

**Nos. 2011-17357, 2011-17373**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

---

**SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION D/B/A  
GLAXOSMITHKLINE,**

Plaintiff-Appellee/Cross-Appellant,

v.

**ABBOTT LABORATORIES,**

Defendant-Appellant/Cross-Appellee,

---

Appeal From The United States District Court For The  
Northern District of California  
In Case No. 4:07-cv-05702-CW, Judge Claudia Wilken

---

**OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR 30-DAY EXTENSION OF TIME TO  
PETITION FOR REHEARING AND FOR REHEARING EN BANC**

---

Brian J. Hennigan  
Alexander F. Wiles  
Andrew Ow  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, California 90067-4276  
Telephone: (310) 277-1010  
Facsimile: (310) 203-7199

Lisa S. Blatt  
Sarah M. Harris  
ARNOLD & PORTER LLP  
555 Twelfth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-1206  
Telephone: (202) 942-5842  
Facsimile: (202) 942-5999

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellee and Cross-Appellant SmithKline  
Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline

**OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

On January 21, 2014, this Court issued a published opinion finding for Plaintiff-Appellee and Cross-Appellant SmithKline Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline (“GSK”), reversing and remanding for a new trial. On January 22, 2014, Defendant-Appellant and Cross-Appellee Abbott Laboratories (“Abbott”) filed a motion for a 30-day extension of time to petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc (“Motion”). Dkt. 85-1. GSK respectfully opposes this Motion.

GSK opposes the Motion because GSK does not believe that Abbott’s offered reasons justify any delay, let alone an extension that would give Abbott more than triple the amount of time that parties ordinarily have to file a petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc. The events giving rise to this case occurred over a decade ago and this lawsuit was filed in 2007. Dkt 20-1, at 5-6. After extensive discovery, motion practice, and an attempt by Abbott to end the case with a petition to this Court for a writ of mandamus, trial occurred and a verdict was returned in March of 2011. *Id.* at 7, 69. After a mixed verdict, both parties appealed. *Id.* at 1.

Regular briefing occurred from February through July of 2012. Dkt. 14-1; Dkt. 20-1; Dkt. 39-1; Dkt. 42-1. On July 31, 2013, after the United States Supreme Court issued its opinion in *United States v. Windsor*, this Court directed the parties

to file supplemental briefs addressing the effect of *Windsor* on issues in this case. Dkt. 62. On August 14, 2013, the parties filed supplemental briefs and oral argument was held on September 18, 2013. Dkt. 71-1; Dkt. 73-1.

The timeline of this case demonstrates that Abbott has had more than enough time to evaluate its decision and options. The supplemental briefing covered the very basis for the opinion in this case and the relief granted; there were no surprises. This litigation should continue to proceed, not be continuously delayed. Accordingly, GSK respectfully opposes Abbott's Motion.

Dated: January 23, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

IRELL & MANELLA LLP

By: /s/ Brian J. Hennigan  
Brian J. Hennigan

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellee and Cross-Appellant SmithKline Beecham Corporation  
d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline

9th Circuit Case Number(s)

**NOTE:** To secure your input, you should print the filled-in form to PDF (File > Print > PDF Printer/Creator).

\*\*\*\*\*

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

#### When All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system on (date)  .

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

Signature (use "s/" format)

\*\*\*\*\*

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

#### When Not All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system on (date)  .

Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

I further certify that some of the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I have mailed the foregoing document by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it to a third party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following non-CM/ECF participants:

Matthew A. Campbell  
Jacob R. Loshin  
WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP  
1700 K Street N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Signature (use "s/" format)