

Teva Pharmaceuticals: generic competition and the Copaxone access record

Research checked: 9 September 2026. Publication date: 9 September 2026. New research edition.

1. Executive assessment: a generic supplier with major branded medicines

Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. is an Israeli pharmaceutical group with both generic and innovative medicines. Its July 2026 results describe growth in Austedo, Ajovy and Uzedly alongside a substantial generics business and expanding biosimilar portfolio. The company reports operations by geography and product category; the U.S. subsidiaries involved in the cases below should not be confused with the parent or European subsidiary named in the European Commission decision.¹

This report focuses on three pricing and access mechanisms: admitted coordination involving U.S. generic medicines; disputed charitable-assistance arrangements connected with Copaxone; and the European Commission's finding that patent practices and misleading communications hindered competing glatiramer acetate products. The last finding is under a court challenge verified in the reviewed record. These matters require different labels: an admission in a deferred prosecution agreement, a civil settlement without admission and a regulator's infringement decision challenged by the company.

The central U.S. criminal document is the August 2023 deferred prosecution agreement with Teva Pharmaceuticals USA. Teva accepted the truth of its statement of facts, while the document expressly says it is not a final adjudication. It provides for a \$225 million penalty, cooperation, compliance measures, specified drug donations and a pravastatin divestiture.² Describing this simply as an unresolved accusation would omit admissions; describing it as a guilty plea would also be wrong.

The 2024 U.S. civil announcement combined two matters into \$450 million. The Copaxone assistance agreement accounts for \$425 million and expressly disclaims admission of liability. A separate \$25 million component concerns generic-drug pricing allegations.^{3,4,9} These payments are distinct from the criminal penalty and from the European fine. They do not constitute a single estimate of worldwide patient harm.

For a transparency organization, Teva is a useful case because generic supply does not eliminate the need to scrutinize conduct. Competition depends on firms actually making independent commercial decisions, and approval alone does not guarantee uptake when legal uncertainty or communications influence the market. At the same time, historical enforcement does not establish that every Teva product is overpriced or that its present medicines lack value.

The report's assessment is therefore specific: the selected record documents meaningful failures and contested practices affecting how competition and assistance operate. It does not create a company-wide price score, estimate individual damages or recommend treatment changes. Current financial results are used to establish context, not to infer what any patient pays at a pharmacy.

2. Timeline: three proceedings with different boundaries

The U.S. generic-drug conduct addressed in the criminal agreement occurred during 2013-2015. DOJ announced the Teva and Glenmark resolutions together in August 2023, identifying three Teva conspiracies involving pravastatin, clotrimazole and tobramycin. It announced a \$225 million Teva penalty, \$50 million in specified drug donations and divestiture obligations. Glenmark's separate penalty was \$30 million; that company's amount is not part of Teva's sanction.¹⁰

The agreement was designed to combine enforcement with continuity of supply. Its stated considerations include the potential consequences of a conviction and exclusion from federal healthcare programs. That rationale explains the procedural choice; it does not excuse the admitted conduct or establish that no alternative enforcement approach was available. The public agreement is evidence of the government's chosen resolution rather than a general rule for every pharmaceutical defendant.²

In October 2024, DOJ announced the two civil resolutions. The Copaxone allegations concerned payments through assistance organizations during 2006-2017 and alleged coordination intended to cover Medicare beneficiaries' copay obligations for that medicine. The second matter treated benefits from the generic price-fixing arrangements as alleged unlawful remuneration.³ Their shared announcement does not make their evidence or legal disposition identical.

Later that month, on 31 October 2024, the European Commission adopted its Copaxone infringement decision. Its summary identifies seven national markets: Belgium, Czechia, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain. It found a combined course of patent-system misuse and exclusionary disparagement, with periods differing by country and practice. The decision imposed a single fine of €462,578,000.^{5,6}

Teva disputed the Commission's legal and factual analysis and announced an appeal. The Official Journal confirms that the action was brought on 15 January 2025 as Case T-19/25, seeking annulment or a reduced fine. The company's first-quarter 2026 contingency disclosure continued to describe that appeal as pending and reported financial guarantees covering the fine and specified interest.^{7,8,9}

The latest operating update reviewed is Teva's July 2026 second-quarter release. It describes an evolving portfolio, not a business defined solely by historical Copaxone sales.¹ A recent search did not provide a verified final judgment disposing of T-19/25 or a final dismissal of the U.S. criminal indictment. This report accordingly preserves the last directly supported procedural status and flags those docket updates for verification rather than assuming that a scheduled agreement anniversary closes a case automatically.

3. Evidence: coordinated bids, assistance independence and patent strategy

The generic-drug admission is the strongest basis for describing established conduct in the U.S. record. Teva's own 2026 disclosure summarizes three instances involving separate customers in which it agreed with competitors not to bid for particular generic supply opportunities. It also reports that the required pravastatin divestiture occurred in November 2024.⁹ This is more specific than attributing every industry-wide generic-price movement to Teva or treating all products as part of the admitted arrangements.

A procurement process can lose competitive pressure even when multiple suppliers appear capable of bidding. The analytical issue is whether those suppliers make independent decisions. This mechanism differs from a patent monopoly or the list price of a new brand. It operates through the conduct of firms that might otherwise discipline one another's prices. The selected records do not provide a complete transaction dataset from which this report could calculate a market-wide overcharge.

The Copaxone assistance case addresses a separate mechanism. The government's position was that purportedly independent support operated as a conduit for the manufacturer's payments of Medicare copays while the drug's price increased.³ The actual settlement describes the covered conduct and preserves Teva's denial of liability.⁴ The presence of patient assistance alone is therefore not evidence of illegality. The relevant concern is the alleged connection among donor control, product-specific support and reimbursed claims.

The European decision examines how a branded medicine faced entry by a competing glatiramer acetate product. The Commission found that Teva staggered overlapping divisional patent filings and strategically withdrew patents before final review, requiring rivals to renew challenges. It also found misleading communications about a competing product directed to healthcare professionals and reimbursement stakeholders. These are Commission findings, not this report's independent adjudication.⁵

The mechanisms can reinforce one another. Repeated legal uncertainty may delay a rival's commercial plans, while doubts about equivalence can restrict uptake after regulatory approval. This is an analytical interpretation of the theory expressed in the decision. It does not imply that all divisional patents are abusive or that every scientific disagreement is improper disparagement. The specific content, timing, justification and market setting remain essential.

Teva's challenge contests market definition, dominance, the patent analysis, the characterization of communications, procedural fairness and the fine calculation.⁸ Including those grounds makes clear what remains contested. A report can accurately state that a regulator imposed a fine while also explaining that the company seeks judicial review. Neither description should erase the other.

4. Quantitative context: sanctions, donation value and actual price evidence

The most visible figures in these cases are not drug prices. The \$225 million criminal penalty is a sanction. The \$450 million U.S. civil package resolves two sets of claims. The European amount is a fine imposed under a different legal system and currency. Adding them into a dollar-denominated “patient loss” total would require both an unsupported equivalence and an arbitrary currency conversion.

Amount	Source context	What it does not measure
\$225 million	2023 U.S. criminal agreement	A retail price or automatically paid cash balance
\$50 million	Required donations of specified medicines	Manufacturing cost or cash delivered to patients
\$425 million	Copaxone civil agreement	A judicially determined price overcharge
\$25 million	Generic-pricing civil resolution	The value of all U.S. generic transactions
€462.578 million	European Commission fine	A universal EU patient-reimbursement amount

The donation valuation is particularly important. The criminal agreement values the required clotrimazole and tobramycin donations at wholesale acquisition cost as of the agreement's effective date, over a donation period ending in 2028.² That benchmark differs from the cost of manufacturing the medicines, their discounted acquisition price and the benefit received by a particular patient. The report reproduces the stated value without converting it into an invented number of treatments.

The Copaxone civil agreement provides installments extending through December 2029. Its final scheduled installment is \$175 million. It states that the agreement neither admits Teva's liability nor concedes that the government's claims lacked merit.⁴ A settlement commitment and verified cash collection are distinct facts. The payment schedule is not proof of default, and the report has not independently audited compliance with every installment.

Current product revenue provides a narrower commercial observation. Teva reported U.S. Copaxone revenue of \$61 million in the second quarter of 2026, down 2% from the corresponding 2025 quarter, primarily reflecting lower volume partly offset by a reduction in sales allowances.¹ This does not establish a 2% decline in either list price or a patient's bill. Volume and accounting deductions can move revenue even when different price measures move differently.

A defensible price study would identify formulation, strength, package, geography, payer and date; separate WAC from net manufacturer realization; and examine patient payments under actual insurance rules. The present sources do not provide that matched series. Accordingly, this report uses the enforcement evidence to explain mechanisms and obligations, while avoiding an unsupported estimate of how much each Copaxone or generic-drug user paid because of the conduct.

5. Outcomes and current status: obligations can outlast headlines

The U.S. criminal agreement's main term was three years, but its payment and prosecution provisions can continue beyond that period. Scheduled criminal payments extend through 2028, and dismissal depends on the agreement's conditions and payment terms. It is therefore inaccurate to infer that the indictment was dismissed simply because August 2026 arrived.² No final dismissal order was verified in this review. This is a limit of the evidence obtained, not an assertion that Teva breached the agreement.

The first-quarter 2026 SEC disclosure provides a concrete implementation update: pravastatin was divested in November 2024, and the separate \$25 million civil obligation was paid in two installments, with the second paid in January 2026. It also continued to describe the criminal penalty schedule.⁹ These disclosures provide stronger support for those particular completed actions than a press release announcing future commitments. They do not independently verify every donation or compliance report.

For the European matter, the Commission's operative decision requires Teva to refrain from repeating the identified conduct or conduct with the same or equivalent effect. The fine is not merely a proposed investigative figure; it was imposed in the decision. The same text allows an acceptable financial guarantee or provisional payment where the decision is challenged.⁶ Thus, a reported guarantee should not be described as either an admission or proof that a final cash fine has been collected.

Teva's public response argued that the legal theories were unsupported and said it would defend its position. Its appeal notice provides more detail about those objections.^{7,8} The reviewed first-quarter 2026 disclosure records the appeal as pending. A fresh search found no verified subsequent final decision, so the report does not state that judicial review is complete. It also avoids importing the outcome of another Teva or Cephalon European case into T-19/25 simply because the company names overlap.

On 31 August 2026, Teva announced an intention to reach a U.S. pricing agreement and said discussions remained active. If finalized, the proposed arrangement would align Medicaid pricing for selected medicines with developed-market prices through GENEROUS, include a prospective most-favored-nation commitment for applicable innovative launches, and support manufacturing and a dedicated active-ingredient reserve. Negotiating conditions remained confidential.¹¹ This is evidence of negotiations and proposed commitments, not a completed deal or measured patient savings. No product-level price schedule or implementation date was disclosed in that release.

The useful current picture is therefore mixed and specific: admitted historical generic conduct, a completed divestiture reported by the company, civil payment commitments with differing schedules, and an imposed European decision still subject to a verified challenge. Evaluation of present affordability requires additional product-level access data rather than a conclusion drawn solely from settlement headlines.

6. Implications, method and limits

Teva's record suggests that transparency research should follow competitive behavior across several stages. At procurement, the question is whether suppliers bid independently. At regulatory entry, the question is whether a competing medicine has approval and a practical route to launch. At uptake, the question is whether accurate information and coverage permit it to reach patients. At the pharmacy counter, the question is how much the patient pays and whether assistance is available on independent terms. These stages are related, but success at one does not establish success at the others.

The first research implication is to maintain a product-specific legal record. The admitted generic arrangements should not be generalized to every Teva medicine. The European findings should retain their named national markets and contested status. The U.S. Copaxone civil allegations should remain separated from those Commission findings even though the brand name is the same. The same medicine can feature in proceedings about different conduct under different laws.

The second implication is to measure remedies in their own units. Drug donations need a valuation basis, delivery record and recipient context. A divestiture needs evidence of transfer and, for an access evaluation, evidence about the successor's supply. A monetary resolution needs both the scheduled obligation and the amount actually received. These proposed measures would allow future reports to move beyond announced commitments without assuming either success or failure in advance.

This report reviewed the signed U.S. criminal and Copaxone civil agreements, DOJ announcements, the Commission's published summary and operative decision sections, the EU appeal notice, Teva's direct response and 2026 disclosures. The full Commission decision is lengthy; this report does not claim to reproduce or independently verify every underlying document. Its analysis is limited to the findings, reasoning and status relevant to the selected access questions.

No confidential purchaser contracts, complete patient claims or individual assistance files were obtained. The report therefore makes no causal estimate of individual harm or treatment benefit. It does not assess a patient's medical options or legal rights. Published monetary amounts retain their original category and currency, and no synthetic global total has been created.

The strongest conclusion is that independent competition and trustworthy information matter even in markets served by large generic suppliers. The reviewed evidence supports scrutiny of specific historical conduct and continued verification of remedies. It also requires fair representation of denials, appeal rights and uncertain current docket details. That combination gives readers a reliable basis for further inquiry without presenting allegations, sanctions and patient prices as if they were the same thing.

References

1. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. *Teva Delivers Strong Q2 Results and Raises Outlook for All Three Key Innovative Brands, Reflecting Continued Execution of Its Pivot to Growth Strategy*. 29 July 2026. [Open source](#)
2. U.S. Department of Justice. *Deferred Prosecution Agreement: U.S. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.*. Filed 21 August 2023. [Open source](#)
3. U.S. Department of Justice. *Drug Maker Teva Pharmaceuticals Agrees to Pay \$450M in False Claims Act Settlement to Resolve Kickback Allegations Relating to Copayments and Price Fixing*. 10 October 2024. [Open source](#)
4. United States and Teva Pharmaceuticals USA Inc. / Teva Neuroscience Inc. *Settlement Agreement, Copaxone assistance matter*. October 2024. [Open source](#)
5. European Commission. *Summary of Commission Decision of 31 October 2024 relating to a proceeding under Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Case AT.40588 - Teva Copaxone)*. Official Journal publication 19 March 2025. [Open source](#)
6. European Commission. *Commission Decision C(2024) 7448 final, AT.40588 - Teva Copaxone*. 31 October 2024; non-confidential version. [Open source](#)
7. Teva. *Teva Statement on European Commission Decision; Company to Appeal*. 31 October 2024. [Open source](#)
8. General Court of the European Union / Official Journal. *Case T-19/25: Action brought on 15 January 2025 - Teva Pharmaceutical Industries and Teva Pharmaceuticals Europe v Commission*. Published 24 February 2025. [Open source](#)
9. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. *First-quarter 2026 Form 10-Q, Commitments and Contingencies*. April 2026. [Open source](#)
10. U.S. Department of Justice. *Major Generic Drug Companies to Pay Over Quarter of a Billion Dollars to Resolve Price-Fixing Charges and Divest Key Drug at the Center of Their Conspiracy*. 21 August 2023. [Open source](#)
11. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. *Teva and Trump Administration Announce Intent to Reach Agreement around Affordable Medicines and Supply Chain Security for Patients in the U.S.*. 31 August 2026. [Open source](#)