

THREE NEW SQUARE

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY



**ANDREW
WAUGH QC**

Year of Call: 1982

Silk: 1998

“He’s pretty much at the top of the pile for big and important patent litigation.”

Chambers & Partners, 2013

PRACTICE AREA

Andrew Waugh has a general intellectual property practice embracing patents, supplementary protection certificates, copyright and designs, confidential information and inter-related aspects of EC law. His background has led to a particular emphasis on chemical, pharmaceutical and bio-technical/genetic engineering matters as well as a broader commercial practice, including arbitrations involving a significant scientific/technical content.

Tribunals in front of which Andrew Waugh most frequently appears include not only the Courts of England and Wales, both at first instance and appellate level, but also the Court of Justice of the European Union, the United Kingdom Trade Marks and Patent Office, the European Patent Office in Munich, the Hague and Berlin and the High Court in Dublin. A list of the principal cases in which Andrew Waugh has appeared both in the UK and in the European Patent Office is at the end of this resume.

EDUCATION

- Graduated in 1980 from the City University, London with a first class honours degree in Chemical and Administrative Studies which included subjects on vitamin chemistry, structure and reactivity correlations and materials science and a thesis on Pharmaceutical Research and Development.
- Post-graduate Diploma in law, 1981
- Called to the Bar, 1982
- Pupillage with Martin Moore-Bick, 1982, 3 Essex Court (The Chambers of Kenneth Rokison QC)
- Pupillage with Simon Thorley 1983, 6 Pump Court (The Chambers of William Aldous QC)
- Queen’s Counsel, 1998
- Admitted to the Irish Bar, 2010

DIRECTORY ENTRIES

“Very commercial and very tenacious, he’s good on his feet and drills into the points.” “An excellent QC for technically complex cases - he takes a very thorough approach.” Chambers and Partners, 2015

“Inspires confidence in clients” Legal 500, 2015

“Top 10 Most Highly Regarded Individuals” Who’s Who Legal: Patents, 2015

“a good listener who is very willing to take on board the views of those instructing him.” Legal 500, 2013

“He’s pretty much at the top of the pile for big and important patent litigation.” Chambers & Partners, 2013

“He’s very thorough, technical and hard-working.” Chambers & Partners, 2013

Intellectual Property Silk of the Year 2013, AI Awards

IP/IT Silk of the Year 2010, Chambers & Partners

IP/IT Silk of the Year 2009, Chambers & Partners

3 New Square, Lincoln’s Inn,
London WC2A 3RS

T +44 (0)20 7405 1111
F +44 (0)20 7405 7800
clerks@3newsquare.co.uk

LDE454

THREE NEW SQUARE

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY



**ANDREW
WAUGH QC**

Year of Call: 1982

Silk: 1998

PRINCIPAL CASES

Some of the technologies which he has considered in the course of contested patent litigation in the High Court (and the Court of Appeal and House of Lords) include:

- semi-conductor devices (General Instrument v. Intel)
- recombinant human growth hormone and insulin (Eli Lilly v. Genentech)
- microporous nylon membranes (Pall v. Commercial Hydraulics)
- cardiac catheters (Bonzel v. Intervention)
- thermoformed laminates (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing v. Rennicks)
- compact discs (Optical Recording Corp. v. Hayden Labs)
- recombinant hepatitis B vaccine (Biogen v. Medeva)
- flight simulators (Rediffusion Simulation v. Singer Link Miles)
- recombinant erythropoietin (Amgen v. Boehringer Mannheim)
- zantac (Glaxo v. Generics)
- ondansetron/gransitron (Glaxo v. SmithKline Beecham)
- terfenadine metabolites (Merrell Dow v. Norton)
- augmentin (SmithKline Beecham v. Norton)
- contact lenses (Optical Sciences v. Aspect Vision Care)
- acetic acid purification (Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. BP Chemicals)
- polyethylene production (Union Carbide Corp. v. BP Chemicals)
- endoluminal stents (Boston Scientific v. Palmaz)
- pertussis vaccines (pertactin) (Chiron v. Evans and SmithKline Beecham v. Connaught)
- paclitaxel (chemotherapy) (Bristol Myers Squibb v. Napro)
- Acesulphame-K (artificial sweeteners) (Nutrinova v. Scanchem)
- method for making recombinant erythropoietin (EPO) - (Amgen v TKT)
- cGMP PDE inhibitors (Viagra) (Lilly ICOS v. Pfizer)
- paroxetine (SmithKline Beecham v. Apotex)
- salmeterol and fluticasone (GlaxoSmithKline v. Cipla)
- Clarithromycin (Abbott v Ranbaxy)
- paroxetine mesylate (Synthon v SKB)
- Atorvastatin (Ranbaxy v Warner Lambert)
- Escitalopram (GUK v Lundbeck)
- Drug eluting stent (Conor v Angiotech)
- Lanzoprazole (Takeda v Sandoz)
- Oxaliplatin (Mayne v Sanofi)
- Neutrokine-alpha (Eli Lilly v HGS)
- Olanzapine (Dr Reddy's Laboratories v Eli Lilly)
- Levofloxacin (Generics v Daiichi)
- Memantine (Merz v Synthon, including reference to the CJEU)
- Anti-TNF-alpha monoclonal antibodies (GSK v Abbott)
- Contact lenses (Cibavision v Johnson & Johnson, Dublin)
- Vaccines (Medeva)
- Oral contraceptives (Gedeon Richter v Schering)
- Circadin (Neurim Pharmaceuticals v The Comptroller, inc. reference to the CJEU)
- Enzyme coatings (Danisco v Novozymes)
- Spot-on Pesticides (Omnipharm v Merial)
- Antibodies to treat Age Related Macular Degeneration (Regeneron v Genentech)
- Vaccine Compositions (Medeva v Comptroller, inc. reference to the CJEU)
- Copaxone, Multiple Sclerosis (Generics/Mylan v Yeda Research and Development Co Ltd)
- Antibodies to Neutrokine-alpha (Eli Lilly & Company v Human Genome Sciences, Inc including reference to the CJEU)
- Zolendronic Acid, Osteoporosis (Hospira UK v Novartis AG)
- Escitalopram (No.2) (Resolution Chemicals v H. Lundbeck)
- Antibodies to Amyloid-beta, Alzheimer's Disease (Eli Lilly & Company v Janssen Alzheimer Immunotherapy)

3 New Square, Lincoln's Inn,
London WC2A 3RS

T +44 (0)20 7405 1111
F +44 (0)20 7405 7800
clerks@3newsquare.co.uk

LDE454

THREE NEW SQUARE

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY



ANDREW
WAUGH QC

Year of Call: 1982

Silk: 1998

PRINCIPAL EPO CASES

Cases in which Andrew Waugh has appeared up to and including Oral Proceedings before the EPO include:

- EP 37,255 - Eli Lilly (Opponent - Hoechst) Subject matter: Process for the recombination of the A & B chains of insulin. Represented patentee on appeal to Appeal Board.
- EP 63,491 - Eli Lilly (Opponent - SmithKline Beecham) Subject matter: Treatment of cattle with antibiotics to improve milk production. Main claims maintained on opposition. On appeal to Appeal Board, case remitted to opposition division for consideration of narrower claims. (On appeal from remission to the Appeal Board, see below)
- EP 203,945 - Bonzel (Opponent: Advanced Cardiovascular Systems) Subject matter: Catheters for Percutaneous Transluminal Coronary Angioplasty. Represented Opponent on opposition before Opposition Division. No appeal.
- EP 68,763 - Board of Regents of the University of Texas (Opponent: Hybritech Inc) Subject matter: Bispecific antibodies. Represented Opponent on appeal to Appeal Board.
- EP 235,691 - Hoechst (Opponent - Eli Lilly) Mixing ball for insulin suspensions. Represented opponent before Opposition Division.
- EP 177,478 - Monsanto (Opponent - Eli Lilly) BST process. Represented opponent before Opposition Division. Result - patent maintained as granted.
- EP 192,629 - Monsanto (Opponent - Eli Lilly) BST formulations. Represented opponent before Opposition Division.
- EP 202,780 - Allied Colloids (Intervenor - American Cyanamid). Flocculating agents. Represented Intervenor before the Enlarged Board of Appeal.
- EP 237,545 - Kirin-Amgen (Opponents: ICI, Kyowa Hakko, Boehringer Mannheim). Subject matter: recombinant granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF). Represented patentee before Opposition Division.
- EP 182,442 - Biogen, Inc. (Opponents: Murex, Institut Pasteur, Immuno, Hexal-Biotech). Subject matter: recombinant hepatitis B viral antigens. Represented patentee before Appeal Board (the patent having been revoked by the Opposition Board)
- EP 148,605 - Amgen, Inc. (Opponents: Elanex, Behringwerke, Boehringer-Mannheim, Immuno) Subject matter: recombinant erythropoietin. Represented patentee before Appeal Board (the patent having been maintained after Opposition).
- EP 63,491 Eli - Lilly (Opponents: SmithKline Beecham and Pfizer Ltd). Subject matter: Treatment of cattle with antibiotics to improve milk production. Represented the Patentee before the Appeal Board on appeal from Opposition Division refusing narrower claims (on remission from Appeal Board (see above).
- EP 209,539 - Genetics Institute, Inc (Opponents: Cilag GmbH, Kirin-Amgen, Inc) subject matter: "Homogeneous Erythropoietin". Represented Opponent before the Appeal Board on appeal from Opposition Division which had rejected the opposition.
- EP 449,958 - Praxis Biologics Inc. (Opposition by Pasteur Merieux Connaught) Subject matter: Mennigococcal Outer Membrane Proteins. Represented Opponent before Opposition Division EP 375,724 - New York University (Opposition by Incyte Corp). Subject matter: Bacteriocidal Permeability Increasing proteins (BPI). Represented Patentee before Opposition Division.
- EP 237,545 - Kirin-Amgen (Opponents: ICI, Kyowa Hakko, Boehringer Mannheim). Subject matter: recombinant granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF). Represented patentee before Appeal Board.
- EP 526,339 - CIBA Speciality Chemical Holdings Inc (Opponents: Cytec Industries Inc.) Subject matter: Fluoropolymer Coatings. Represented Opponent before the Opposition Division. • EP 382,526 - BIOCHEM Pharma (Opponents: Emory University) Subject matter - 3TC - Acted for Opponents before the Opposite Division • EP 516,885 - CYTEC Technology Group (Opponents: BK Guilini, Dow Chemical) - Subject matter: Sizing Agents - Acted for Patentee before Opposition Division. • EP 383,569 - PAFRA Ltd (assigned to INHALE CORP) - (Opponents: Boehringer Mannheim GmbH, Novo, Quadrant Technology, Akzo) - Subject matter: storage stabilisation of labile materials using glasses - Acted for Patentee before the Opposition Division.
- EP 702,555 - Pfizer Ltd. - (Opponents Lilly Corp, ICOS Corp and ors) - Subject matter: PDEV inhibitors for the treatment of impotence - Acted for the Opponents before the OD and Appeal Board.
- EP 888,093 - Divysio Solutions - (Opponents - Guidant Corp) - Subject matter: Expandable stent - Acted for the Opponent before the Opposition Division.
- EPA 96915698.3 - Genentech Inc. - subject matter: use of IGF-1 to sustain biological response - Acted

3 New Square, Lincoln's Inn,
London WC2A 3RS

T +44 (0)20 7405 1111
F +44 (0)20 7405 7800
clerks@3newsquare.co.uk

LDE454

THREE NEW SQUARE

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY



ANDREW
WAUGH QC

Year of Call: 1982

Silk: 1998

- for Applicant before Appeal Board. • EP 623,354 - Medtronic Inc. - Opposition by Guidant Corp. Subject matter: intravascular stents - acted of the opponent before Opposition Division.
- EP 620,720 - Wake Forest Univ. - Opposition by Mondomed NV - Subject matter: medical device - acted for patentee before appeal board. • EP 748,213 - Nektar Inc - Opposition by Lilly - Subject matter: Inhalable insulin - acted for Patentee before Opposition Division
- EP 843,149 - Mofet Etzion Ltd - Opposition by Rafael Armament Ltd - Subject matter: Ceramic armour protection - acted for Opponent before Appeal Board.
- EP 614,984 - Bayer Corp - Opposition by Centocor Inc - Subject matter: Anti-TNF human antibodies - acted for Opponent before Appeal Board and Enlarged Board of Appeal. • EP 1,176,981 - Genentech Inc - Opposition by Tribion Pharmaceuticals - Subject matter: Anti-CD20 Antibodies for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis - acted for Opponent before Opposition Division and Appeal Board • EP 1,308,455 - Genentech Inc. - Opposition by Synthron - Subject Matter: Anti-HER2 antibodies - acted for patentee before Opposition Division
- EP1,308,455 - Acted for Genentech Inc (Proprietor) in Opposition to patent for 'acidic variants of HER2 antibodies'.
- EP1,213,919 - Acted for ROVI/United Video Properties (Proprietor) in Opposition to patent in respect of "Interactive Television Guide System"
- EP 1,623,350 - Acted for Genentech Inc (Proprietor) in T734/12 in respect of oppositions to EP in respect of "Therapy of autoimmune disease in a patient with an inadequate response of a TNF-alpha inhibitor" (novelty of distinct patient population).
- EP 2,103,236 - Acted for Doewe Egberts (Opponents) in T1674/12 in oppositions to EP in respect of "Capsule Extraction Device" (Nespresso) in the name of Nestec.
- EP 1,869,961 - Acted for Monsanto (patentee) in Opposition brought by Syngenta in respect of seed sampling and analysis.

3 New Square, Lincoln's Inn,
London WC2A 3RS

T +44 (0)20 7405 1111
F +44 (0)20 7405 7800
clerks@3newsquare.co.uk

LDE454