Clarifications

1. The laws of Equatoria and Costoguana are pari materia to which countries?
   Their laws are not relevant for interpretation beyond what is stated in the proposition.

2. Whether the plaintiff issued / rejected or ignored any request, if so from the defendent regarding usage of its patent towards any of its activity?
   Participants may rely only on what is stated therein para 11. PharmaCo relies on alleged licensing negotiations which is disputed by Med-Life.

3. Could you please throw more light on the relevant correspondence between pharmaco and medlife?
   Participants may rely only on what is stated therein para 11. Med-Life is disputing the correspondence alleged by PharamaCo.

4. Whether the second patent is comprising of the API as one of the main claim of Pharma Co?
   Reference should be drawn to Paragraph 3 of the proposition.

5. In Para 10 of the proposition, it's mentioned about drug degradation, could you please elaborate regarding the same?
   PharmaCo argues that the new formulation solved critical issues of drug degradation and improved patient compliance. This means the formulation patent claims enhanced stability of the drug.

6. Can we bypass the 15 page limit for arguments advanced provided that the issues need larger consideration and page limit is curbing the same?
   The prescribed page limit is mandatory and must be strictly followed unless officially revised by the organizers.

7. What is the current status of medlife's application for marketing approval to regulatory authorities mentioned in Para 5?
   Status of marketing approval in Equatoria and Costaguana not relevant to the present dispute.