprive consumers of the benefit of low-cost, non-infringing generic drugs.

Prozac provides a telling example of what will be lost if brand and generic companies can enter pay-for-delay settlements. In the course of the Prozac patent litigation, the generic challenger reportedly asked to be paid \$200 million to drop its patent challenge. The brand company rejected the idea, stating that such a settlement would violate the antitrust laws.<sup>34</sup> The generic ultimately won that patent litigation, and consumers – as well as federal and state governments – saved over two billion dollars.<sup>35</sup> Under the legal standard articulated in the *Schering*, *Tamoxifen*, and *Cipro* cases, however, the proposed settlement would have been legal and profitable for both parties. The parties would have had every reason to enter the agreement,

---

<sup>33</sup> Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Office of the Actuary, Table 11, *Prescription Drug Expenditures; Aggregate and per Capita Amounts, Percent Distribution and Annual Percent Change by Source of Funds: Calendar Years 2003-2018* (2009), available at <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NationalHealthExpendData/downloads/proj2008.pdf>.

<sup>34</sup> Bethany McLean, *A Bitter Pill*, FORTUNE, Aug. 13, 2001, at 5, available at [http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune\\_archive/2001/08/13/308077/index.htm](http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/2001/08/13/308077/index.htm).

<sup>35</sup> Kirchgaessner & Waldmeir, *supra* note 3.

generic Prozac entry would not have occurred until much later, and consumers and others would have paid the price.

#### D. Permissive legal treatment of pay-for-delay settlements undermines the Hatch-Waxman Act

The problem of pay-for-delay patent settlements has arisen in – and, to the FTC’s knowledge, only in – the context of the special statutory framework that Congress created with the Hatch-Waxman Act. Congress intended that the Hatch-Waxman Act would “make available more low cost generic drugs,” while fully protecting legitimate patent claims.<sup>36</sup> The special rules that apply in this area were designed to balance the two policy goals that are of critical significance in the pharmaceutical industry: speeding generic drugs to market and maintaining incentives for new drug development. Legislative action concerning pay-for-delay settlements can be tailored to the special circumstances of pharmaceutical patent settlements and help to ensure that this unique framework works as Congress intends.

Hatch-Waxman was designed to give generic companies an incentive to challenge weak patents and to compete, not to take money in exchange for sitting on the sidelines. But as one of the authors of the Act, Congressman Henry Waxman, has observed, because of pay-for-delay settlements, the law “has been turned on its head.”<sup>37</sup>

The reasoning underlying these permissive appellate court rulings underscores the need for action by Congress. These decisions reflect judicial judgments about the policy choice that Congress made in Hatch-Waxman. For example, the Eleventh Circuit’s *Schering* decision –

---

<sup>36</sup> H.R. Rep. No. 857, 98th Cong., 2nd Sess., Pt. 1 (1984), as reprinted in 1984 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2647, 2661.

<sup>37</sup> Cheryl Gay Stolberg et al., *Keeping Down the Competition; How Companies Stall Generics and Keep Themselves Healthy*, N.Y. TIMES, July 23, 2000, at A11 (quoting Rep. Waxman), available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/07/23/us/keeping-down-competition-companies-stall-generics-keep-themselves-healthy.html?sec=&spon=&pagewanted=all>.



which opined that the Hatch-Waxman framework Congress created gave generic firms “considerable leverage in patent litigation,” and could therefore “cost Schering its patent”<sup>38</sup> – emphasized that its decision was based on “policy.”<sup>39</sup> Congress, however, is the body with the responsibility to set patent policy. Striking the balance so as to promote innovation while also promoting generic entry is fundamentally a legislative choice. Accordingly, it is fitting that if courts have disturbed the balance Congress struck in Hatch-Waxman between patents and competition, Congress should address the use of exclusion payments in drug patent settlements to correct that balance.

E. Legislation is likely to be swifter and more comprehensive than litigation

While the Commission’s enforcement activities are continuing, we recognize the time and uncertainty involved in litigation challenges to anticompetitive settlements. The Commission’s *Provigil* case has been stalled at the district court level for over a year without progress, thus illustrating the delay that can arise in litigation. Although the Commission will continue to be vigilant in this area, litigating another case to conclusion will take years, and the outcome of such litigation is uncertain given the *Schering*, *Tamoxifen*, and *Cipro* decisions. In any event, such litigation will provide little relief for those harmed in the interim by not being afforded the option of a generic alternative. The cost to consumers, employers, and government programs will be substantial. Legislation could provide a speedier and more comprehensive way to address this pressing concern.

---

<sup>38</sup> 402 F.3d at 1074.

<sup>39</sup> *Id.* at 1076.

## II. The Arguments Against Barring Exclusion Payments Are Contradicted by Experience in the Market

In the debate over legislation to ban pay-for-delay settlements, certain arguments are routinely offered by supporters of these settlements: (1) such settlements typically allow generic entry before patent expiration and therefore benefit rather than harm consumers; (2) it is virtually impossible to settle Hatch-Waxman patent cases without payments to the generic challenger; and (3) barring such payment to generic firms will mean that fewer generic firms will undertake patent challenges. In the Commission's view, these arguments overlook market realities.

First, the suggestion that pay-for-delay patent settlements are procompetitive – by guaranteeing generic entry prior to the expiration of the disputed patent – is contrary to the Commission's experience. The *Provigil* case is a good example. The branded drug company, Cephalon, touted the “obvious benefits and efficiencies” of its settlement to the court on the ground that the settlement “permitted the [g]enerics to enter the market three years prior to the expiration of the [ ] patent.”<sup>40</sup> But Cephalon has told a very different story to its investors. Discussing its plan to switch sales from Provigil to a follow-on product, Cephalon's CEO stated, “if we do our job right . . . the Provigil number in 2012 [the date the settlement agreement permit the generics to enter the market] that will be genericized will be very, very small.”<sup>41</sup> As this example reveals, that a settlement permits generic entry before patent expiration in no way ensures that consumers will benefit from the settlement.

---

<sup>40</sup> Ceph. Mem. in Support of its Mtn. to Dismiss at 1, *FTC v. Cephalon, Inc.*, No. 08-2141 (E.D. Pa. Mem. filed May 5, 2008).

<sup>41</sup> Cephalon Q4 2008 Earnings Call Transcript at 9 (Feb. 13, 2009), *available at* <http://seekingalpha.com/article/87859-cephalon-inc-q2-2008-earnings-call>.

Second, experience does not support the contention that Hatch-Waxman cases can typically only be settled by the transfer of value from the patent holder to the generic challenger. On the contrary, the settlement data that the FTC has for the period from 2000 through 2004 indicate that parties can and do find other ways to settle cases. During that period of successful Commission enforcement, pay-for-delay settlements essentially stopped. But

---

<sup>42</sup> The agency lacks data for the approximately three year period between the end of the Generic Drug Study in 2000 and the beginning of the MMA reporting period in 2003. It is likely that there are additional settlements that occurred during this period for which the agency does not have information.

patent settlements in which the parties share monopoly profits preserved by delaying generic competition may increase the number of patent challenges that are filed, but it does not promote consumer access to generic drugs or cost savings.

### III. The Legislative Remedy

The Commission believes that certain principles are important in crafting the precise form and scope of a legislative remedy to the pay-for-delay settlements. The fundamental antitrust concern underlying such settlements is the sharing of monopoly profits that are preserved by an agreement not to compete, whatever form the compensation to the generic takes. Thus, legislation must be sufficiently broad to encompass the various ways that a branded firm may share its profits with the generic, including not only the ways we have seen to date, but also those that may arise in the future. At the same time, legislation should be designed to avoid unwarranted deterrence of settlements that present no competitive problem.

H.R.1706 embodies these principles. It broadly proscribes settlements in which a generic firm receives “anything of value” and agrees to refrain from selling the product, while also providing two mechanisms to prevent settlement avenues from being unduly limited and avoid chilling procompetitive settlements. First, section 2(b) contains express exclusions from the general prohibition on settlements in which the generic firm receives something of value and agrees to refrain from selling its product. Second, section 3 provides flexibility by authorizing the FTC to adopt rules to exempt other agreements from the general prohibition.

In sum, H.R. 1706 offers a straightforward means to quickly combat anticompetitive conduct that is pervasive and costly to consumers, while also providing flexibility to protect procompetitive arrangements.

## Conclusion

Thank you for this opportunity to share the Commission's views. The Commission looks forward to working with the Subcommittee to protect consumers from anticompetitive pay-for-delay settlements that cost consumers and the federal government billions of dollars.