# UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION Washington D.C. 20549

Washington, D.C. 20549

# FORM 8-K

## CURRENT REPORT

Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Date of Report (Date of Earliest Event Reported): July 7, 2011

# PDL BioPharma, Inc.

(Exact name of Company as specified in its charter)

000-19756 (Commission File Number)

Delaware (State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation) 94-3023969 (I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

932 Southwood Boulevard Incline Village, Nevada 89451 (Address of principal executive offices, with zip code)

(775) 832-8500

(Company's telephone number, including area code)

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the Company under any of the following provisions:

□ Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)

□ Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12)

Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b))

Dere-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c))

#### Item 8.01 Other Events.

Nevada State Judge Denies Roche and Genentech's Motions to Dismiss PDL BioPharma's Complaint

On July 11, 2011, PDL BioPharma, Inc. ("PDL") issued a press release announcing that on July 7, 2011, the Second Judicial District Court of Nevada ruled in favor of PDL on two motions to dismiss filed by Genentech and F. Hoffmann LaRoche, Ltd. ("Roche") in PDL's lawsuit related to the 2003 settlement agreement with Genentech. The court denied Genentech and Roche's motion to dismiss four of PDL's five claims for relief and, further, denied Roche's separate motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The court dismissed one of PDL's claims that Genentech committed a bad-faith breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing stating that, based on the current state of the pleadings, no "special relationship" had been established between Genentech and PDL, as required under Nevada law.

The effect of the Court's ruling is that PDL is permitted to continue to pursue its claims that (i) Genentech is obligated to pay royalties to PDL on international sales of the Genentech Products; (ii) Genentech, by challenging, at the behest of Roche and Novartis, whether PDL's SPCs cover the Genentech Products breached its contractual obligations to PDL under the 2003 settlement agreement; (iii) Genentech breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing with respect to the 2003 settlement agreement and (iv) Roche intentionally and knowingly interfered with PDL's contractual relationship with Genentech in conscious disregard of PDL's rights.

PDL seeks compensatory damages, including liquidated damages and other monetary remedies set forth in the 2003 settlement agreement, punitive damages and attorney's fees as a result of Genentech and Roche's conduct. The ultimate outcome of this litigation is uncertain and we may not be successful in our allegations.

The press release is attached hereto as Exhibit 99.1 and is incorporated herein by reference.

#### Item 9.01 Financial Statements and Exhibits.

(d) Exhibits.

Exhibit No.

99.1

Press Release, dated July 11, 2011

Description

## SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Company has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned hereunto duly authorized.

PDL BIOPHARMA, INC (Company)

By: /s/ Christopher Stone

Christopher Stone Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary

Dated: July 11, 2011

Exhibit No. <u>99.1</u>

Press Release, dated July 11, 2011

Description



Contacts: Cris Larson PDL BioPharma, Inc. 775-832-8505 cris.larson@pdl.com

Jennifer Williams Cook Williams Communications, Inc. 360-668-3701 jennifer@cwcomm.org

## Nevada State Judge Denies Roche and Genentech's Motions to Dismiss PDL BioPharma's Complaint

INCLINE VILLAGE, NV, July 11, 2011 – PDL BioPharma, Inc. (PDL) (NASDAQ: PDLI) announced a favorable ruling today, specifically that on July 7, 2011, the Second Judicial District Court of Nevada ruled in favor of PDL on two motions to dismiss filed by Genentech and F. Hoffmann LaRoche, Ltd. (Roche) in PDL's lawsuit related to the 2003 settlement agreement with Genentech. The court denied Genentech and Roche's motion to dismiss four of PDL's five claims for relief and, further, denied Roche's separate motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The court dismissed one of PDL's claims that Genentech committed a bad-faith breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing stating that, based on the current state of the pleadings, no "special relationship" had been established between Genentech and PDL, as required under Nevada law.

### Background on Litigation with Genentech

In August 2010, PDL received a letter from Genentech, on behalf of Roche and Novartis, asserting that Avastin®, Herceptin®, Lucentis® and Xolair® (the Genentech Products) do not infringe the supplementary protection certificates (SPCs) granted to PDL by various countries in Europe for each of the Genentech Products and seeking a response from PDL to these assertions. PDL believes that the SPCs are enforceable against the Genentech Products, that Genentech's letter violates the terms of the 2003 settlement agreement and that Genentech owes PDL royalties on sales of the Genentech Products on a worldwide basis. In August 2010, in connection with the letter described above, PDL filed a complaint in state court in Nevada seeking to enforce PDL's rights under its 2003 settlement agreement with Genentech Products. The complaint alleges that the communication received from Genentech, which states that it was sent at the behest of Roche and Novartis, damaged PDL and constitutes a breach of Genentech's obligations under its 2003 settlement agreement with PDL. In November 2010, Genentech and Roche filed a motion to dismiss PDL's complaint against them in which PDL seeks to enforce its rights under the 2003 settlement agreement agreement should be dismissed because the 2003 settlement agreement applies only to PDL's U.S. patents. In addition, Roche filed a separate motion to dismiss PDL's complaint under Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) on the ground that the Nevada court lacks personal jurisdiction over Roche.

### Effect of the Court's Ruling

The effect of the Court's ruling is that PDL is permitted to continue to pursue its claims that:

- 1) Genentech is obligated to pay royalties to PDL on international sales of the Genentech Products;
- 2) Genentech, by challenging, at the behest of Roche and Novartis, whether PDL's SPCs cover the Genentech Products breached its contractual obligations to PDL under the 2003 settlement agreement;
- 3) Genentech breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing with respect to the 2003 settlement agreement; and
- 4) Roche intentionally and knowingly interfered with PDL's contractual relationship with Genentech in conscious disregard of PDL's rights.

PDL seeks compensatory damages, including liquidated damages and other monetary remedies set forth in the 2003 settlement agreement, punitive damages and attorney's fees as a result of Genentech and Roche's conduct.

#### **About PDL BioPharma**

PDL pioneered the humanization of monoclonal antibodies and, by doing so, enabled the discovery of a new generation of targeted treatments for cancer and immunologic diseases. PDL is focused on maximizing the value of its antibody humanization patents and related assets. The Company receives royalties on sales of a number of humanized antibody products marketed by leading pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies today based on patents which expire in late 2014. For more information, please visit www.pdl.com.

NOTE: PDL BioPharma and the PDL BioPharma logo are considered trademarks of PDL BioPharma, Inc.

1					
1	1	-	7	7	7
ı	ı		1	1	1