EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
MIAMI DIVISION
Case No. 12-60704-CV-SEITZ
12-60705-CV-SEITZ
12-60808-CV-SEITZ

APOTEX, INC., MIAMI, FLORIDA
Plaintiff

May 13, 2013

Versus VOLUME I
PAGE 1 TO 53

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS, ET AL.
Defendants

STATUS CONFERENCE RE: RESCHEDULING MARKMAN HEARING
BEFORE THE HON. PATRICIA A. SEITZ, J.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
JOSHUA D. MARTIN, ESQ.
Johnson & Martin
W. Cypress Creek Road - Suite 430
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33309
CRAIG KUCHII, ESQ.
MARTIN S. MASAR, III, ESQ.
Katten Muchin & Rosenman, LLP
525 West Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60661-3693

FOR THE DEFENDANT LUPIN AND MYLAN:
SUSAN WARNER, ESQ.
Isicoff Ragatz & Koenigsberg
1200 Brickell Avenue - Suite 1900
Miami, FL 33131

REPORTED BY: DAVID S. EHRLICH, RPR
Official Court Reporter
Wilkie D. Ferguson, Jr.
U. S. Courthouse
400 N. Miami, Room 11-4
Miami, Florida 33128-1810
(305) 523-5537

APPEARANCES : (Continued)

FOR THE DEFENDANT MYLAN:

ROBERT F. GREEN, ESQ.
Leydig, Voit & Mayer, Ltd.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, IL 60601-6731

DEEPRO R. MUKERJEE, ESQ.
POOPAK BANKY, ESQ.
Alston & Bird, LLP
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016

FOR THE DEFENDANT PFIZER:

MARIA J. BEGURISTAIN, ESQ.
White & Case
200 S. Biscayne Boulevard - Suite 4900
Miami, FL 33131-2352

SYLVIA M. BECKER, ESQ.
Kaye Scholer, LLP
901 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

FOR DEFENDANT TEVA:

JANET MUNN, ESQ.
Rasco Klock Perez Nieto
283 Catalonia Avenue
Coral Gables, FL 33134-6700

FREDERICK H. REIN, ESQ.
BRIAN PREW, ESQ.
Goodwin Proctor
The New York Times Building
620 8th Avenue
New York, NY 10018-1405

electronically. You all know my -- those that were here before know my law clerk, my chief of staff Cindy Bulan who has been working on this case. If Mr. Kuchii and Mr. Rein need to see what she looks like I will have her stand in front of the camera so you can see what she looks like and you can see the face that goes with the voice on the phone. Do you want me to have her stand in front of the camera?

MR. REIN: Whatever Your Honor wants is fine with us.

THE COURT: We are here to serve.

Anything else for the good of the order?

MS. BEGUIRISTAIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I appreciate very very much, and welcome to the case Mr. Kuchii and Mr. Rein, and anyone else who is going to be filing a motion pro hac vice. And welcome to you, Mr. Martin, as well.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Will there need to be any additional papers filed by Teva for the Markman hearing?

MR. REIN: Yes. We had worked out a schedule with Apotex in terms of briefing the re-specification disclaimer issue that I mentioned earlier. That is all worked out.

I believe that there might be an issue, not with us and with Apotex. But if we raise the specification disclaimer issue I think that possibly Pfizer, Mylan and/or Lupin might want to file

papers addressing that disclaimer argument as well. And that has not been discussed with Apotex.

MS. BECKER: If I may, Your Honor, again on behalf of Pfizer, we do believe that if new issues are raised in the consolidated claim construction briefing process that yes, of course the other codefendants should have an opportunity to comment on any new issues that are raised in claim construction and would want to participate in the briefing to that extent since Apotex would also be having opportunity to comment on whatever Teva is raising.

THE COURT: Miss Becker, can you just give me a hint as to what Pfizer would be filing on that issue that would be divergent from the position of Teva?

MS. BECKER: I don't know that there would necessarily be anything divergent because we haven't really seen the position developed. We are learning about these things as we go right here. I'm just saying that in general as a matter of fairness we would expect that if there were going to be new briefing on claim construction dealing with new issues that then the other codefendants would have an opportunity to participate whether it's by signing on with Teva or whether it's by commenting separately. That would depend on how the specific positions roll out.

MR. KUCHII: Your Honor, this is Craig Kuchii for plaintiffs. It's our position that claim construction in the consolidated case, the briefing there is all done. We don't think that the previously consolidated defendants should get another bite

at the apple via the consolidation --

THE COURT: Mr. Kuchii, I didn't hear Miss Becker addressing that. I think that she recognizes, I hope she recognizes, that the briefing as far as the claims construction is at a close. She is interested in seeing what the parties' papers, or at least what Teva's papers would be on the disclaimer issue and then having an opportunity if she on behalf of her client, or Lupin or Mylan thinks that they have something that is germane to their particular client that they be able to do I presume a five-page speak up. But I would presume that she would only be doing this if she really had something that was not covered by Teva or she would want simply the opportunity to say, "We sign on to Teva's position," and save her client having to file anything at all.

Am I reading you correctly, Miss Becker?

MS. BECKER: Yes, that's right, Your Honor. What I'm talking about is if Apotex is given the opportunity to speak to a new claims construction issue raised by Teva, then we feel the other codefendants should be involved in the hearing and be given the opportunity if necessary to speak to that. It would not be unfair Apotex would be getting an opportunity to comment on the new issues --

THE COURT: Well, this is what I am going to hold you responsible for, Miss Becker, is that you are going to take the lead in coordinating with the other counsel of the other defendants to find out once Teva has filed their brief on this within five days of

their filing the brief you are going to make sure that everyone else has had an opportunity to read it, to make some decisions as to do you all want to have an individual response -- And it needs to be really different. I don't need to see the same topic covered saying the same thing but just in different words to be added in before Apotex has to file a response so that Apotex has an opportunity to see all of the defendants' positions on that issue before they have to file their response. So I will need for you to be the coordinator. And perhaps you can avoid all of this by just talking to the Teva folks that they would be willing to sort of give you a heads up as to sort of what their approach is on the issue and you all can be talking among yourselves to say, "Okay, do we really have anything that we can add that we need to add," or can we just, "They have done such a good job we can say, 'We join in that position?'"

MS. BECKER: Absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And if that's the case Apotex will know that it just has that one thing to respond to and it doesn't have to file separate papers, and you can save and you don't have to file separate papers, and I don't have to read separate papers. Okay?

MS. BECKER: Absolutely, Your Honor. I would be happy to coordinate our participation in the briefing in that way that will minimize and assure --

THE COURT: Does that take care of your concern, Mr. Kuchii?

MR. KUCHII: Yes, Your Honor. And one additional thing is

that there was a schedule proposed for the claim construction, and I think the Teva defendants were in agreement with the schedule. And I believe that either a hard copy is attached to the schedule, the proposed schedule that was handed to the Court, or, if not, one of the defendants might have a hard copy.

THE COURT: I have a hard copy.

LAW CLERK: Not of the briefing for the claims construction.

THE COURT: Oh. I do not have that.

MS. MUNN: Your Honor, Janet Munn for the Teva defendants. If it's okay I will approach and hand it to your law clerk.

THE COURT: Does everyone have what you are giving us?

MS. MUNN: Yes, Your Honor. The only thing that would need to be changed I believe would be the dates for the pre-Markman hearing conference and the Markman hearing for all parties.

THE COURT: Okay. So it's the 26th and the 27th. And you all still want to stick with the September 9 date for the joint claim construction and prehearing statement?

MR. KUCHII: That's fine with plaintiffs, Your Honor.

MR. REIN: That is fine with Teva as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Then we'll stick with the list you have. And thank you all very much. You are doing a great job and I appreciate it.