

## Don't Fear IP-Antitrust 'Turducken' in Reverse-Payment Cases

Published in *Law360*

November 24, 2020

This article discusses whether apprehension associated with applying a "Turducken" analysis (the word "Turducken," which was penned by former American football coach and sportscaster John Madden, referring to a chicken stuffed inside a duck stuffed inside a turkey), or a patent case inside an antitrust case, to reverse-payment antitrust actions is warranted. The article analyzes whether it is fair to hold a generic pharmaceutical company liable for antitrust damages based on a surrogate proof of patent weakness based on the existence of a reverse payment, instead of requiring a private plaintiff to prove the patent merits directly. According to the authors, the 2013 US Supreme Court case of *Federal Trade Commission v. Actavis Inc.* does not require bypassing direct proof of the patent merits to determine antitrust injury in private actions.

---

### CONTACTS

For more information, contact your Katten attorney or any of the following attorneys.



**Deepro R. Mukerjee**

+1.212.940.8552

[deepro.mukerjee@katten.com](mailto:deepro.mukerjee@katten.com)



**Jillian M. Schurr**

+1.214.765.3684

[jillian.schurr@katten.com](mailto:jillian.schurr@katten.com)



**Brian Sodikoff**

+1.312.902.5462

[brian.sodikoff@katten.com](mailto:brian.sodikoff@katten.com)

Attorney advertising. Published as a source of information only. The material contained herein is not to be construed as legal advice or opinion.

©2025 Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP.

All rights reserved. Katten refers to Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP and the affiliated partnership as explained at [katten.com/disclaimer](https://katten.com/disclaimer).