

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

BAYER BIOSCIENCE N.V.,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) C.A. No. 03-023 GMS
)
 MONSANTO COMPANY,)
)
 Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 10, 2003, the plaintiff, Bayer Bioscience, N.V. (“Bayer”), filed the above-captioned action alleging that Monsanto Company (“Monsanto”) is engaging in activity that infringes Bayer’s U.S. Patent No. 5,659,123 (“the ‘123 patent”).

Presently before the court is Monsanto’s motion to transfer the case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). For the following reasons, the court will grant this motion.

II. BACKGROUND

Bayer is a foreign corporation headquartered in Ghent, Belgium. Monsanto is a Delaware corporation, with its headquarters in St. Louis, Missouri.

The patent at issue involves a corn product that has been genetically modified to express a particular “Bt” gene that makes the corn resistant to a type of Coleopteran insect known as the corn rootworm. For the past two years, Monsanto and Bayer have been engaged in litigation in the Eastern District of Missouri regarding four other patents assigned to Bayer. Those four patents all generally relate to crops genetically engineered with a “Bt gene,” purportedly rendering the crops toxic to a class of insects known as Lepidopteran insects.

On December 27, 2002, the Missouri District Court issued a summary judgment order finding that all four of the patents-in-suit in that case were unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. On January 10, 2003, Bayer filed the present action. Also on January 10, 2003, Monsanto filed a declaratory judgment action for noninfringement in the Missouri District Court.

III. DISCUSSION

A. The “First-Filed” Rule

Where two patent lawsuits involving the same claims are filed in different jurisdictions, the Federal Circuit requires that the first-filed action be given preference absent special circumstances. *See Genentech v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 998 F.2d 931, 937 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The first-filed doctrine also serves to prevent a multiplicity of actions and to achieve resolution in a single lawsuit of all disputes arising from common matters. *See id.* at 937.

Applying the first-filed rule, Bayer now argues that it would be improper for the court to transfer this first-filed action to the Eastern District of Missouri. While the court does not dispute that this action is first-filed, albeit only by several hours, for the following reasons, the court concludes that the 1404(a) factors nevertheless weigh in favor of litigating this dispute in Missouri. *See id.* at 937-38 (noting that “the trial court’s discretion tempers the preference for the first-filed suit, when such preference should yield to the forum in which all interests are best served.”).

B. Section 1404(a)

Section 1404(a) provides that “[f]or the convenience of [the] parties and [the] witnesses, in the interest of justice,” the court may transfer this action to “any other district where it might have been brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Bayer suggests that the Eastern District of Missouri may not

have personal jurisdiction over it.¹ Importantly, however, Bayer fails to suggest that it could not have originally brought this action in Missouri, rather than in Delaware. Thus, because Bayer could have brought this action in the proposed transferee district, the court will move on with the inquiry as directed by the Third Circuit. *See Jumara v. State Farm Ins. Co.*, 55 F.3d 873, 879 (3d Cir. 1995).

When considering a motion to transfer, the court must determine ‘whether on balance the litigation would more conveniently proceed and the interests of justice be better served by transfer to a different forum.’ *Id.* This inquiry requires “a multi-factor balancing test” embracing not only the statutory criteria of convenience of the parties and the witnesses and the interests of justice, but all relevant factors, including certain private and public interests. *Id.* at 875, 879. These private interests include the plaintiff’s choice of forum; the defendants’ preference; whether the claim arose elsewhere; and the location of books and records, to the extent that they could not be produced in the alternative forum.² *Id.* at 879. Among the relevant public interests are: “[t]he enforceability of the judgment; practical considerations that could make the trial easy, expeditious, or inexpensive; the relative administrative difficulty in the two fora resulting from court congestion; the local interest in deciding local controversies at home; [and] the public policies of the fora.” *Id.* at 879-80 (citations omitted).

Upon consideration of these factors, the court finds that Monsanto has met its burden of

¹As it is not the court’s province to determine the question of another court’s personal jurisdiction, the court expresses no opinion on this issue.

² The first three of these private interest collapse into other portions of the *Jumara* analysis. The court, therefore, will consider them in the context of the entire inquiry only. *See Affymetrix, Inc. v. Synteni, Inc. and Incite Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 28 F. Supp. 2d 192 (D. Del. 1998).

demonstrating that transfer is appropriate. In reaching this conclusion, the court relied on the following considerations, among others: (1) while the defendant is a Delaware entity, and should reasonably expect to litigate in this forum, there is little connection between Delaware and this action or the parties; (2) no party maintains operations in Delaware; (3) the parties are large and international organizations with substantial assets; (4) because the parties are litigating apparently related issues in Missouri, travel time and convenience in the aggregate would be substantially increased with a transfer of forum; and (5) any disparity in court congestion is not so great as to weigh against transfer due to the “mirror image” action currently pending in the Eastern District of Missouri. Thus, given the on-going relationship that the Eastern District of Missouri has with the same parties, and the same, or related, patent or patents, the court concludes that the public and private interests are sufficient to tip the balance of convenience strongly in favor of transfer.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the aforementioned reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Bayer’s Motion for Leave to File a Sur-Reply (D.I. 10) is GRANTED as unopposed.
2. Monsanto’s Motion to Transfer this case (D.I. 5) is GRANTED.
3. The above-captioned action is hereby TRANSFERRED to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Dated: March 25, 2003

Gregory M. Sleet
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE