

CELL THERAPEUTICS INC

Form 10-Q

October 25, 2011

[Table of Contents](#)

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-Q

x **QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

For the quarterly period ended: September 30, 2011

OR

.. **TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

For the transition period from to

Commission File Number 001-12465

CELL THERAPEUTICS, INC.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

Washington
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)
501 Elliott Avenue West, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington
(Address of principal executive offices)
(206) 282-7100
(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

91-1533912
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)
98119
(Zip Code)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, or a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of large accelerated filer, accelerated filer and smaller reporting company in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer
Non-accelerated filer (Do not check if a smaller reporting company) Smaller reporting company
Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

Indicate the number of shares outstanding of each of the issuer's classes of common stock, as of the latest practicable date:

Class	Outstanding at October 21, 2011
Common Stock, no par value	192,763,414

Table of Contents

CELL THERAPEUTICS, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<u>PART I - FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>	
<u>ITEM 1: Financial Statements</u>	
<u>Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets at September 30, 2011 (unaudited) and December 31, 2010</u>	3
<u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Operations Three and Nine Months Ended September 30, 2011 and 2010 (unaudited)</u>	4
<u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows Nine Months Ended September 30, 2011 and 2010 (unaudited)</u>	5
<u>Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements</u>	6
<u>ITEM 2: Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	19
<u>ITEM 3: Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk</u>	32
<u>ITEM 4: Controls and Procedures</u>	32
<u>PART II - OTHER INFORMATION</u>	
<u>ITEM 1: Legal Proceedings</u>	34
<u>ITEM 1A: Risk Factors</u>	37
<u>ITEM 2: Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds</u>	56
<u>ITEM 3: Defaults Upon Senior Securities</u>	56
<u>ITEM 4: (Removed and Reserved)</u>	56
<u>ITEM 5: Other Information</u>	56
<u>ITEM 6: Exhibits</u>	57
<u>Signatures</u>	59

Table of Contents**CELL THERAPEUTICS, INC.****CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS**

(In thousands, except share amounts)

	September 30, 2011 (unaudited)	December 31, 2010
ASSETS		
Current assets:		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 45,212	\$ 22,649
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	4,692	4,256
Total current assets	49,904	26,905
Property and equipment, net	4,309	3,426
Goodwill		17,064
Other assets	8,637	6,197
Total assets	\$ 62,850	\$ 53,592
LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY		
Current liabilities:		
Accounts payable	\$ 6,564	\$ 6,037
Accrued expenses	10,420	11,008
Current portion of long-term obligations	1,395	1,717
7.5% convertible senior notes		10,215
5.75% convertible senior notes	12,429	12,093
Total current liabilities	30,808	41,070
Long-term obligations, less current portion	3,088	4,206
Total liabilities	33,896	45,276
Commitments and contingencies		
Common stock purchase warrants	13,461	13,461
Shareholders' equity (deficit):		
Common stock, no par value:		
Authorized shares - 283,333,333 and 200,000,000 at September 30, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively		
Issued and outstanding shares - 192,801,179 and 135,625,216 at September 30, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively	1,721,284	1,579,866
Accumulated other comprehensive loss	(8,246)	(7,969)
Accumulated deficit	(1,696,917)	(1,576,643)
Total CTI shareholders' equity (deficit)	16,121	(4,746)
Noncontrolling interest	(628)	(399)
Total shareholders' equity (deficit)	15,493	(5,145)
Total liabilities and shareholders' equity (deficit)	\$ 62,850	\$ 53,592

See accompanying notes.

Table of Contents**CELL THERAPEUTICS, INC.****CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS****(In thousands, except per share amounts)****(unaudited)**

	Three Months Ended September 30,		Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2011	2010	2011	2010
Revenues:				
License and contract revenue	\$	\$	\$	\$ 319
Total revenues				319
Operating expenses:				
Research and development	7,530	5,101	26,982	19,375
Selling, general and administrative	7,760	7,893	25,297	39,378
Total operating expenses	15,290	12,994	52,279	58,753
Loss from operations	(15,290)	(12,994)	(52,279)	(58,434)
Other income (expense):				
Investment and other income (expense), net	29	(23)	54	240
Interest expense	(204)	(385)	(855)	(1,948)
Amortization of debt discount and issuance costs	(129)	(166)	(436)	(600)
Foreign exchange gain (loss)	(1,133)	1,000	(56)	(300)
Debt conversion expense				(2,031)
Other income (expense), net	(1,437)	426	(1,293)	(4,639)
Net loss before noncontrolling interest	(16,727)	(12,568)	(53,572)	(63,073)
Noncontrolling interest	65	46	179	149
Net loss attributable to CTI	(16,662)	(12,522)	(53,393)	(62,924)
Dividends and deemed dividends on preferred stock	(13,023)	(3,085)	(49,817)	(50,519)
Net loss attributable to CTI common shareholders	\$ (29,685)	\$ (15,607)	\$ (103,210)	\$ (113,443)
Basic and diluted net loss per common share	\$ (0.16)	\$ (0.13)	\$ (0.62)	\$ (1.03)
Shares used in calculation of basic and diluted net loss per common share	184,997	118,591	165,724	109,874

See accompanying notes.

Table of Contents**CELL THERAPEUTICS, INC.****CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS****(In thousands)****(unaudited)**

	Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2011	2010
Operating activities		
Net loss	\$ (53,393)	\$ (62,924)
Adjustments to reconcile net loss to net cash used in operating activities:		
Equity-based compensation expense	2,320	16,260
Noncash interest expense	436	600
Depreciation and amortization	1,748	1,413
Debt conversion expense		2,031
Noncontrolling interest	(179)	(149)
Other	(242)	(217)
Changes in operating assets and liabilities:		
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	(644)	1,472
Other assets	(2,604)	68
Accounts payable	(335)	(2,888)
Accrued expenses	(757)	(4,944)
Other liabilities	(1,140)	(1,078)
Total adjustments	(1,397)	12,568
Net cash used in operating activities	(54,790)	(50,356)
Investing activities		
Purchases of property and equipment	(1,974)	(1,232)
Proceeds from the sales of property and equipment	27	82
Net cash used in investing activities	(1,947)	(1,150)
Financing activities		
Proceeds from issuance of Series 3 preferred stock and warrants, net of issuance costs		27,951
Proceeds from issuance of Series 4 preferred stock and warrants, net of issuance costs		18,621
Proceeds from issuance of Series 5 preferred stock and warrants, net of issuance costs		19,704
Proceeds from issuance of Series 6 preferred stock and warrants, net of issuance costs		3,603
Proceeds from issuance of Series 8 preferred stock, warrants and additional investment right, net of issuance costs	23,213	
Proceeds from issuance of Series 10 preferred stock, warrants and additional investment right, net of issuance costs	23,530	
Proceeds from issuance of Series 12 preferred stock and warrants, net of issuance costs	14,962	
Proceeds from issuance of Series 13 preferred stock and warrants, net of issuance costs	28,149	
Repayment of 7.5% convertible senior notes	(10,250)	
Repayment of 4% convertible senior subordinated notes		(38,515)
Cash paid for repurchase of shares in connection with taxes on restricted stock vesting	(342)	(748)
Other	(23)	
Net cash provided by financing activities	79,239	30,616
Effect of exchange rate changes on cash and cash equivalents	61	347

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents	22,563	(20,543)
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	22,649	37,811
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	\$ 45,212	\$ 17,268
Supplemental disclosure of cash flow information		
Cash paid during the period for interest obligations	\$ 705	\$ 2,401
Cash paid for taxes	\$	\$
Supplemental disclosure of noncash financing and investing activities		
Conversion of Series 3 preferred stock to common stock	\$	\$ 27,761
Conversion of Series 4 preferred stock to common stock	\$	\$ 18,621
Conversion of Series 5 preferred stock to common stock	\$	\$ 19,464
Conversion of Series 6 preferred stock to common stock	\$	\$ 2,970
Conversion of Series 9 preferred stock to common stock	\$ 25,000	\$
Conversion of Series 11 preferred stock to common stock	\$ 24,957	\$
Conversion of Series 12 preferred stock to common stock	\$ 10,647	\$
Conversion of Series 13 preferred stock to common stock	\$ 19,077	\$
Exchange of 4% convertible senior subordinated notes for common stock	\$	\$ 1,848
Issuance of common stock upon exercise of common stock purchase warrants	\$ 17,485	\$
Issuance of Series 9 preferred stock	\$ 25,000	\$
Issuance of Series 11 preferred stock	\$ 24,957	\$
Redemption of Series 8 and 10 preferred stock	\$ 36,638	\$

See accompanying notes.

Table of Contents

CELL THERAPEUTICS, INC.

NOTES TO CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(unaudited)

1. Description of Business and Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

Description of Business

Cell Therapeutics, Inc., also referred to in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q as CTI, the Company, we, us or our, focuses on the development, acquisition and commercialization of drugs for the treatment of cancer. Our principal business strategy is focused on cancer therapeutics, an area with significant market opportunity that we believe is not adequately served by existing therapies. Subsequent to the closure of our Bresso, Italy operations in September 2009, our operations are now primarily conducted in the United States. During 2008, we had one approved drug, Zevalin® (ibritumomab tiuxetan), or Zevalin, which we acquired in 2007, generating product sales. We contributed Zevalin to a joint venture, RIT Oncology, LLC, or RIT Oncology, upon its formation in December 2008 and in March 2009 we finalized the sale of our 50% interest in RIT Oncology to the other member, Spectrum Pharmaceuticals, Inc., or Spectrum. All of our current product candidates, including Pixuvri (pixantrone dimaleate), or Pixuvri, OPAXIO (paclitaxel poliglumex), or OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates are under development.

We operate in a highly regulated and competitive environment. The manufacturing and marketing of pharmaceutical products require approval from, and are subject to ongoing oversight by, the Food and Drug Administration, or the FDA, in the United States, by the European Medicines Agency, or EMA, in Europe and by comparable agencies in other countries. Obtaining approval for a new therapeutic product is never certain, may take many years and involves expenditure of substantial resources.

Basis of Presentation

The accompanying unaudited financial information of CTI as of September 30, 2011 and for the three and nine months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010 has been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States for interim financial information and with the instructions to Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and Article 10 of Regulation S-X. In the opinion of management, such financial information includes all adjustments (consisting only of normal recurring adjustments) considered necessary for a fair presentation of our financial position at such date and the operating results and cash flows for such periods. Operating results for the three and nine-month periods ended September 30, 2011 are not necessarily indicative of the results that may be expected for the entire year.

Certain information and footnote disclosure normally included in financial statements prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles have been omitted pursuant to the rules of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, or the SEC. These unaudited financial statements and related notes should be read in conjunction with our audited annual financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2010 included in our Annual Report on Form 10-K filed with the SEC on February 16, 2011.

The condensed consolidated balance sheet at December 31, 2010 has been derived from the audited financial statements at that date, but does not include all of the information and footnotes required by generally accepted accounting principles in the United States for complete financial statements.

Reverse Stock Split

On May 15, 2011, we effected a one-for-six reverse stock split, or the reverse stock split (see Note 5, *Reverse Stock Split*). Unless otherwise noted, all impacted amounts included in the condensed consolidated financial statements and notes thereto have been retroactively adjusted for the reverse stock split. Unless otherwise noted, impacted amounts include shares of common stock authorized and outstanding, preferred stock authorized (but not outstanding because there were no shares of preferred stock outstanding as of the time of the reverse stock split), share issuances, shares underlying preferred stock, convertible notes, warrants and stock options, shares reserved and loss per share.

Principles of Consolidation

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

The accompanying condensed consolidated financial statements include the accounts of CTI and its wholly-owned subsidiaries, which include Systems Medicine LLC, or SM, CTI Commercial LLC, and CTI Life Sciences

Table of Contents

Limited (from the date of formation in March 2009). CTI Life Sciences Limited opened a branch in Italy in December 2009. We also retain ownership of our branch, Cell Therapeutics Inc. Sede Secondaria, or CTI (Europe); however, we ceased operations related to this branch in September 2009.

As of September 30, 2011, we also had a 67% interest in our majority-owned subsidiary, Aequus Biopharma, Inc., or Aequus. In accordance with the Financial Accounting Standards Board, or FASB, Accounting Standards Codification, or ASC, 810, *Consolidation*, the noncontrolling interest in Aequus (previously shown as minority interest) is reported below net loss in *noncontrolling interest* in the condensed consolidated statement of operations and shown as a component of equity in the condensed consolidated balance sheet.

All intercompany transactions and balances are eliminated in consolidation.

Liquidity

The accompanying condensed consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming that we will continue as a going concern, which contemplates realization of assets and the satisfaction of liabilities in the normal course of business for the twelve-month period following the date of these financial statements. However, we have incurred losses since inception and expect to generate losses for the next few years primarily due to research and development costs for Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates.

Our available *cash and cash equivalents* were \$45.2 million as of September 30, 2011. This amount does not include approximately \$8.2 million received in October 2011 related to our settlement with The Lash Group, Inc. (see Note 8, *Legal Proceedings*). Our total current liabilities were \$30.8 million as of September 30, 2011, including \$10.9 million outstanding principal balance related to our 5.75% convertible senior notes, which are due in December 2011. We do not expect that our existing cash and cash equivalents, including additional funds received to date, will be sufficient to fund our presently anticipated operations beyond the first quarter of 2012. This raises substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern.

If we receive approval of Pixuvri by the EMA and/or the FDA, we would anticipate additional commercial expenses associated with Pixuvri operations. Accordingly, we will need to raise additional funds and are currently exploring alternative sources of equity or debt financing. We may seek to raise such capital through public or private equity financings, partnerships, joint ventures, disposition of assets, debt financings or restructurings, bank borrowings or other sources of financing. However, additional funding may not be available on favorable terms or at all. If additional funds are raised by issuing equity securities, substantial dilution to existing shareholders may result. If we fail to obtain additional capital when needed, we may be required to delay, scale back, or eliminate some or all of our research and development programs and may be forced to cease operations, liquidate our assets and possibly seek bankruptcy protection. The accompanying condensed consolidated financial statements do not include any adjustments that may result from the outcome of this uncertainty.

We are seeking shareholder approval to increase our authorized shares from 284,999,999 to 384,999,999 and to increase the total number of our authorized shares of common stock from 283,333,333 to 383,333,333 shares at our upcoming annual meeting of shareholders scheduled for November 11, 2011. We are seeking shareholder approval of this increase in our authorized shares because a number of our currently authorized shares of common stock have been issued or are reserved for issuance upon exercise or conversion of existing derivative securities (*i.e.*, securities convertible or exchangeable into our common stock). Because of the number of shares issued or reserved for issuance under various convertible securities, warrants, other derivative securities and otherwise, we believe we do not have a sufficient number of shares of common stock authorized at present to continue to fund our operations, including our research and development activities of key drug candidates and our pre-commercial activities prior to the potential approval of pixantrone in the U.S. and the E.U. In order to continue to fund our operations, we will need to raise additional capital from financing sources. One of the ways we may raise such capital is by issuing shares of common stock and/or derivative securities from time to time. Without additional authorized shares of common stock, we will be unable to raise all of the financing we will likely need to maintain our operations.

Table of Contents

Value Added Tax Receivable

Our European operations are subject to a value added tax, or VAT, which is usually applied to all goods and services purchased and sold throughout Europe. The VAT receivable is approximately \$5.2 million and \$5.3 million as of September 30, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively, of which \$4.9 million and \$5.2 million is included in *other assets* and \$0.3 million and \$0.1 million is included in *prepaid expenses and other current assets* as of September 30, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively. This receivable balance relates to our Italian operations and typically has a three year collection period. We review our VAT receivable balance for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate the carrying amount might not be recoverable.

Net Loss Per Share

Basic net income (loss) per common share is calculated based on the net income (loss) attributable to common shareholders divided by the weighted average number of shares outstanding for the period excluding any dilutive effects of options, warrants, unvested share awards and convertible securities. Diluted net income (loss) per common share assumes the conversion of all dilutive convertible securities, such as convertible debt and convertible preferred stock using the if-converted method, and assumes the exercise or vesting of other dilutive securities, such as options, warrants and share awards using the treasury stock method. As of September 30, 2011 and 2010, options, warrants, unvested share awards, unvested share rights and convertible debt securities aggregating 28.6 million and 13.4 million common share equivalents, respectively, prior to the application of the as-if converted method for convertible securities and the treasury stock method for other dilutive securities, such as options and warrants, are not included in the calculation of diluted net loss per share as they are anti-dilutive.

Recently Adopted Accounting Standards

In April 2010, the FASB issued guidance on the milestone method for revenue recognition purposes. Previously, definitive guidance on when the use of the milestone method was appropriate did not exist. This guidance provides a framework of the criteria that should be met for determining whether the milestone method of revenue recognition is appropriate. This guidance was effective on a prospective basis for milestones achieved in fiscal years and interim periods within those years, beginning on or after June 15, 2010 with early adoption permitted. The adoption of this guidance on January 1, 2011 did not have a material impact on our financial statements.

In December 2010, the FASB issued additional guidance on when to perform Step 2 of the goodwill impairment test for reporting units with zero or negative carrying amounts. The criteria for evaluating Step 1 of the goodwill impairment test and proceeding to Step 2 was amended for reporting units with zero or negative carrying amounts and requires performing Step 2 if qualitative factors indicate that it is more likely than not that a goodwill impairment exists. For public entities, this guidance is effective for fiscal years, and interim periods within those years, beginning after December 15, 2010. Upon adoption of this guidance on January 1, 2011, we performed Step 2 of the goodwill impairment test. Based on a valuation using the income, market and cost approaches, we determined that all of our \$17.1 million in goodwill was impaired. The related charge was recorded as a cumulative-effect adjustment to beginning retained earnings in the current period.

Recently Issued Accounting Standards

In June 2011, the FASB issued guidance amending the presentation requirements for comprehensive income. For public entities, this guidance is effective for fiscal years, and interim periods within those years, beginning after December 15, 2011 with early adoption permitted. Upon adoption, we will have the option to report total comprehensive income, including components of net income and components of other comprehensive income, as a single continuous statement or in two separate but consecutive statements. We do not anticipate the adoption of this guidance will have a material impact on our condensed consolidated financial statements.

Reclassifications

Certain prior year items have been reclassified to conform to current year presentation.

Table of Contents**2. Comprehensive Loss**

Comprehensive loss is comprised of net loss and other comprehensive income or loss. Our other comprehensive income or loss includes unrealized gains and losses on our securities available-for-sale and certain net exchange gains or losses resulting from the translation of assets and liabilities of foreign subsidiaries not recorded in the statement of operations. Total comprehensive loss and total accumulated other comprehensive loss consisted of the following (in thousands):

	Three Months Ended		Nine Months Ended	
	September 30, 2011	September 30, 2010	September 30, 2011	September 30, 2010
Net loss before noncontrolling interest	\$ (16,727)	\$ (12,568)	\$ (53,572)	\$ (63,073)
Foreign currency translation gain (loss)	703	(492)	(73)	252
Net unrealized loss on securities available-for-sale	(107)		(204)	
Comprehensive loss before noncontrolling interest	(16,131)	(13,060)	(53,849)	(62,821)
Noncontrolling interest	65	46	179	149
Comprehensive loss attributable to CTI	\$ (16,066)	\$ (13,014)	\$ (53,670)	\$ (62,672)

	September 30, 2011	December 31, 2010
Foreign currency translation adjustment	\$ (8,184)	\$ (8,111)
Net unrealized gain (loss) on securities available-for-sale	(62)	142
Total accumulated other comprehensive loss	\$ (8,246)	\$ (7,969)

3. Goodwill

In January 2011, we adopted the accounting standards update on *Intangibles - Goodwill and Other (Topic 350)*, which provided additional guidance on when to perform Step 2 of the goodwill impairment test for reporting units with zero or negative carrying amounts. Upon adoption of the guidance, we determined that it was more likely than not that a goodwill impairment existed. On January 1, 2011, the implied fair value of goodwill for the reporting unit, after considering unrecognized in-process research and development, was zero. An impairment charge of \$17.1 million was recorded in retained earnings as a cumulative-effective adjustment.

The following tables present the effects of the cumulative-effect application (in thousands):

	Goodwill	Adjustment	Net
Balance at January 1, 2011	\$ 17,064	\$	\$ 17,064
Cumulative effect adjustment		(17,064)	(17,064)
Adjusted Goodwill at January 1, 2011	\$ 17,064	\$ (17,064)	\$

Accumulated Deficit	Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income/(Loss)	Total Shareholders (Deficit)
---------------------	---	------------------------------

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

Balance at December 31, 2010	\$ (1,576,643)	\$	\$ (5,145)
Cumulative effect adjustment	(17,064)		(17,064)
Adjusted Balance at January 1, 2011	\$ (1,593,707)	\$	\$ (22,209)

Table of Contents**4. Lease Agreements**

In 2010, we recorded a charge of \$1.5 million for excess facilities under an operating lease upon vacating a portion of our corporate office space. Our liability for this excess facilities charge was \$0.8 million as of September 30, 2011, which was included in *current portion of long-term obligations*. The following table summarizes the changes in the liability for excess facilities during the period ended September 30, 2011 (in thousands):

	Excess Facilities Liability
Balance at December 31, 2010	\$ 1,410
Adjustments	85
Payments	(733)
Balance at September 30, 2011	\$ 762

5. Reverse Stock Split

In May 2011, our Board of Directors approved a one-for-six reverse stock split and, on May 15, 2011, the reverse stock split became effective. As a result of the reverse stock split, every six shares of our authorized and outstanding common stock were converted into one authorized and outstanding share of common stock and every six shares of our authorized preferred stock were converted into one authorized share of preferred stock; there were no shares of preferred stock outstanding so there was no impact. Fractional shares calculated in the split were rounded down to the nearest share and no fractional shares were issued. In lieu of fractional shares, shareholders received cash at a rate of approximately \$0.27 per whole pre-split share. The reverse stock split affected all of the holders of our common stock pro rata and did not materially affect any shareholder's percentage of ownership interest. Any shares of our common stock or shares underlying options, warrants, convertible preferred stock and convertible notes were proportionately reduced and the exercise price of any warrants or options and the conversion prices of any convertible preferred stock or convertible notes were proportionately increased in accordance with the terms of the related agreements. Unless otherwise noted, all impacted amounts included in the condensed consolidated financial statements and notes thereto have been retroactively adjusted for the reverse stock split.

6. Preferred Stock

Prior to the effective date of the reverse stock split (see Note 5, *Reverse Stock Split*), we completed three preferred stock transactions in 2011, each of which are described below. All of the outstanding shares of the preferred stock issued in these transactions converted to common stock or the outstanding shares of preferred stock issued in these transactions were redeemed, in each case, prior to the effective date of the reverse stock split. Accordingly, for purposes of the descriptions of these transactions included in this Note 6, *Preferred Stock*, the number of shares of preferred stock issued and the initial stated value of shares of preferred stock issued are not adjusted to reflect the reverse stock split. However, the number of shares of common stock issued upon conversion of the preferred stock, the conversion price of common stock issued upon conversion, the exercise prices of warrants issued and the number of shares of common stock issued or issuable upon exercise of the warrants in these transactions are adjusted to reflect the reverse stock split.

Series 8 and 9 Preferred Stock

In January 2011, we issued to an institutional investor, or the Investor, 25,000 shares of Series 8 non-convertible preferred stock, or Series 8 Preferred Stock, warrants to purchase up to 3.8 million shares of common stock and an additional investment right to purchase up to 25,000 shares of Series 9 convertible preferred stock, or Series 9 Preferred Stock, for an aggregate offering price of \$25.0 million. The aggregate offering price was reduced by a 5% commitment fee retained by the Investor for total gross proceeds received of \$23.7 million. We allocated the proceeds on a relative fair value basis, of which \$18.5 million, \$1.3 million and \$3.9 million was allocated to the Series 8 Preferred Stock, warrants and additional investment right, respectively. Issuance costs related to this transaction were approximately \$0.5 million.

The shares of Series 8 Preferred Stock accrued annual dividends at the rate of 10% from the date of issuance, payable in the form of additional shares of Series 8 Preferred Stock. Each share of our Series 8 Preferred Stock was

Table of Contents

entitled to a liquidation preference equal to the initial stated value of \$1,000 per share of our Series 8 Preferred Stock plus any accrued and unpaid dividends before any distribution of assets may be made to the holders of our common stock or any other securities ranking junior to our Series 8 Preferred Stock. The Series 8 Preferred Stock had no voting rights except as otherwise expressly provided in the Company's amended and restated articles of incorporation or as otherwise required by law. The shares of Series 8 Preferred Stock were redeemable by the Company at any time after issuance, either in cash or by offset against recourse notes fully secured with marketable securities, or Recourse Notes, which were issued by the Investor to the Company in connection with the exercise of the warrants and the additional investment right as discussed below.

Each warrant had an exercise price of \$2.3268 per share of common stock. The warrants were exercisable immediately and had an expiration date of two years from the date of issuance. The holder of the warrants had the option to pay the exercise price for the warrant either in cash or through the issuance of Recourse Notes to the Company. The Investor exercised all of the warrants to purchase 3.8 million shares of common stock for a total of \$8.8 million through the issuance of Recourse Notes by the Investor to the Company.

Each additional investment right had an exercise price of \$1,000 per share of Series 9 Preferred Stock. The additional investment right was exercisable immediately upon issuance and had an expiration date of February 11, 2011. The holder of the additional investment right had the option to pay the exercise price in cash or through issuance of Recourse Notes to the Company. The Investor exercised the entire additional investment right to purchase 25,000 shares of Series 9 Preferred Stock for a total of \$25.0 million through the issuance of Recourse Notes by the Investor to the Company. The Investor also elected to convert the 25,000 shares of Series 9 Preferred Stock into 10.7 million shares of common stock.

Each share of our Series 9 Preferred Stock was entitled to a liquidation preference equal to the initial stated value of \$1,000 per share of our Series 9 Preferred Stock plus any accrued and unpaid dividends before any distribution of assets may be made to the holders of our common stock or any other securities ranking junior to our Series 9 Preferred Stock. The Series 9 Preferred Stock was not entitled to dividends except to share in any dividends actually paid on the common stock or any *pari passu* or junior securities. The Series 9 Preferred Stock was convertible into common stock, at the option of the holder, at an initial conversion price of \$2.3268 per share of common stock, subject to a 9.99% blocker provision. The Series 9 Preferred Stock had no voting rights except as otherwise expressly provided in the Company's amended and restated articles of incorporation or as otherwise required by law.

In March 2011, we redeemed all 25,000 outstanding shares of Series 8 Preferred Stock (plus accrued dividends). Each share of Series 8 Preferred Stock (plus accrued dividends) was offset by \$1,350 principal amount of Recourse Notes (plus accrued interest), regardless of the issuance date of the shares of Series 8 Preferred Stock and Recourse Notes. We recognized \$0.4 million in accrued dividends on the Series 8 Preferred Stock and \$0.1 million accrued interest on the Recourse Notes through the redemption date, both of which are included in *dividends and deemed dividends on preferred stock* for the nine-month period ended September 30, 2011. Additionally, we recognized \$15.5 million in *dividends and deemed dividends on preferred stock* for the nine-month period ended September 30, 2011 upon redemption of the Series 8 Preferred Stock equal to the difference between the \$33.9 million principal balance of Recourse Notes, including accrued interest, and \$18.4 million carrying amount of Series 8 Preferred Stock, including accrued dividends.

Series 10 and 11 Preferred Stock

In February 2011, we issued to the Investor 24,957 shares of Series 10 non-convertible preferred stock, or Series 10 Preferred Stock, warrants to purchase up to 4.3 million shares of common stock and an additional investment right to purchase up to 24,957 shares of Series 11 convertible preferred stock, or Series 11 Preferred Stock, for an aggregate offering price of approximately \$25.0 million. The aggregate offering price was reduced by a 5% commitment fee retained by the Investor for total gross proceeds received of \$23.7 million. We allocated the proceeds on a relative fair value basis, of which \$18.5 million, \$1.3 million and \$3.9 million was allocated to the Series 10 Preferred Stock, warrants and additional investment right, respectively. Issuance costs related to this transaction were approximately \$0.3 million.

The shares of Series 10 Preferred Stock accrued annual dividends at the rate of 10% from the date of issuance, payable in the form of additional shares of Series 10 Preferred Stock. Each share of our Series 10 Preferred Stock

Table of Contents

was entitled to a liquidation preference equal to the initial stated value of \$1,000 per share of our Series 10 Preferred Stock plus any accrued and unpaid dividends before any distribution of assets may be made to the holders of our common stock or any other securities ranking junior to our Series 10 Preferred Stock. The Series 10 Preferred Stock had no voting rights except as otherwise expressly provided in the Company's amended and restated articles of incorporation or as otherwise required by law. The shares of Series 10 Preferred Stock were redeemable by the Company at any time after issuance, either in cash or by offset against Recourse Notes, which were issued by the Investor to the Company in connection with the exercise of the warrants and the additional investment right as discussed below.

Each warrant had an initial exercise price of \$2.022 per share of common stock. The warrants were exercisable immediately and had an expiration date of two years from the date of issuance. The holder of the warrants had the option to pay the exercise price for the warrant either in cash or through the issuance of Recourse Notes to the Company. The Investor exercised all of the warrants to purchase 4.3 million shares of common stock for a total of \$8.7 million through the issuance of Recourse Notes by the Investor to the Company.

Each additional investment right had an exercise price of \$1,000 per share of Series 11 Preferred Stock. The additional investment right was exercisable immediately upon issuance and had an expiration date of March 19, 2011. The holder of the additional investment right had the option to pay the exercise price in cash or through issuance of Recourse Notes to the Company. The Investor exercised the entire additional investment right to purchase 24,957 shares of Series 11 Preferred Stock for a total of approximately \$25.0 million through the issuance of Recourse Notes by the Investor to the Company. The Investor also elected to convert the 24,957 shares of Series 11 Preferred Stock into 12.3 million shares of common stock.

Each share of our Series 11 Preferred Stock was entitled to a liquidation preference equal to the initial stated value of \$1,000 per share of our Series 11 Preferred Stock plus any accrued and unpaid dividends before any distribution of assets may be made to the holders of our common stock or any other securities ranking junior to our Series 11 Preferred Stock. The Series 11 Preferred Stock was not entitled to dividends except to share in any dividends actually paid on the common stock or any pari passu or junior securities. The Series 11 Preferred Stock was convertible into common stock, at the option of the holder, at an initial conversion price of \$2.022 per share of common stock, subject to a 9.99% blocker provision. The Series 11 Preferred Stock had no voting rights except as otherwise expressly provided in the Company's amended and restated articles of incorporation or as otherwise required by law.

In March 2011, we redeemed all 24,957 outstanding shares of Series 10 Preferred Stock (plus accrued dividends). Each share of Series 10 Preferred Stock (plus accrued dividends) was offset by \$1,350 principal amount of Recourse Notes (plus accrued interest), regardless of the issuance date of the shares of Series 10 Preferred Stock and Recourse Notes. We recognized \$0.1 million in accrued dividends on the Series 10 Preferred Stock and \$41,000 accrued interest on the Recourse Notes through the redemption date, both of which are included in *dividends and deemed dividends on preferred stock* for the nine-month period ended September 30, 2011. Additionally, we recognized \$15.4 million in *dividends and deemed dividends on preferred stock* for the nine-month period ended September 30, 2011 upon redemption of the Series 10 Preferred Stock equal to the difference between the \$33.7 million principal balance of Recourse Notes, including accrued interest, and \$18.3 million carrying amount of Series 10 Preferred Stock, including accrued dividends.

Series 12 Convertible Preferred Stock

In May 2011, we issued 15,972 shares of our Series 12 convertible preferred stock, or Series 12 preferred stock, which was convertible into 7.6 million shares of our common stock, and warrants to purchase up to 3.0 million shares of our common stock for gross proceeds of \$16.0 million. Issuance costs related to this transaction were \$1.2 million, including \$0.2 million related to the placement agent warrants as discussed below.

Each share of our Series 12 preferred stock was entitled to a liquidation preference equal to the initial stated value of \$1,000 per share of Series 12 preferred stock, plus any accrued and unpaid dividends, before the holders of our common stock or any other junior securities receive any payments upon such liquidation. The Series 12 preferred stock was not entitled to dividends except to share in any dividends actually paid on our common stock or any pari passu or junior securities. The Series 12 preferred stock was convertible into our common stock, at the option of the holder, at an initial conversion price of \$2.10 per share, subject to a 4.99% blocker provision. A holder

Table of Contents

of our Series 12 preferred stock could have elected to increase the blocker provision to 9.99% by providing 61 days prior notice, and the maximum percentage would have automatically increased to 19.99% in the event of an automatic conversion. The Series 12 preferred stock had no voting rights except as otherwise expressly provided in our amended and restated articles of incorporation or as otherwise required by law.

Each warrant has an exercise price of \$2.40 per share of our common stock, was exercisable immediately on the date of issuance and expires five years and one day from the date of issuance. No warrants have been exercised as of September 30, 2011.

For the nine-month period ended September 30, 2011, we recognized \$5.5 million in *dividends and deemed dividends on preferred stock* related to the beneficial conversion feature on our Series 12 preferred stock.

In connection with this offering, we also issued warrants to purchase up to 0.2 million shares of our common stock to the placement agent, which were estimated to have a fair value of \$0.2 million using the Black-Scholes pricing model. These warrants have an exercise price of \$2.625 per share, were exercisable immediately on the date of issuance and expire five years and one day from the date of issuance. No warrants have been exercised as of September 30, 2011.

In May 2011, all of our Series 12 preferred stock was converted into 7.6 million shares of our common stock.

Series 13 Convertible Preferred Stock

In July 2011, we issued 30,000 shares of our Series 13 convertible preferred stock, or Series 13 preferred stock, which was convertible into 17.6 million shares of our common stock, and warrants to purchase up to 8.8 million shares of our common stock for gross proceeds of \$30.0 million. Issuance costs related to this transaction were \$2.5 million, including \$0.5 million related to the placement agent warrants and financial advisor warrants as discussed below.

Each share of Series 13 preferred stock was entitled to a liquidation preference equal to the initial stated value of \$1,000 per shares of Series 13 preferred stock, plus any accrued and unpaid dividends, before the holders of our common stock or any other junior securities receive any payments upon such liquidation. The Series 13 preferred stock was not entitled to dividends except to share in any dividends actually paid on our common stock or any pari passu or junior securities. The Series 13 preferred stock was convertible into common stock, at the option of the holder, at an initial conversion price of \$1.70 per share, subject to a 4.99% blocker provision. A holder of Series 13 preferred stock could have elected to increase the blocker provision to 9.99% by providing 61 days prior notice, and the maximum percentage would have automatically increased to 19.99% in the event of an automatic conversion. The Series 13 preferred stock had no voting rights except for limited protective provisions and except as is otherwise required by law.

Each warrant has an exercise price of \$2.15 per share of our common stock, is exercisable beginning six months and one day from the date of issuance and expires five years and one day from the date of issuance. No warrants have been exercised as of September 30, 2011.

For the three and nine-month periods ended September 30, 2011, we recognized \$13.0 million in *dividends and deemed dividends on preferred stock* related to the beneficial conversion feature on our Series 13 preferred stock.

In connection with this offering, we also issued warrants to purchase up to 0.4 million shares of our common stock to the placement agent, which were estimated to have a fair value of \$0.3 million using the Black-Scholes pricing model, and warrants to purchase up to 0.2 million shares of our common stock to the financial advisor as partial compensation for its services in connection with this offering, which were estimated to have a fair value of \$0.2 million using the Black-Scholes pricing model. These warrants have an exercise price of \$2.45 per share, are exercisable beginning six months and one day from the date of issuance and expire five years and one day from the date of issuance. No warrants have been exercised as of September 30, 2011.

In July 2011, all of our Series 13 preferred stock was converted into 17.6 million shares of our common stock.

Table of Contents**7. Share-based Compensation Expense**

The following table summarizes share-based compensation expense for the three and nine months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010, which was allocated as follows (in thousands):

	Three Months Ended September 30,		Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2011	2010	2011	2010
Research and development	\$ 206	\$ 340	\$ 839	\$ 2,494
Selling, general and administrative	574	574	1,481	13,766
Share-based compensation expense included in operating expenses	\$ 780	\$ 914	\$ 2,320	\$ 16,260

For the three and nine months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010, we incurred share-based compensation expense due to the following types of awards (in thousands):

	Three Months Ended September 30,		Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2011	2010	2011	2010
December 2009 performance awards	\$	\$	\$	\$ 13,954
Restricted stock	753	843	2,243	2,165
Options	27	71	77	141
Total share-based compensation expense	\$ 780	\$ 914	\$ 2,320	\$ 16,260

8. Legal Proceedings

On August 10, 2011 the parties settled outstanding litigation entitled Cell Therapeutics, Inc. v. The Lash Group, Inc., et al., Case No. 07-310 (filed in the Western District of Washington), or the Litigation. The settlement is not an admission of liability by either party. Under the terms of the settlement agreement, CTI received \$11.0 million from The Lash Group, Inc.'s insurers. Of that settlement amount, CTI received a payment of approximately \$8.2 million in October 2011, which represents the settlement amount net of certain attorneys' fees, litigation costs and expenses outstanding at the time the settlement payment was made. The settlement agreement also provides for a complete, mutual and general release of all claims between CTI and The Lash Group, Inc.

On December 23, 2008, CONSOB sent a notice to us requesting that we issue (i) immediately, a press release providing, among other things, information about our debt restructuring plan, the current state of compliance with the relevant covenants regulating our debt and the equity line of credit agreement we entered into with Midsummer Investment Ltd. on July 29, 2008, and (ii) by the end of each month and starting from the month of December 2008, a press release providing certain information relating to our management and financial situation, updated to the previous month, or the Monthly CONSOB Press Release. On July 31, 2009, CONSOB sent us a notice asserting three violations of the provisions of Section 114, paragraph 5 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98, as follows: (a) the non-disclosure without delay of the press release described under point (i) above and the subsequent incomplete disclosure of the relevant information through press releases dated January 9, 2009 and January 13, 2009; (b) the non-disclosure of the Monthly CONSOB Press Release in December 2008; and (c) the incomplete disclosure of the Monthly CONSOB Press Release in January 2009. The sanctions established by Section 193, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 for such violations are pecuniary administrative sanctions amounting to between 5,000 and 500,000, or approximately \$7,000 to \$672,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, applicable to each one of the three asserted violations. According to the applicable Italian legal provisions, CONSOB may impose such administrative sanctions by means of a decree stating the grounds of its decision only after evaluating our possible defenses that were submitted to CONSOB on August 28, 2009 (within 30 days of July 31, 2009, the notification date of the relevant charges, according to the

Table of Contents

applicable Italian rules). On May 5, 2010, CONSOB (1) notified us that it had begun the preliminary investigation for its decision on these administrative proceedings and (2) provided us with a preliminary investigation report in response to our defenses submitted on August 28, 2009. On June 4, 2010 (within 30 days of May 5, 2010, the notification date of the beginning of the aforesaid preliminary investigation, according to the applicable Italian rules), we submitted further defenses that CONSOB had to evaluate before imposing any possible administrative sanctions. On January 21, 2011, CONSOB notified us of a resolution confirming the occurrence of the three asserted violations and applying a fine for each of them in the following amounts: 20,000 for sanction (a) above; 50,000 for sanction (b) above; and 30,000 for sanction (c) above, for an aggregate fine of 100,000, or approximately \$136,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of January 21, 2011, for these sanctions. On March 4, 2011, we paid the aggregate fine of 100,000 in full.

Separately, on December 10, 2009, CONSOB sent us a notice claiming two violations of the provisions of Section 114, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 due to the asserted late disclosure of certain information then reported, at CONSOB's request, in press releases disseminated on December 19, 2008 and March 23, 2009. Such information concerned, respectively: (i) the conversion by BAM Opportunity Fund LP of 9.66% notes into shares of common stock that occurred between October 24, 2008 and November 19, 2008; and (ii) the contents of the opinion expressed by Stonefield Josephson, Inc., an independent registered public accounting firm, with respect to our 2008 financial statements. The sanctions established by Section 193, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 for such violations are pecuniary administrative sanctions amounting to between 5,000 and 500,000, or approximately \$7,000 to \$672,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, applicable to each of the two asserted violations. According to the applicable Italian legal provisions, CONSOB may impose such administrative sanctions by means of a decree stating the grounds of its decision only after evaluating our possible defenses that were submitted to CONSOB on January 8, 2010 (within 30 days of December 10, 2009, the notification date of the relevant charges, according to the applicable Italian rules). On July 12, 2010, CONSOB (a) notified us that it had begun the preliminary investigation for its decision on these administrative proceedings and (b) provided us with a preliminary investigation report in response to our defenses submitted on January 8, 2010. On August 12, 2010 (within 30 days of July 12, 2010, the notification date of the beginning of the aforesaid preliminary investigation, according to the applicable Italian rules), we submitted further defenses that CONSOB had to evaluate before imposing any possible administrative sanctions. In a letter dated March 10, 2011, CONSOB notified us of a resolution confirming the occurrence of the violation asserted in clause (i) above and applied a fine in the amount of 40,000, or approximately \$55,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 10, 2011, which we paid on April 5, 2011. CONSOB has not yet notified us of a resolution with respect to the violation asserted in clause (ii) above, but based on our assessment we believe the likelihood that a pecuniary administrative sanction will be imposed on the Company for the violation asserted in clause (ii) is probable.

On April 14, 2009 and December 21, 2009, the Italian Tax Authority, or the ITA, issued notices of assessment to CTI (Europe) based on the ITA's audit of CTI (Europe)'s VAT returns for the years 2003 and 2005, respectively. On June 25, 2010, the ITA issued notices of assessment to CTI (Europe) for the years 2006 and 2007 based on similar findings for the 2003 and 2005 assessments. The ITA audits concluded that CTI (Europe) did not collect and remit VAT on certain invoices issued to non-Italian clients for services performed by CTI (Europe). The assessments, including interest and penalties, for the years 2003, 2005, 2006 and 2007 are 0.5 million, 5.5 million, 2.5 million and 0.8 million, or approximately \$0.7 million, \$7.4 million, \$3.4 million and \$1.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, respectively. We believe that the services invoiced were non-VAT taxable consultancy services and that the VAT returns are correct as originally filed. We are vigorously defending ourselves against the assessments both on procedural grounds and on the merits of the case. If the decisions of the Provincial Tax Court of Milan, or the Tax Court, for the different VAT cases are unfavorable, then we expect to appeal to the higher courts in order to further defend our interests. However, if we are unable to successfully defend ourselves against the assessments issued by the ITA, we may be requested to pay to the ITA an amount ranging from 4.9 million to 9.4 million, or approximately \$6.6 million to \$12.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, plus collection fees, notification expenses and additional interest for the period lapsed between the date in which the assessments were issued and the date of effective payment. On February 2, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2005 VAT in the amount of 1.5 million, or approximately \$2.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of February 2, 2011. On March 4, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2006 VAT in the amount of 0.4 million, or approximately \$0.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 4, 2011. On September 26, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2007 VAT in the amount of 0.1 million, or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 26, 2011.

Table of Contents

2003 VAT. We did not receive a notice from the ITA requesting a deposit payment for the VAT based on the 2003 assessment as of September 30, 2011. The first hearing for the discussion of the merits of the case was held on March 18, 2011 in front of the Provincial Tax Court of Milan. On September 13, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 229/3/2011 in which the Tax Court (i) fully accepted the merits of our appeal, (ii) declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, and (iii) found the Tax Office liable to pay us €10,000, or approximately \$14,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 13, 2011, as partial refund of the legal expenses we incurred for our appeal. The Tax Office is entitled to appeal this decision to a higher court within six months. We have not been notified of any appeal from the Tax Office.

2005 VAT. On July 14, 2010, the ITA issued a notice requiring a deposit payment for the VAT to CTI (Europe) based on the 2005 assessment, including 50% of the assessed VAT, interest and collection fees for an amount of €1.5 million, or approximately \$2.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011. We filed a petition with the Tax Court for suspension of the 2005 notice of deposit payment. On September 28, 2010, the merits of the case for the year 2005 were discussed in a public hearing before the Tax Court. On January 13, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 4/2010 in which the Tax Court (i) partially accepted our appeal and declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, (ii) confirmed the right of the Italian Tax Authorities to reassess the VAT (plus interest) in relation to the transactions identified in the 2005 notice of assessment and (iii) repealed the suspension of the notice of deposit payment. As a result of this decision, our exposure for 2005 VAT assessment is currently reduced by the waiver of penalties of €2.6 million, or approximately \$3.5 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011. On February 2, 2011, we paid the required VAT deposit of €1.5 million, or approximately \$2.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of February 2, 2011, prior to the due date of February 6, 2011. On March 25, 2011, we paid to the Italian collection agent an additional €0.1 million, or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 25, 2011. The additional payment was for interest and collection fees during the suspension period. We do not believe this additional payment was due and we intend to pursue recovery of such payment through litigation. In July 2011, we were notified by our Italian counsel of the ITA's appeal regarding the January 2011 decision that no penalties could be imposed on the Company. We do not believe that the Tax Court has carefully reviewed all of our arguments, relevant documents and other supporting evidence that our counsel filed and presented during the hearing, including an appraisal from an independent expert, and, therefore, that there are grounds of appeal in order to ask the judges of the higher court to further consider all of our arguments in support of invalidating the entire notice of assessment. Accordingly, we filed an appeal with the Tax Office on July 7, 2011 and intend to file a complaint with the European Commission.

While we contend that services invoiced were non-VAT taxable consulting services and that the VAT returns are correct as originally filed, we have recorded a reserve for VAT assessed, interest and collection fees totalling €2.6 million, or approximately \$3.6 million as of September 30, 2011, of which \$3.1 million is included in *long-term obligations, less current portion* and \$0.5 million of the reserve is accounted for as an offset to VAT receivable included in *other assets*.

2006 VAT. On January 10, 2011, we received a notice from the ITA requiring a deposit payment for VAT to CTI (Europe) based on the 2006 assessment, including 50% of the assessed VAT, interest and collection fees for an amount of €0.4 million, or approximately \$0.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of January 10, 2011, payable in the first quarter 2011. We filed a request for suspension of the collection of such amount, which was rejected. On March 4, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2006 VAT in the amount of €0.4 million, or approximately \$0.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 4, 2011. The first hearing for the discussion of the merits of the case was held on May 27, 2011 (jointly with the 2007 VAT case). On October 18, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 276/21/11 (jointly with the 2007 VAT case) in which the Tax Court (i) fully accepted the merits of our appeal, (ii) declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, and (iii) found for the 2006 and 2007 VAT cases the Tax Office liable to pay us €10,000, or approximately \$14,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of October 18, 2011, as partial refund of the legal expenses we incurred for our appeal. The Tax Office is entitled to appeal this decision to a higher court within six months. We have not been notified of any appeal from the Tax Office.

2007 VAT. The first hearing for the discussion of the merits of the case was held on May 27, 2011 (jointly with the 2006 VAT case). On August 4, 2011, we received a notice from the ITA requiring a deposit payment for VAT to CTI (Europe) based on the 2007 assessment, including 50% of the assessed VAT, interest and collection fees for an amount of €0.1 million, or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of August 4, 2011, payable in the third quarter 2011. On September 26, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2007 VAT in the amount of €0.1 million or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 26, 2011. On October 18, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 276/21/11 (jointly with the 2006 VAT case) in which the Tax Court (i) fully accepted the merits of our appeal, (ii) declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, and (iii) found for the 2006 and 2007 VAT cases the Tax Office liable to pay us €10,000, or approximately \$14,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of October 18, 2011, as partial refund of the legal expenses we incurred for our appeal. The Tax Office is entitled to appeal this decision to a higher court within six months. We have not been notified of any appeal from the Tax Office.

On August 3, 2009, Sicor Italia, or Sicor, filed a lawsuit in the Court of Milan to compel us to source Pixuvri from Sicor according to the terms of a supply agreement executed between Sicor and NovusPharma on October 4,

Table of Contents

2002. Sicor alleges that the agreement was not terminated according to its terms. We assert that the supply agreement in question was properly terminated and that we have no further obligation to comply with its terms. A hearing was held on January 21, 2010 to discuss preliminary matters and set a schedule for future filings and hearings. The parties filed the authorized pleadings and submitted to the Court their requests for evidence. On November 11, 2010, a hearing was held to examine and discuss the requests for evidence submitted by the parties in the briefs filed pursuant to article 183, paragraph 6 of the Italian code of civil procedure. At the hearing of November 11, 2010, the judge declared that the case does not require any discovery or evidentiary phase, and may be decided on the basis of the documents and pleadings already filed by the parties. A final hearing is scheduled for October 11, 2012, for the parties to definitively submit to the judge their requests. No estimate of a loss, if any, can be made at this time in the event that we do not prevail.

In March 2010, three purported securities class action complaints were filed against the Company and certain of its officers and directors in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. On August 2, 2010, Judge Marsha Pechman consolidated the actions, appointed lead plaintiffs, and approved lead plaintiffs' counsel. On September 27, 2010, lead plaintiff filed an amended consolidated complaint, captioned *Sabbagh v. Cell Therapeutics, Inc.* (Case No. 2:10-cv-00414-MJP), naming the Company, Dr. James A. Bianco, Louis A. Bianco, and Craig W. Philips as defendants. The amended consolidated complaint alleges that defendants violated the federal securities laws by making certain alleged false and misleading statements related to the FDA approval process for Pixuvri. The action seeks damages on behalf of purchasers of the Company's stock during a purported class period of March 25, 2008 through March 22, 2010. On October 27, 2010, defendants moved to dismiss the amended consolidated complaint. On February 4, 2011, the Court denied in large part the defendants' motion. Defendants answered the amended consolidated complaint on March 28, 2011. Discovery has commenced, and the Court has set a trial date of June 25, 2012.

In April 2010, three shareholder derivative complaints were filed against the Company and certain of its officers and directors in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. These derivative complaints allege that defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Company by making or failing to prevent the issuance of certain alleged false and misleading statements related to the FDA approval process for Pixuvri. The allegations in the derivative actions are substantially similar to those in the securities action. On May 10, 2010, Judge Marsha Pechman consolidated the shareholder derivative actions under the caption *Shackleton v. Bauer* (Case No. 2:10-cv-00414-MJP), and appointed the law firms of Robbins Umeda LLP and Federman & Sherwood as co-lead counsel for derivative plaintiffs. Three more derivative complaints were filed in June, July and October 2010, and they have also been consolidated with *Shackleton v. Bauer*. The parties have agreed to coordinate discovery in the derivative and securities actions. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the Court has stayed the deadline for the derivative plaintiffs to file an amended complaint until March 12, 2012 (45 days after the scheduled close of discovery in the securities class action), and briefing on any motion to dismiss will follow. The court has set a trial date of December 3, 2012 for the shareholder derivative action.

Discovery has commenced in the securities class action, and as such, the lawsuits are at a preliminary stage in the proceedings. We believe that the securities class action is without merit and intend to defend it vigorously. For the shareholder derivative action, no estimate of a loss, if any, can be made at this time in the event that we do not prevail.

In addition to the litigation discussed above, we are from time to time subject to legal proceedings and claims arising in the ordinary course of business, some of which may be covered in whole or in part by insurance.

9. Collaborative Agreements

During the first quarter of 2011, we entered into an agreement with Chroma Therapeutics Ltd., or Chroma, the Chroma Agreement, under which we have an exclusive license to certain technology and intellectual property controlled by Chroma to develop and commercialize the drug candidate tosedostat in North, Central and South America, or the Licensed Territory. Pursuant to the terms of the Chroma Agreement, we paid Chroma an upfront fee of \$5.0 million upon execution of the agreement. *Research and development* expense attributable to the Chroma Agreement was \$0.6 million and \$6.2 million for the three and nine months ended September 30, 2011, respectively.

Table of Contents

We will make a milestone payment of \$5.0 million upon the initiation of the first pivotal trial, which could commence as early as the second quarter of 2012. The Chroma Agreement also includes additional development- and sales-based milestone payments related to acute myeloid leukemia, or AML, and certain other indications, up to a maximum amount of \$209.0 million payable by us to Chroma if all development and sales milestones are achieved. We will pay Chroma royalties on net sales of tosedostat in any country within the Licensed Territory, commencing on the first commercial sale of tosedostat in any country in the Licensed Territory and continuing with respect to that country until the later of (a) the expiration date of the last patent claim covering tosedostat in that country, (b) the expiration of all regulatory exclusivity periods for tosedostat in that country or (c) ten years after the first commercial sale in that country. Royalty payments to Chroma are based on net sales volumes in any country within the Licensed Territory and range from the low- to mid-teens as a percentage of net sales.

We will oversee and be responsible for performing the development operations and commercialization activities in the Licensed Territory and Chroma will oversee and be responsible for performing the development operations and commercialization activities worldwide except for the Licensed Territory, or the ROW Territory. Development costs may not exceed \$50.0 million for the first three years of the Chroma Agreement unless agreed by the parties and we will be responsible for 75% of all development costs, while Chroma will be responsible for 25% of all development costs, subject to certain exceptions. Chroma will be solely responsible for the manufacturing of tosedostat for development purposes in the Licensed Territory and the ROW Territory in accordance with the terms of the manufacturing and supply agreement. We have the option of obtaining a commercial supply of tosedostat from Chroma or from another manufacturer at our sole discretion in the Licensed Territory. The Chroma Agreement may be terminated by us at our convenience upon 120 days written notice to Chroma. The Chroma Agreement may also be terminated by either party following a material breach by the other party subject to notice and cure periods.

Table of Contents**Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations**

This Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, including the following discussion, contains forward-looking statements, which involve risks and uncertainties and should be read in conjunction with the Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements and the related Notes included in Part I, Item I of this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. When used in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, terms such as anticipates, believes, continue, could, estimates, expects, intends, may, plans, potential, predicts, should, or will or the negative of those terms or other comparable terms are intended to identify such forward-looking statements. Such statements, which include statements concerning product sales, research and development expenses, selling, general and administrative expenses, additional financings and additional losses, are subject to known and unknown risks and uncertainties, including, but not limited to, those discussed below and elsewhere in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and our Annual Report on Form 10-K, particularly in Factors Affecting Our Operating Results and Financial Condition, that could cause actual results, levels of activity, performance or achievement to differ significantly from those projected. Although we believe that expectations reflected in the forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot guarantee future results, levels of activity, performance or achievements. We will not update any of the forward-looking statements after the date of this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q to conform these statements to actual results or changes in our expectations. Readers are cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements, which apply only as of the date of this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

OVERVIEW

We develop, acquire and commercialize novel treatments for cancer. Our goal is to build a leading biopharmaceutical company with a diversified portfolio of proprietary oncology drugs. Our research, development, acquisition and in-licensing activities concentrate on identifying and developing new, less toxic and more effective ways to treat cancer.

We are currently focusing our efforts on Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates. As of September 30, 2011, we had incurred aggregate net losses of approximately \$1.7 billion since inception. Even if we receive FDA or EMA approval for Pixuvri, we may continue to incur operating losses for at least the next few years.

Pixuvri

We are developing Pixuvri, a novel aza-anthracenedione, for the treatment of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, or NHL, and various other hematologic malignancies, and solid tumors. Pixuvri was studied in our EXTEND, or PIX301, clinical trial, which was a phase III single-agent trial of Pixuvri for patients with relapsed, refractory aggressive NHL who received two or more prior therapies and who were sensitive to treatment with anthracyclines. In November 2008, we announced that this trial achieved the primary efficacy endpoint. Based on the outcome of the EXTEND trial and on the basis of pre-New Drug Application, or NDA, communication we received from the FDA relating to this phase III trial, we began a rolling NDA submission to the FDA in April 2009. We completed the submission in June 2009.

The FDA completed its inspection of the facilities at NerPharMa DS, S.r.l. and NerPharMa, S.r.l. (two independent pharmaceutical manufacturing companies belonging to Nerviano Medical Sciences S.r.l., in Nerviano, Italy). The FDA found both manufacturing sites in compliance and acceptable for continued manufacturing of the drug in early March 2010. NerPharMa, S.r.l. agreed to manufacture our drug product, Pixuvri, which will be used for clinical and commercial supplies.

On March 22, 2010, the FDA's Oncologic Drugs Advisory Committee, or ODAC, panel voted unanimously that the clinical trial data was not adequate to support approval of Pixuvri for this patient population. In early April 2010, we received a Complete Response Letter from the FDA regarding our NDA for Pixuvri recommending that we design and conduct an additional trial to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of Pixuvri. We met with the FDA in August 2010 at an end of review meeting at which time the FDA informed us that the Pixuvri Investigational New Drug application, or IND, and NDA were being transferred to the newly-formed Division of Hematology Drug Products, or the DHP. We filed an appeal in December 2010 with the FDA's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research regarding the FDA's decision in April 2010 to not approve Pixuvri for relapsed/refractory aggressive NHL. The appeal was filed under the FDA's formal dispute resolution process asking the Office of New Drugs, or the OND, to conclude that PIX301 demonstrated efficacy. In March 2011, we announced that we met with officials of the OND and presented our arguments supporting our belief that the data contained in the NDA support the conclusion that Pixuvri is effective for its planned use. At the meeting, the OND requested additional analyses from the EXTEND clinical study which we submitted.

Table of Contents

On May 3, 2011, we announced that the OND responded to our December 2010 appeal of the FDA's April 2010 decision to not approve Pixuvri for relapsed or refractory aggressive NHL. In its response, the OND indicated that after considering the data available in the appeal, it does not believe that accelerated approval of our NDA is necessarily out of reach based on a single controlled clinical trial, provided that two key matters can be resolved satisfactorily. First, the circumstances of stopping the PIX301 trial early must be resolved to assure that ongoing results assessment were not dictating the decision to stop. Second, ascertainment of the primary endpoint in the PIX301 study must be determined to have been sound and not subject to bias.

The OND also indicated that our request that the OND find that the data in our NDA demonstrate efficacy and return the NDA to the Office of Oncology Drug Products for consideration of safety and other issues was denied because the OND was not able to conclude that efficacy had been demonstrated. However, the OND also did not find that it could be concluded that PIX301 was a failed study, which warranted application of interim analysis statistical thresholds.

On June 14, 2011, we announced that we had met with the FDA's Division of Oncology Drug Products, or DODP, in a meeting that focused on the documents we proposed to provide regarding the circumstances of stopping the enrollment of PIX301 prior to achieving the original planned patient accrual and the make-up of the new radiology expert panel, as well as our plan to address the items noted in the FDA's Complete Response Letter. The DODP confirmed that our NDA would be reviewed within six months from the resubmission of our NDA. On September 28, 2011, we announced that a second independent radiology assessment of response and progression endpoint data from our PIX301 clinical trial of Pixuvri were achieved with statistical significance. We believe this assessment confirmed the statistical robustness of the PIX301 efficacy data that was previously submitted by us to the FDA in our NDA for Pixuvri. We anticipate filing the additional information by the end of October 2011; accordingly, it is possible that we could obtain FDA approval as early as the first half of 2012.

We believe the results of the EXTEND trial showed that patients randomized to treatment with Pixuvri achieved a significantly higher rate of confirmed and unconfirmed complete response compared to patients treated with standard chemotherapy, had a significantly increased overall response rate and experienced a statistically significant improvement in median progression free survival. Pixuvri was well tolerated when administered at the proposed dose and schedule in the EXTEND clinical trial in heavily pre-treated patients. The most common (incidence greater than or equal to 10%) grade 3/4 adverse events reported for Pixuvri-treated subjects across studies were neutropenia and leukopenia. Use of growth factor support was minimal. Other common adverse events (any grade) included infection, anemia, thrombocytopenia, asthenia, pyrexia and cough. Overall, the incidence of grade 3 or greater cardiac adverse events was 7% (five patients) on the Pixuvri arm and 2% (one patient) on the comparator arm. There were an equal number of deaths due to an adverse event in both the Pixuvri and comparator arm.

In March 2011, we initiated an additional Pixuvri clinical trial, PIX306, or PIX-R trial, to study Pixuvri in combination with rituximab in patients with relapsed/refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, or DLBCL. The trial will compare a combination of Pixuvri plus rituximab to a combination of gemcitabine plus rituximab in patients with relapsed or refractory DLBCL who have received one to three prior lines of therapy. The PIX-R trial utilizes progression free survival, or PFS, and overall survival, or OS, as co-primary endpoints of the study. The PIX-R trial is targeting to enroll approximately 350 patients and will include patients who have failed at least one line of previous therapy and patients who are not candidates for myeloablative chemotherapy and stem cell transplant. We had discussions with the DHP relating to a Special Protocol Assessment, or SPA, for the study and we were advised that OS as the sole primary endpoint would be the only acceptable trial design in order for us to obtain an SPA agreement for the PIX-R trial; however, the DHP noted that we could conduct a study utilizing PFS along with OS as co-primary endpoints which would be an acceptable design outside of the formal SPA process. Regulatory acceptability will depend on the magnitude of the difference between the trial study arms as well as a risk and benefit analysis. This study could serve as either a post-approval confirmatory study, if Pixuvri were to be approved on the basis of our current NDA, or as a registration study for approval in the United States.

In July 2009, we were notified by the EMA that Pixuvri was eligible to be submitted for an MAA through the EMA's centralized procedure. The centralized review process provides for a single coordinated review for approval of pharmaceutical products that is conducted by the EMA on behalf of all European Union, or EU, member states. The EMA also designated Pixuvri as a New Active Substance, or NAS; if approved by the EMA, compounds designated as an NAS are eligible to receive a 10-year market exclusivity period in EU member states. In September

Table of Contents

2009, we applied to the EMA for orphan drug designation for Pixuvri, which was granted in December 2009. In September 2009, we also submitted a Pediatric Investigation Plan, or PIP, to the EMA as part of the required filing process for approval of Pixuvri for treating relapsed, refractory aggressive NHL in Europe. In April 2010, the EMA recommended that we submit an updated PIP for Pixuvri following discussions with us about the preclinical and clinical Pixuvri data, including EXTEND, and the desire to explore the potential benefits Pixuvri may offer to children with lymphoid malignancies and solid tumors. We submitted an expanded PIP to the Pediatric Committee of the EMA, or PDCO, in July 2010. The expanded PIP was accepted for review by the PDCO in August 2010. On October 19, 2010, we announced that the PDCO had adopted an opinion agreeing to our PIP. The PDCO also recommended deferral of the initiation of the clinical studies until after Pixuvri receives EMA approval. In November 2010, the MAA seeking approval for Pixuvri for the treatment of adult patients with multiple relapsed or refractory aggressive NHL was validated and accepted for review by the EMA. Since Pixuvri was initially granted orphan drug status by the EMA for the treatment of DLBCL, we agreed to withdraw the orphan designation from the EU register in November 2010 based on the expansion of the MAA to the broader aggressive NHL population.

In June 2010, the Italian Medicines Agency, or AIFA, the national authority responsible for drug regulation in Italy, approved the facility at NerPharMa DS, S.r.l. for the production of Pixuvri drug substance. In July 2010, we signed a supply agreement with NerPharMa, S.r.l. for Pixuvri drug product manufacturing. The five-year contract provides for both the commercial and clinical supply of Pixuvri drug product.

In March 2011, we received the Day 120 list of questions from the EMA. In April 2011, we met with the co-rapporteurs and members of the EMA to discuss our proposed responses. Based on feedback and recommendation from the rapporteurs, in order to allow time for preclinical reports to be available, we requested and were granted an extension so that our Day 120 responses can address the questions in the Day 120 list. In August 2011, we submitted our response to the Day 120 questions. We expect to receive an opinion from the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use, or CHMP, regarding approvability of Pixuvri during the first quarter of 2012.

We have also conducted the RAPID, or PIX203, phase II clinical trial study (CHOP-R vs. CPOP-R) in which Pixuvri is substituted for doxorubicin in the CPOP-R regimen compared to the standard CHOP-R regimen in front-line treatment of patients with aggressive NHL. The study enrolled 124 patients, 61 on the CPOP-R arm and 63 on the CHOP-R arm. An interim analysis of the RAPID trial, reported in July 2007, showed that at that time, a majority of patients on both arms of the study achieved a major objective anti-tumor response (complete response or partial response). Preliminary results were presented in the fourth quarter of 2010 and we expect additional study data to be presented in 2011. Three patients on the CPOP-R arm died on study compared to none of the patients on the CHOP-R arm. These events were observed in patients ages 79 years old or older with higher risk disease. The median number of cycles for the CPOP-R arm was eight compared to six for the CHOP-R arm. Pixuvri patients had fewer severe cardiac events including declines in left ventricular ejection fraction of 20% (1 versus 8), cases of congestive heart failure (0 versus 4) and on study elevations in levels of Troponin T, a marker of cardiac damage. Other important treatment related side effects such as bone marrow suppression and infections were essentially equivalent between the study arms.

Pixuvri for metastatic breast cancer

Pixuvri is also being studied in patients with HER2-negative metastatic breast cancer who have tumor progression after at least two, but not more than three, prior chemotherapy regimens. In the second quarter of 2010, the North Central Cancer Treatment Group, or the NCCTG, that is conducting the trial opened this phase II study for enrollment. Accrual is expected to be completed in the fourth quarter of 2011.

OPAXIO

OPAXIO, which we have previously referred to as XYOTAX, is our novel biologically-enhanced chemotherapeutic agent that links paclitaxel to a biodegradable polyglutamate polymer, resulting in a new chemical entity. We are currently focusing our development of OPAXIO on ovarian, brain and esophageal cancer.

OPAXIO for ovarian cancer

We are currently focusing our development of OPAXIO as a potential maintenance therapy for women with advanced stage ovarian cancer who achieve a complete remission following first-line therapy with paclitaxel and carboplatin. This study, the GOG0212 trial, is under the control of the Gynecologic Oncology Group, or GOG, and is expected to enroll 1,100 patients with 817 patients enrolled as of September 30, 2011. The GOG Data Monitoring Committee plans to conduct an interim analysis of overall survival and, based on feedback provided by the GOG, an interim analysis is currently expected in mid-2012. If successful, we could utilize those results to form the basis of an NDA for OPAXIO.

Table of Contents

OPAXIO for brain cancer

In November 2010, results were presented by the Brown University Oncology Group from a phase II trial of OPAXIO combined with temozolomide, or TMZ, and radiotherapy in patients with newly-diagnosed, high-grade gliomas, a type of brain cancer. The trial demonstrated a high rate of complete and partial responses and an encouragingly high rate of six month PFS. Based on these results, we have worked with the Brown University Oncology Group to conduct an additional study in a subset of patients with high-grade lymphoma with specific genetic markers for which we believe OPAXIO and radiotherapy could be more beneficial than standard treatment of TMZ and radiotherapy. The Brown University Oncology Group opened this study for enrollment in August 2011.

OPAXIO for esophageal cancer

In June 2009, we announced that, in a study released from Brown University at the 2009 American Society for Clinical Oncology Annual Meeting, patients with cancer of the lower esophagus had evidence of a high pathological complete response rate when given OPAXIO in addition to cisplatin and full-course radiotherapy. In this phase II clinical trial study, data suggests that OPAXIO may provide enhanced radiation sensitization as compared to standard therapy.

OPAXIO for non-small cell lung cancer

In March 2008, we submitted an MAA to the EMA for first-line treatment of patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer, or NSCLC, who are poor performance status, or PS2, based on a non-inferior survival and improved side effect profile which we believe was demonstrated in our previous clinical trials. The application was based on a positive opinion we received from the EMA's Scientific Advice Working Party, or SAWP; the EMA agreed that switching the primary endpoint from superiority to non-inferiority is feasible if the retrospective justification provided in the marketing application is adequate. In September 2009, we notified the EMA of our decision to withdraw the MAA and we refocused our resources on the development of OPAXIO for its potential superiority indication in maintenance therapy for ovarian cancer and as a radiation sensitizer in the treatment of esophageal cancer.

Preclinical data presented at the 2006 meeting of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancers, National Cancer Institute and American Association for Cancer Research demonstrated that the efficacy of OPAXIO is enhanced in certain human tumors when mice are given additional estrogen. In subsequent clinical studies, more than 1,900 patients were treated in our four pivotal phase III trials of OPAXIO for the treatment of NSCLC. While the STELLAR 2, 3 and 4 trials missed their primary endpoint of superior OS, women treated with OPAXIO for newly-diagnosed advanced NSCLC in STELLAR 3 and 4 had a significant improvement in their overall survival compared to women or men treated with standard chemotherapy. In addition, with single-agent OPAXIO, we observed a significant reduction in most of the severe toxic side effects associated with the standard chemotherapy agents studied in the STELLAR trials.

In September 2007, we initiated our PGT307 trial, which focuses exclusively on NSCLC in women with pre-menopausal estrogen levels, the subset of patients where OPAXIO demonstrated the greatest potential survival advantage in the STELLAR trials. During the second quarter of 2010, we ceased enrollment in the PGT307 trial and the study is now closed.

Tosedostat

In March 2011, we entered into a co-development and license agreement with Chroma, providing us with exclusive marketing and co-development rights to Chroma's drug candidate tosedostat in North, Central and South America. Tosedostat is an oral, aminopeptidase inhibitor that has demonstrated significant anti-tumor responses in blood related cancers and solid tumors in phase I-II clinical trials. Interim results from the phase II OPAL study of tosedostat in elderly patients with relapsed or refractory AML were presented in June 2011 at the 2011 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Clinical Oncology, or ASCO. These results showed that once-daily, oral doses of tosedostat was well-tolerated and demonstrated encouraging response rates at the interim evaluation time point including a high-response rate among patients who received prior hypomethylating agents, which are used to treat myelodysplastic syndrome, or MDS, a precursor of AML. Based on these results, and pending discussions with the FDA, we, in collaboration with Chroma, anticipate initiating a phase III study for patients with relapsed or refractory MDS in the second quarter of 2012.

Table of Contents

Brostallicin

We are developing brostallicin through our wholly-owned subsidiary, Systems Medicine LLC, which holds worldwide rights to use, develop, import and export brostallicin. Brostallicin is a synthetic DNA minor groove binding agent that has demonstrated anti-tumor activity and a favorable safety profile in clinical trials in which more than 230 patients have been treated to date. We use a genomic-based platform to guide the development of brostallicin.

In the second quarter of 2010, the NCCTG opened for enrollment a phase II study of brostallicin in combination with cisplatin in patients with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer, or mTNBC. mTNBC is defined by tumors lacking expression of estrogen, progesterone receptors and without over-expression of HER2. Women with mTNBC have very limited effective treatments and based on the novel mechanism of action of brostallicin and the recognized activity of cisplatin in this disease, the combination of the two agents will be explored by the NCCTG. In addition to standard clinical efficacy measures, biological endpoints will also be evaluated to assist in understanding the specific activity of brostallicin in this disease.

A phase II study of brostallicin in relapsed, refractory soft tissue sarcoma met its predefined activity and safety hurdles and resulted in a first-line phase II clinical trial study that was conducted by the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer, or EORTC. Planned enrollment for this study was completed in August 2008 and the EORTC conducted final data analysis in 2009. The data was reported at the ASCO Annual Meeting in June 2010. The EORTC trial demonstrated, in this hard to treat patient group, a modest level of clinical activity with an acceptable level of toxicity. No further development is planned in this indication.

Research and Preclinical Development

Platinates are an important class of chemotherapy agents used to treat a wide variety of cancers. There are three platinates currently commercially available (cisplatin, carboplatin, and oxaliplatin), which are first-line agents in ovarian cancer, lung cancer, testicular cancer, and colorectal cancer, as well as a broad variety of other diseases. We are developing the dinuclear-platinum complex CT-47463. CT-47463 has a different mechanism of action than the commercially available platinum compounds and is substantially more active on many preclinical models including those with resistance to monoplatinates. We have initiated active pharmaceutical ingredient and formulation development as prerequisites to IND enabling activities for bisplatinates.

Critical Accounting Estimates

Management makes certain judgments and uses certain estimates and assumptions when applying accounting principles generally accepted in the United States in the preparation of our condensed consolidated financial statements. We evaluate our estimates and judgments on an on-going basis and base our estimates on historical experience and on assumptions that we believe to be reasonable under the circumstances. Our experience and assumptions form the basis for our judgments about the carrying value of assets and liabilities that are not readily apparent from other sources. Actual results may vary from what we anticipate and different assumptions or estimates about the future could change our reported results. As described in Item 7, *Management's Discussion and Analysis of Consolidated Financial Condition and Results of Operations*, of our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2010, we consider our policies for license and contract revenue, impairment of long-lived assets, valuation of goodwill, derivatives embedded in certain debt or equity securities, restructuring charges and stock-based compensation expense to be the most critical in the preparation of the condensed consolidated financial statements because they involve the most difficult, subjective, or complex judgments about the effect of matters that are inherently uncertain. There have been no material changes to our application of critical accounting policies and significant judgments and estimates since December 31, 2010.

Table of Contents**RESULTS OF OPERATIONS****Three months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010**

Research and development expenses. Research and development costs are expensed as incurred in accordance with ASC 730, *Research and Development*. In instances where we enter into agreements with third parties for research and development activities, we may prepay fees for services at the initiation of the contract. We record the prepayment as a prepaid asset and amortize the asset into research and development expense over the period of time the contracted research and development services are performed. Other types of arrangements with third parties may be fixed fee or fee for service, and may include monthly payments or payments upon completion of milestones or receipt of deliverables. In instances where we enter into cost-sharing arrangements, all costs reimbursed by the collaborator are a reduction to research and development expense while costs paid to the collaborator are an addition to research and development expense. We expense upfront license payments related to acquired technologies which have not yet reached technological feasibility and have no alternative future use.

Our research and development expenses for compounds under development and preclinical development are as follows (in thousands):

	Three Months Ended September 30,	
	2011	2010
Compounds under development:		
Pixuvri	\$ 2,942	\$ 1,287
OPAXIO	255	436
Tosedostat	567	
Brostallicin	13	59
Operating expenses	3,702	3,300
Research and preclinical development	51	19
 Total research and development expenses	 \$ 7,530	 \$ 5,101

Costs for compounds under development include external direct expenses such as principal investigator fees, clinical research organization charges and contract manufacturing fees incurred for preclinical, clinical, manufacturing and regulatory activities associated with preparing the compounds for submissions of NDAs or similar regulatory filings to the FDA, EMA or other regulatory agencies outside the United States and Europe, as well as upfront license fees for acquired technology. Operating costs include our personnel and occupancy expenses associated with developing these compounds. Research and preclinical development costs include primarily costs associated with bisplatin development as well as external laboratory services associated with other compounds. We do not allocate operating costs to the individual compounds under development as our accounting system does not track these costs by individual compound. As a result, we are not able to capture the total cost of each compound. Direct external costs incurred to date for Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat and brostallicin are approximately \$71.2 million, \$224.3 million, \$6.2 million and \$9.3 million, respectively. Costs for Pixuvri prior to our merger with Novuspharma S.p.A, a public pharmaceutical company located in Italy, or CTI (Europe), in January 2004 are excluded from this amount. Costs for brostallicin prior to our acquisition of SM in July 2007 are also excluded from this amount. Costs for tosedostat prior to our co-development and license agreement with Chroma are also excluded.

Research and development expenses increased to approximately \$7.5 million for the three months ended September 30, 2011 from approximately \$5.1 million for the three months ended September 30, 2010. Pixuvri costs increased primarily due to an increase in clinical activity associated with the startup of the PIX306 study in addition to increases in regulatory consulting and manufacturing activity. Costs for our OPAXIO program decreased primarily due to a decrease in clinical activity. Costs for tosedostat relate to our share of development costs associated with clinical and manufacturing activity incurred under our co-development and license agreement with Chroma. Costs for brostallicin relate primarily to clinical development activities associated with phase I and phase II studies. Our operating expenses increased primarily due to our 2011 estimated discretionary bonus accrual, partially offset by a decrease in occupancy costs associated with a lease adjustment.

Table of Contents

Our lead drug candidates Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat and brostallicin are currently in clinical trials. Many drugs in human clinical trials fail to demonstrate the desired safety and efficacy characteristics. Even if our drugs progress successfully through initial human testing, they may fail in later stages of development. A number of companies in the pharmaceutical industry, including us, have suffered significant setbacks in advanced clinical trials, even after reporting promising results in earlier trials. Regulatory agencies, including the FDA and EMA, regulate many aspects of a product candidate's life cycle, including research and development and preclinical and clinical testing. We or regulatory authorities may suspend clinical trials at any time on the basis that the participants are being exposed to unacceptable health risks. Completion of clinical trials depends on, among other things, the number of patients available for enrollment in a particular trial, which is a function of many factors, including the availability and proximity of patients with the relevant condition. We rely on third parties to conduct clinical trials, which may result in delays or failure to complete trials if the third parties fail to perform or meet applicable standards. We have drug candidates that are still in research and preclinical development, which means that they have not yet been tested on humans. We will need to commit significant time and resources to develop these and additional product candidates.

Our products will be successful and we will be able to generate revenues only if:

our product candidates are developed to a stage that will enable us to commercialize, sell, or license related marketing rights to third parties; and

our product candidates, if developed, are approved.

Failure to generate such revenues may preclude us from continuing our research, development and commercial activities for these and other product candidates. We also enter into collaboration agreements for the development and commercialization of our product candidates. We cannot control the amount and timing of resources our collaborators devote to product candidates, which may also result in delays in the development or marketing of products. Because of these risks and uncertainties, we cannot accurately predict when or whether we will successfully complete the development of our product candidates or the ultimate product development cost. Specific comments for individual product candidates are below.

Pixuvri. Pixuvri is an aza-anthracenedione that has distinct structural and physiochemical properties that make its anti-tumor unique in this class of agents. The novel pharmacologic differences between Pixuvri and the other agents in the class may allow re-introduction of anthracycline-like potency in the treatment of patients who are otherwise at their lifetime recommended doxorubicin exposure. We are unable to provide the nature, timing, and estimated costs of the efforts necessary to complete the development of Pixuvri because, among other reasons, we cannot predict with any certainty the pace of enrollment of our clinical trials. Even after a clinical trial is enrolled, preclinical and clinical data can be interpreted in different ways, which could delay, limit or preclude regulatory approval and advancement of this compound through the development process. For these reasons, among others, we cannot estimate the date on which clinical development of Pixuvri will be completed or when we will be able to begin commercializing Pixuvri to generate material net cash inflows.

OPAXIO. OPAXIO is our novel biologically enhanced chemotherapeutic agent that links paclitaxel to a biodegradable polyglutamate polymer, resulting in a new chemical entity. We are currently focusing our development of OPAXIO on ovarian, brain and esophageal cancer. We are unable to provide the nature, timing, and estimated costs of the efforts necessary to complete the development of OPAXIO because, among other reasons, a third party is conducting the key clinical trial of OPAXIO and even after a clinical trial has been enrolled, preclinical and clinical data can be interpreted in different ways, which could delay, limit or preclude regulatory approval and advancement of this compound through the development process. For these reasons, among others, we cannot estimate the date on which clinical development of OPAXIO will be completed or when we will be able to begin commercializing OPAXIO to generate material net cash inflows.

Tosedostat. Tosedostat is an oral, aminopeptidase inhibitor that has demonstrated significant anti-tumor responses in blood related cancers and solid tumors in phase I-II clinical trials. We are unable to provide the nature, timing, and estimated costs of the efforts necessary to complete the development of tosedostat because, among other reasons, we cannot predict with any certainty the pace of enrollment of our clinical trials. Even after a clinical trial is enrolled, preclinical and clinical data can be interpreted in different ways, which could delay, limit or preclude regulatory approval and advancement of this compound through the development process. For these reasons, among others, we cannot estimate the date on which clinical development of tosedostat will be completed or when we will be able to begin commercializing tosedostat to generate material net cash inflows.

Table of Contents

Brostallicin. Brostallicin is a synthetic DNA minor groove binding agent that has demonstrated anti-tumor activity. The NCCTG is conducting a phase II study of brostallicin in combination with cisplatin in patients with mTNBC. We are unable to provide the nature, timing, and estimated costs of the efforts necessary to complete the development of brostallicin because, among other reasons, a third party is conducting the clinical trial of brostallicin for which enrollment is subject to their control and even after a clinical trial has been enrolled, preclinical and clinical data can be interpreted in different ways, which could delay, limit or preclude regulatory approval and advancement of this compound through the development process. For these reasons, among others, we cannot estimate the date on which clinical development of brostallicin will be completed or when we will be able to begin commercializing brostallicin to generate material net cash inflows.

Bisplatinates (CT-47463). Cisplatin is a platinum-based chemotherapy drug used to treat a wide variety of cancers. We are developing new analogues of the dinuclear-platinum complex, or CT-47463, that is more potent than cisplatin. CT-47463 is endowed with a unique mechanism of action, active in preclinical studies on a large panel of tumor models, sensitive and refractory to cisplatin, and has a safety profile comparable to that of cisplatin. The novel bisplatinum analogues are rationally designed and synthesized to have improved biopharmaceutical properties that reduce the intrinsic reactivity of the molecule and that demonstrate preclinical anti-tumor efficacy in solid tumor models. We are unable to provide the nature, timing, and estimated costs of the efforts necessary to complete the development of CT-47463 because, among other reasons, a third party is conducting the preclinical trial for CT-47463, no clinical trial design for CT-47463 has been developed yet and even after a clinical trial is enrolled, preclinical and clinical data can be interpreted in different ways, which could delay, limit or preclude regulatory approval and advancement of this compound through the development process. For these reasons, among others, we cannot estimate the date on which clinical development of CT-47463 will be completed or when we will be able to begin commercializing CT-47463 to generate material net cash inflows.

The risks and uncertainties associated with completing development on schedule and the consequences to operations, financial position and liquidity if the project is not timely completed are discussed in more detail in the following risk factors, which begin on page 37 of this Form 10-Q: *Our financial condition may be adversely affected if third parties default in the performance of contractual obligations.* ; *We may be delayed, limited or precluded from obtaining regulatory approval of OPAXIO as a maintenance therapy for advanced stage ovarian cancer.* ; *We are subject to extensive government regulation.* ; *Even if our drug candidates are successful in clinical trials, we may not be able to successfully commercialize them.* ; *If we do not successfully develop our product candidates into marketable products, we may be unable to generate significant revenue or become profitable.* ; and *We may take longer to complete our clinical trials than we expect, or we may not be able to complete them at all.*

Selling, general and administrative expenses. Selling, general and administrative expenses decreased to approximately \$7.8 million for the three months ended September 30, 2011 from approximately \$7.9 million for the three months ended September 30, 2010. This decrease was primarily related to reductions in legal expenses offset in part by our 2011 estimated discretionary bonus accrual.

Interest expense. Interest expense decreased to approximately \$0.2 million for the three months ended September 30, 2011 from approximately \$0.4 million for the three months ended September 30, 2010. This decrease is primarily due to a reduction in principal balances outstanding on our convertible notes during the three months ended September 30, 2011 compared to the same period in 2010. Upon maturity, we fully repaid \$10.3 million on our 7.5% convertible senior notes in April 2011.

Amortization of debt discount and issuance costs. Amortization of debt discount and issuance costs for the three months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010 is primarily related to the amortization of debt discount and issuance costs incurred on our 5.75% and 7.5% convertible senior notes.

Foreign exchange gain (loss). The foreign exchange loss for the three months ended September 30, 2011 and the foreign exchange gain for the three months ended September 30, 2010 is due to fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates, primarily related to payables and receivables in our European branches denominated in foreign currencies.

Table of Contents**Nine months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010**

License and contract revenue. License and contract revenue for the nine months ended September 30, 2010 represents recognition of deferred revenue from the sale of Lisofylline material to DiaKine Therapeutics, Inc.

Research and development expenses. Our research and development expenses for compounds under development and preclinical development are as follows (in thousands):

	Nine Months Ended September 30,	
	2011	2010
Compounds under development:		
Pixuvri	\$ 8,975	\$ 5,195
OPAXIO	1,235	1,818
Tosedostat	6,183	
Brostallicin	53	223
Operating expenses	10,426	11,589
Research and preclinical development	110	550
 Total research and development expenses	 \$ 26,982	 \$ 19,375

Research and development expenses increased to approximately \$27.0 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2011 from approximately \$19.4 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2010. Pixuvri costs increased primarily due to an increase in clinical activity associated with the startup of the PIX306 study. This increase was partially offset by decreases in regulatory costs and manufacturing activity. Costs for our OPAXIO program decreased primarily due to a decrease in clinical development activities. Costs for tosedostat include the \$5.0 million upfront license fee upon execution of the co-development and license agreement with Chroma, in addition to our share of development costs associated with clinical and manufacturing activity incurred under the agreement. Costs for brostallicin decreased primarily due to a decrease in clinical development activities related to phase I and phase II studies in addition to a decrease in consulting activity. Our operating expenses decreased primarily due to a decrease in noncash share-based compensation expense as well as a decrease in occupancy costs associated with a lease adjustment. These decreases were partially offset by our 2011 estimated discretionary bonus accrual and an increase in depreciation.

Selling, general and administrative expenses. Selling, general and administrative expenses decreased to approximately \$25.3 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2011 from approximately \$39.4 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2010. This decrease was primarily related to reductions in noncash share-based compensation of \$12.3 million, \$1.0 million decrease in compensation and benefits associated with a lower average number of personnel between the periods and \$2.4 million decrease in sales and marketing expense incurred in 2010 that was associated with the pre-commercial efforts for Pixuvri. These decreases were offset in part by our 2011 estimated discretionary bonus accrual.

Interest expense. Interest expense decreased to approximately \$0.9 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2011 from approximately \$1.9 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2010. This decrease is primarily due to the retirement of \$38.5 million outstanding principal balance on our 4% convertible senior subordinated notes in July 2010 upon maturity. In addition, we retired \$10.3 million outstanding principal balance on our 7.5% convertible senior notes in April 2011 upon maturity.

Amortization of debt discount and issuance costs. Amortization of debt discount and issuance costs for the nine months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010 is primarily related to the amortization of debt discount and issuance costs incurred on our 5.75% and 7.5% convertible senior notes and our 4% convertible senior subordinated notes.

Foreign exchange gain (loss). The foreign exchange loss for the nine months ended September 30, 2011 and 2010 is due to fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates, primarily related to payables and receivables in our European branches denominated in foreign currencies.

Table of Contents

Debt conversion expense. Debt conversion expense of \$2.0 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2010 is related to the exchange of \$1.8 million principal balance of our 4% convertible senior subordinated notes in May 2010 for approximately 0.7 million shares of our common stock.

LIQUIDITY AND CAPITAL RESOURCES

As of September 30, 2011, we had approximately \$45.2 million in *cash and cash equivalents*. This amount does not include \$8.2 million received in October 2011 related to our settlement with The Lash Group, Inc.

Net cash used in operating activities increased to approximately \$54.8 million during the nine months ended September 30, 2011 compared to approximately \$50.4 million for the same period during 2010. The increase is primarily due to an increase in *research and development* expense, excluding the allocation of noncash share-based compensation, which includes an upfront payment of \$5.0 million related to the licensing of tosedostat and \$1.1 million payment in 2011 to the GOG related to the 650 patient enrollment milestone achieved in 2010. These increases are offset by decreases in cash paid for interest during the period and payments related to the closure of our Bresso, Italy operations made in 2010.

Net cash used in investing activities increased to approximately \$1.9 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2011 compared to \$1.2 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2010. The increase was primarily due to an increase in purchases of property and equipment.

Net cash provided by financing activities of approximately \$79.2 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2011 was primarily due to issuances of our preferred stock. In January 2011, we received approximately \$23.2 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 8 Preferred Stock, warrants to purchase 3.8 million shares of common stock and an additional investment right to purchase shares of our Series 9 Preferred Stock. In February 2011, we received approximately \$23.5 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 10 preferred stock, warrants to purchase 4.3 million shares of common stock and an additional investment right to purchase shares of our Series 11 Preferred Stock. In May 2011, we received approximately \$15.0 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 12 preferred stock and warrants to purchase 3.0 million shares of common stock. In July 2011, we received approximately \$28.1 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 13 preferred stock and warrants to purchase 8.8 million shares of common stock. These proceeds were offset by a \$10.3 million payment to fully retire the outstanding principal balance on our 7.5% convertible senior notes in April 2011 and \$0.3 million cash paid for the repurchase of shares in connection with satisfying tax withholding obligations on the vesting of restricted stock awards to employees. Net cash provided by financing activities of approximately \$30.6 million for the nine months ended September 30, 2010 was primarily due to the issuances of our Series 3, 4, 5 and 6 preferred stock. We received \$28.0 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 3 preferred stock and warrants to purchase approximately 1.4 million shares of our common stock in January 2010. We also received \$18.6 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 4 preferred stock and warrants to purchase 3.3 million shares of our common stock in April 2010. In addition, we received \$19.7 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 5 preferred stock and warrants to purchase approximately 4.4 million contingently issuable shares of our common stock in May 2010. In July 2010, we received \$3.6 million in net proceeds from the issuance of our Series 6 preferred stock and warrants to purchase 1.0 million shares of our common stock. These proceeds were offset by a \$38.5 million payment to retire the outstanding principal balance on our 4% convertible senior subordinated notes in July 2010 in addition to \$0.7 million cash paid for the repurchase of shares in connection with satisfying tax withholding obligations on the vesting of restricted stock awards to employees.

We have prepared our financial statements assuming that we will continue as a going concern, which contemplates realization of assets and the satisfaction of liabilities in the normal course of business. We have incurred net losses since inception and expect to generate losses from operations for the next few years primarily due to research and development costs for Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates. As of September 30, 2011, our total current liabilities were \$30.8 million, including \$10.9 million outstanding principal balance related to our 5.75% convertible senior notes, which are due in December 2011.

We do not expect that our existing *cash and cash equivalents*, including additional funds received to date, will be sufficient to fund our presently anticipated operations beyond the first quarter of 2012. This raises substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern.

We are seeking shareholder approval to increase our authorized shares from 284,999,999 to 384,999,999 and to increase the total number of our authorized shares of common stock from 283,333,333 to 383,333,333 shares at our upcoming annual meeting of shareholders scheduled for November 11, 2011. We are seeking shareholder approval of this increase in our authorized shares because a number of our currently authorized shares of common stock have

Table of Contents

been issued or are reserved for issuance upon exercise or conversion of existing derivative securities (*i.e.*, securities convertible or exchangeable into our common stock). Because of the number of shares issued or reserved for issuance under various convertible securities, warrants, other derivative securities and otherwise, we believe we do not have a sufficient number of shares of common stock authorized at present to continue to fund our operations, including our research and development activities of key drug candidates and our pre-commercial activities prior to the potential approval of pixantrone in the U.S. and the E.U. In order to continue to fund our operations, we will need to raise additional capital from financing sources. One of the ways we may raise such capital is by issuing shares of common stock and/or derivative securities from time to time. Without additional authorized shares of common stock, we will be unable to raise all of the financing we will likely need to maintain its operations. Other important corporate needs, including the potential issuance of shares in a merger or issuing stock-based incentive rewards to our employees and directors, require additional authorized shares of common stock as well.

If we receive approval of Pixuvri by EMA and/or the FDA, we would anticipate additional commercial expenses associated with Pixuvri operations. Accordingly, we will need to raise additional funds and are currently exploring alternative sources of financing. We may seek to raise such capital through public or private equity financings, partnerships, joint ventures, disposition of assets, debt financings or restructurings, bank borrowings or other sources.

Our future capital requirements will depend on many factors, including:

results of our clinical trials;

regulatory approval of our products;

success in acquiring or divesting products, technologies or businesses;

progress in and scope of our research and development activities;

finding appropriate partners for the development and commercialization of our products if they are approved for marketing; and

competitive market developments.

Future capital requirements will also depend on the extent to which we acquire or invest in businesses, products and technologies or sell or license our products to others. We will require additional financing and such financing may not be available when needed or, if available, we may not be able to obtain it on terms favorable to us or to our shareholders. If additional funds are raised by issuing equity securities, substantial dilution to existing shareholders may result. If we fail to obtain capital when required, we may be required to delay, scale back, or eliminate some or all of our research and development programs, which may adversely affect our ability to operate as a going concern and we may be forced to cease operations, liquidate our assets and possibly seek bankruptcy protection.

The following table includes information relating to our contractual obligations as of September 30, 2011 (in thousands):

Contractual Obligations	Payments Due by Period				After 5 Years
	Total	1 Year	2-3 Years	4-5 Years	
5.75% convertible senior notes (1)	\$ 10,913	\$ 10,913	\$	\$	\$
Interest on convertible notes	131	131			
Operating leases:					
Facilities	3,680	3,292	388		
Long-term obligations (2)	366	333	33		

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

Purchase commitments	691	590	101		
	\$ 15,781	\$ 15,259	\$ 522	\$	\$

- (1) The 5.75% convertible senior notes are convertible into shares of our common stock at a conversion rate of 5.55555 shares of common stock per \$1,000 principal amount of the notes, which is equivalent to a conversion price of approximately \$180.00 per share.
- (2) Long-term obligations do not include \$1.1 million related to excess facilities charges and \$3.1 million related to the reserve for VAT assessments.

Table of Contents

Manufacturing Supply Agreements

We signed a manufacturing supply agreement, or the NerPharMa Agreement, with NerPharMa, S.r.l., or NerPharMa (a pharmaceutical manufacturing company belonging to Nerviano Medical Sciences, S.r.l., in Nerviano, Italy), for our drug candidate Pixuvri. The NerPharMa Agreement is a five year non-exclusive agreement and provides for both the commercial and clinical supply of Pixuvri. The NerPharMa Agreement commenced on July 9, 2010 and expires on the fifth anniversary date of the first government approval obtained either in the United States or Europe. The NerPharMa Agreement may be terminated for an uncured material breach, insolvency or the filing of bankruptcy, or by mutual agreement. We may also terminate the NerPharMa Agreement (i) upon prior written notice in the event of failure of three or more of seven consecutive lots of product or (ii) in the event NerPharMa is acquired or a substantial portion of NerPharMa's assets related to the NerPharMa Agreement are sold to another entity.

We signed a manufacturing and supply agreement, or the Chroma Manufacturing Agreement, with Chroma for our drug candidate tosedostat. The Chroma Manufacturing Agreement is a non-exclusive agreement and provides for both the clinical and commercial drug supply of tosedostat. The Chroma Manufacturing Agreement commenced on June 8, 2011 and expires two years from the date when tosedostat is granted first approval for commercial distribution by the applicable regulatory authority in the licensed territory. Upon expiration of the initial term, we have a one year renewal option. We have the right to terminate the Chroma Manufacturing Agreement without cause with 90 days written notice to Chroma. Both parties have the right to terminate for breach, bankruptcy, mutual agreement, or termination of the development agreement.

Additional Milestone Activities

Chroma Therapeutics, Ltd.

We have an agreement with Chroma, the Chroma Agreement, under which we have an exclusive license to certain technology and intellectual property controlled by Chroma to develop and commercialize the drug candidate tosedostat in North, Central and South America, or the Licensed Territory. Pursuant to the terms of the Chroma Agreement, we paid Chroma an upfront fee of \$5.0 million upon execution of the agreement and will make a milestone payment of \$5.0 million upon the initiation of the first pivotal trial, which could commence as early as the second quarter of 2012. The Chroma Agreement also includes additional development- and sales-based milestone payments related to AML and certain other indications, up to a maximum amount of \$209.0 million payable by us to Chroma if all development and sales milestones are achieved.

We will also pay Chroma royalties on net sales of tosedostat in any country within the Licensed Territory, commencing on the first commercial sale of tosedostat in any country in the Licensed Territory and continuing with respect to that country until the later of (a) the expiration date of the last patent claim covering tosedostat in that country, (b) the expiration of all regulatory exclusivity periods for tosedostat in that country or (c) ten years after the first commercial sale in that country. Royalty payments to Chroma are based on net sales volumes in any country within the Licensed Territory and range from the low- to mid-teens as a percentage of net sales.

We will oversee and be responsible for performing the development operations and commercialization activities in the Licensed Territory and Chroma will oversee and be responsible for performing the development operations and commercialization activities worldwide except for the Licensed Territory, or the ROW Territory. Development costs may not exceed \$50.0 million for the first three years of the Chroma Agreement unless agreed by the parties and we will be responsible for 75% of all development costs, while Chroma will be responsible for 25% of all development costs, subject to certain exceptions. Chroma will be solely responsible for the manufacturing of tosedostat for development purposes in the Licensed Territory and the ROW Territory in accordance with the terms of the manufacturing and supply agreement. We have the option of obtaining a commercial supply of tosedostat from Chroma or from another manufacturer at our sole discretion in the Licensed Territory. The Chroma Agreement may be terminated by us at our convenience upon 120 days' written notice to Chroma. The Chroma Agreement may also be terminated by either party following a material breach by the other party subject to notice and cure periods.

Gynecologic Oncology Group

We have an agreement with the GOG related to the GOG0212 trial, which the GOG is conducting. We recorded a \$1.7 million payment due to the GOG based on the 800 patient enrollment milestone achieved in the second quarter of 2011, which is included in *accounts payable* as of September 30, 2011. Under this agreement we are required to pay up to \$1.8 million in additional milestone payments related to the trial, of which \$0.5 million will become due upon receipt of the interim analysis and data transfer which may occur in 2012. There were 817 patients enrolled as of September 30, 2011.

Table of Contents

Nerviano Medical Sciences

Under a license agreement entered into with Nerviano Medical Sciences, S.r.l. for brostallicin, we may be required to pay up to \$80.0 million in milestone payments based on the achievement of certain product development results. Due to the early stage of development that brostallicin is in, we are not able to determine whether the clinical trials will be successful and therefore cannot make a determination that the milestone payments are reasonably likely to occur at this time.

PG-TXL

We have an agreement, or the PG-TXL Agreement, with PG-TXL Company, L.P., or PG-TXL, which grants us an exclusive worldwide license for the rights to OPAXIO and to all potential uses of PG-TXL's polymer technology. Pursuant to the PG-TXL Agreement, we acquired the rights to research, develop, manufacture, market and sell anti-cancer drugs developed using this polymer technology. Pursuant to the PG-TXL Agreement, we are obligated to make payments to PG-TXL upon the achievement of certain development and regulatory milestones of up to \$14.4 million. The timing of the remaining milestone payments under the PG-TXL Agreement is based on trial commencements and completions for compounds protected by PG-TXL license rights, and regulatory and marketing approval of those compounds by the FDA and the EMA. Additionally, we are required to make royalty payments to PG-TXL based on net sales. Our royalty payments range from low-single digits to mid-single digits as a percentage of net sales. Unless otherwise terminated, the term of the PG-TXL Agreement continues until no royalties are payable to PG-TXL. We may terminate the PG-TXL Agreement (i) upon advance written notice to PG-TXL in the event issues regarding the safety of the products licensed pursuant to the PG-TXL Agreement arise during development or clinical data obtained reveal a materially adverse tolerability profile for the licensed product in humans or (ii) for any reason upon advance written notice. In addition, either party may terminate the PG-TXL Agreement (a) upon advance written notice in the event certain license fee payments are not made; (b) in the event of an uncured material breach of the respective material obligations and conditions of the PG-TXL Agreement; or (c) in the event of liquidation or bankruptcy of a party.

Cephalon

Pursuant to an acquisition agreement entered into with Cephalon, Inc., or Cephalon, in June 2005, we may receive up to \$100.0 million in payments upon achievement by Cephalon of specified sales and development milestones related to TRISENOX. However, the achievement of any such milestones is uncertain at this time.

Novartis

In September 2006, we entered into an exclusive worldwide licensing agreement, or the Novartis Agreement, with Novartis International Pharmaceutical Ltd., or Novartis, for the development and commercialization of OPAXIO. Total product and registration milestones to us for OPAXIO under the Novartis Agreement could reach up to \$270 million. Royalty payments to us for OPAXIO are based on worldwide OPAXIO net sales volumes and range from the low-twenties to mid-twenties as a percentage of net sales.

Pursuant to the Novartis Agreement, we are responsible for the development costs of OPAXIO and have control over development of OPAXIO unless and until Novartis exercises its development rights, or the Development Rights. In the event that Novartis exercises the Development Rights, then from and after the date of such exercise, or the Novartis Development Commencement Date, Novartis will be solely responsible for the development of OPAXIO. Prior to the Novartis Development Commencement Date, we are solely responsible for all costs associated with the development of OPAXIO, but will be reimbursed by Novartis for certain costs after the Novartis Development Commencement Date. After the Novartis Development Commencement Date, Novartis will be responsible for costs associated with the development of OPAXIO, subject to certain limitations; however, we are also responsible for reimbursing Novartis for certain costs pursuant to the Novartis Agreement.

The Novartis Agreement also provides Novartis with an option to develop and commercialize Pixuvri based on agreed terms. If Novartis exercises its option on Pixuvri under certain conditions and we are able to negotiate and sign a definitive license agreement with Novartis, Novartis would be required to pay us a \$7.5 million license fee, up to \$104 million in registration and sales related milestones and a royalty on Pixuvri worldwide net sales. Royalty payments to us for Pixuvri are based on worldwide Pixuvri net sales volumes and range from the low-double digits to the low-thirties as a percentage of net sales.

Table of Contents

Royalties for OPAXIO are based on worldwide sales volumes of OPAXIO and royalties for Pixuvri are based on sales volumes in the United States and sales volumes in other countries.

Royalties for OPAXIO and Pixuvri are payable from the first commercial sale of a product until the later of the expiration of the last to expire valid claim of the licensor or the occurrence of other certain events, or the Royalty Term. Unless otherwise terminated, the term of the Novartis Agreement continues on a product-by-product and country-by-country basis until the expiration of the last-to-expire Royalty Term with respect to a product in such certain country. In the event Novartis does not exercise its Development Rights until the earlier to occur of (i) the expiration of 30 days following receipt by Novartis of the product approval information package pursuant to the Novartis Agreement or (ii) Novartis determination, in its sole discretion, to terminate the Development Rights exercise period by written notice to us (events (i) and (ii) collectively being referred to as the Development Rights Exercise Period), the Novartis Agreement will automatically terminate upon expiration of the Development Rights Exercise Period. In the event of an uncured material breach of the Novartis Agreement, the non-breaching party may terminate the Novartis Agreement. Either party may terminate the Novartis Agreement without notice upon the bankruptcy of the other party. In addition, Novartis may terminate the Novartis Agreement without cause at any time (a) in its entirety within 30 days written notice prior to the exercise by Novartis of its Development Rights or (b) on a product-by-product or country-by-country basis on 180 days written notice after the exercise by Novartis of its Development Rights. If we experience a change of control that involves certain major pharmaceutical companies, Novartis may terminate the Novartis Agreement by written notice within a certain period of time to us or our successor entity.

As of September 30, 2011, we have not received any milestone payments and we will not receive any milestone payments unless Novartis elects to exercise its option to participate in the development and commercialization of Pixuvri or exercise its Development Rights for OPAXIO.

Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk

Foreign Exchange Market Risk

We are exposed to risks associated with foreign currency transactions insofar as we use U.S. dollars to make contract payments denominated in euros or vice versa. As the net positions of our unhedged foreign currency transactions fluctuate, our earnings might be negatively affected. As of September 30, 2011, our foreign currency transactions are minimal and changes to the exchange rate between the U.S. dollar and foreign currencies would have an immaterial affect on our earnings. In addition, the reported carrying value of our euro-denominated assets and liabilities will be affected by fluctuations in the value of the U.S. dollar as compared to the euro. As of September 30, 2011, we had a net asset balance excluding intercompany payables and receivables in our European branches and subsidiaries denominated in euros. As of September 30, 2011, if the euro were to weaken 20% against the dollar, our net asset balance would decrease by approximately \$1.1 million as of this date.

Item 4. Controls and Procedures

(a) Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We maintain disclosure controls and procedures that are designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in reports filed under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or the Exchange Act, is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC rules and forms, and that such information is accumulated and communicated to our management to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure. In designing and evaluating the disclosure controls and procedures, our management recognizes that any controls and procedures, no matter how well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable assurance of achieving the desired control objectives.

Our management, under the supervision and with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Executive Vice President, Finance and Administration, or EVP of Finance, has evaluated the effectiveness of the design and operation of our disclosure controls and procedures, as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Exchange Act as of the end of the period covered by this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. Based upon that evaluation, our Chief Executive Officer and EVP of Finance have concluded that, as of the end of the period covered by this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, our disclosure controls and procedures were effective.

Table of Contents

(b) Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting

There have been no changes to our internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the period covered by this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

Table of Contents**PART II - OTHER INFORMATION****Item 1. Legal Proceedings**

On August 10, 2011 the parties settled outstanding litigation entitled Cell Therapeutics, Inc. v. The Lash Group, Inc., et al., Case No. 07-310 (filed in the Western District of Washington), or the Litigation. Further information regarding the Litigation may be found in CTI's quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the period ending June 30, 2011, as filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission on July 28, 2011. The settlement is not an admission of liability by either party. Under the terms of the settlement agreement, CTI received \$11.0 million from The Lash Group, Inc.'s insurers. Of that settlement amount, CTI received a payment of approximately \$8.2 million in October 2011, which represents the settlement amount net of certain attorneys' fees, litigation costs and expenses outstanding at the time the settlement payment was made. The settlement agreement also provides for a complete, mutual and general release of all claims between CTI and The Lash Group, Inc.

On December 23, 2008, CONSOB sent a notice to us requesting that we issue (i) immediately, a press release providing, among other things, information about our debt restructuring plan, the current state of compliance with the relevant covenants regulating our debt and the equity line of credit agreement we entered into with Midsummer Investment Ltd. on July 29, 2008, and (ii) by the end of each month and starting from the month of December 2008, a press release providing certain information relating to our management and financial situation, updated to the previous month, or the Monthly CONSOB Press Release. On July 31, 2009, CONSOB sent us a notice asserting three violations of the provisions of Section 114, paragraph 5 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98, as follows: (a) the non-disclosure without delay of the press release described under point (i) above and the subsequent incomplete disclosure of the relevant information through press releases dated January 9, 2009 and January 13, 2009; (b) the non-disclosure of the Monthly CONSOB Press Release in December 2008; and (c) the incomplete disclosure of the Monthly CONSOB Press Release in January 2009. The sanctions established by Section 193, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 for such violations are pecuniary administrative sanctions amounting to between 5,000 and 500,000, or approximately \$7,000 to \$672,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, applicable to each one of the three asserted violations. According to the applicable Italian legal provisions, CONSOB may impose such administrative sanctions by means of a decree stating the grounds of its decision only after evaluating our possible defenses that were submitted to CONSOB on August 28, 2009 (within 30 days of July 31, 2009, the notification date of the relevant charges, according to the applicable Italian rules). On May 5, 2010, CONSOB (1) notified us that it had begun the preliminary investigation for its decision on these administrative proceedings and (2) provided us with a preliminary investigation report in response to our defenses submitted on August 28, 2009. On June 4, 2010 (within 30 days of May 5, 2010, the notification date of the beginning of the aforesaid preliminary investigation, according to the applicable Italian rules), we submitted further defenses that CONSOB had to evaluate before imposing any possible administrative sanctions. On January 21, 2011, CONSOB notified us of a resolution confirming the occurrence of the three asserted violations and applying a fine for each of them in the following amounts:

20,000 for sanction (a) above; 50,000 for sanction (b) above; and 30,000 for sanction (c) above, for an aggregate fine of 100,000, or approximately \$136,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of January 21, 2011, for these sanctions. On March 4, 2011, we paid the aggregate fine of €100,000 in full.

Separately, on December 10, 2009, CONSOB sent us a notice claiming two violations of the provisions of Section 114, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 due to the asserted late disclosure of certain information then reported, at CONSOB's request, in press releases disseminated on December 19, 2008 and March 23, 2009. Such information concerned, respectively: (i) the conversion by BAM Opportunity Fund LP of 9.66% notes into shares of common stock that occurred between October 24, 2008 and November 19, 2008; and (ii) the contents of the opinion expressed by Stonefield Josephson, Inc., an independent registered public accounting firm, with respect to our 2008 financial statements. The sanctions established by Section 193, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 for such violations are pecuniary administrative sanctions amounting to between 5,000 and 500,000, or approximately \$7,000 to \$672,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, applicable to each of the two asserted violations. According to the applicable Italian legal provisions, CONSOB may impose such administrative sanctions by means of a decree stating the grounds of its decision only after evaluating our possible defenses that were submitted to CONSOB on January 8, 2010 (within 30 days of December 10, 2009, the notification date of the relevant charges, according to the applicable Italian rules). On July 12, 2010, CONSOB (a) notified us that it had begun the preliminary investigation for its decision on these administrative proceedings and (b) provided us with a preliminary investigation report in response to our defenses submitted on January 8, 2010. On August 12, 2010 (within 30 days of July 12, 2010, the notification date of the beginning of the aforesaid preliminary investigation, according to the applicable Italian rules), we submitted further defenses that CONSOB had to evaluate before imposing any possible administrative sanctions. In a letter dated March 10, 2011, CONSOB notified us of a resolution confirming the occurrence of the violation asserted in clause (i) above and applied a fine in the amount of €40,000, or approximately \$55,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 10, 2011, which we paid on April 5, 2011. CONSOB has not yet notified us of a resolution with respect to the violation asserted in clause (ii) above, but based on our assessment we believe the likelihood that a pecuniary administrative sanction will be imposed on the Company for the violation asserted in clause (ii) is probable.

Table of Contents

On April 14, 2009 and December 21, 2009, the Italian Tax Authority, or the ITA, issued notices of assessment to CTI (Europe) based on the ITA's audit of CTI (Europe)'s VAT returns for the years 2003 and 2005, respectively. On June 25, 2010, the ITA issued notices of assessment to CTI (Europe) for the years 2006 and 2007 based on similar findings for the 2003 and 2005 assessments. The ITA audits concluded that CTI (Europe) did not collect and remit VAT on certain invoices issued to non-Italian clients for services performed by CTI (Europe). The assessments, including interest and penalties, for the years 2003, 2005, 2006 and 2007 are 0.5 million, 5.5 million, 2.5 million and 0.8 million, or approximately \$0.7 million, \$7.4 million, \$3.4 million and \$1.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, respectively. We believe that the services invoiced were non-VAT taxable consultancy services and that the VAT returns are correct as originally filed. We are vigorously defending ourselves against the assessments both on procedural grounds and on the merits of the case. If the decisions of the Provincial Tax Court of Milan, or the Tax Court, for the different VAT cases are unfavorable, then we expect to appeal to the higher courts in order to further defend our interests. However, if we are unable to successfully defend ourselves against the assessments issued by the ITA, we may be requested to pay to the ITA an amount ranging from 4.9 million to 9.4 million, or approximately \$6.6 million to \$12.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, plus collection fees, notification expenses and additional interest for the period lapsed between the date in which the assessments were issued and the date of effective payment. On February 2, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2005 VAT in the amount of 1.5 million, or approximately \$2.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of February 2, 2011. On March 4, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2006 VAT in the amount of 0.4 million, or approximately \$0.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 4, 2011. On September 26, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2007 VAT in the amount of \$0.1 million, or approximately 0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 26, 2011.

2003 VAT. We did not receive a notice from the ITA requesting a deposit payment for the VAT based on the 2003 assessment as of September 30, 2011. The first hearing for the discussion of the merits of the case was held on March 18, 2011 in front of the Provincial Tax Court of Milan. On September 13, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 229/3/2011 in which the Tax Court (i) fully accepted the merits of our appeal, (ii) declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, and (iii) found the Tax Office liable to pay us 10,000, or approximately \$14,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 13, 2011, as partial refund of the legal expenses we incurred for our appeal. The Tax Office is entitled to appeal this decision to a higher court within six months. We have not been notified of any appeal from the Tax Office.

2005 VAT. On July 14, 2010, the ITA issued a notice requiring a deposit payment for the VAT to CTI (Europe) based on the 2005 assessment, including 50% of the assessed VAT, interest and collection fees for an amount of 1.5 million, or approximately \$2.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011. We filed a petition with the Tax Court for suspension of the 2005 notice of deposit payment. On September 28, 2010, the merits of the case for the year 2005 were discussed in a public hearing before the Tax Court. On January 13, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 4/2010 in which the Tax Court (i) partially accepted our appeal and declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, (ii) confirmed the right of the Italian Tax Authorities to reassess the VAT (plus interest) in relation to the transactions identified in the 2005 notice of assessment and (iii) repealed the suspension of the notice of deposit payment. As a result of this decision, our exposure for 2005 VAT assessment is currently reduced by the waiver of penalties of 2.6 million, or approximately \$3.5 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011. On February 2, 2011, we paid the required VAT deposit of 1.5 million, or approximately \$2.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of February 2, 2011, prior to the due date of February 6, 2011. On March 25, 2011, we paid to the Italian collection agent an additional 0.1 million, or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 25, 2011. The additional payment was for interest and collection fees during the suspension period. We do not believe this additional payment was due and we intend to pursue recovery of such payment through litigation. In July 2011, we were notified by our Italian counsel of the ITA's appeal regarding the January 2011 decision that no penalties could be imposed on the Company. We do not believe that the Tax Court has carefully reviewed all of our arguments, relevant documents and other supporting evidence that our counsel filed and presented during the hearing, including an appraisal from an independent expert, and, therefore, that there are grounds of appeal in order to ask the judges of the higher court to further consider all of our arguments in support of invalidating the entire notice of assessment. Accordingly, we filed an appeal with the Tax Office on July 7, 2011 and intend to file a complaint with the European Commission.

While we contend that services invoiced were non-VAT taxable consulting services and that the VAT returns are correct as originally filed, we have recorded a reserve for VAT assessed, interest and collection fees totaling 2.6 million, or approximately \$3.6 million as of September 30, 2011, of which \$3.1 million is included in *long-term obligations, less current portion* and \$0.5 million of the reserve is accounted for as an offset to VAT receivable included in *other assets*.

2006 VAT. On January 10, 2011, we received a notice from the ITA requiring a deposit payment for VAT to CTI (Europe) based on the 2006 assessment, including 50% of the assessed VAT, interest and collection fees for an amount of 0.4 million, or approximately \$0.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of January 10, 2011, payable in the first quarter 2011. We filed a request for suspension of the collection of such amount, which was rejected. On March 4, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2006 VAT in the amount of 0.4 million, or approximately \$0.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 4, 2011. The first hearing for the discussion of the merits of the case was held on May 27, 2011.

Table of Contents

(jointly with the 2007 VAT case). On October 18, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 276/21/11 (jointly with the 2007 VAT case) in which the Tax Court (i) fully accepted the merits of our appeal, (ii) declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, and (iii) found for the 2006 and 2007 VAT cases the Tax Office liable to pay us €10,000, or approximately \$14,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of October 18, 2011, as partial refund of the legal expenses we incurred for our appeal. The Tax Office is entitled to appeal this decision to a higher court within six months. We have not been notified of any appeal from the Tax Office.

2007 VAT. The first hearing for the discussion of the merits of the case was held on May 27, 2011 (jointly with the 2006 VAT case). On August 4, 2011, we received a notice from the ITA requiring a deposit payment for VAT to CTI (Europe) based on the 2007 assessment, including 50% of the assessed VAT, interest and collection fees for an amount of 0.1 million, or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of August 4, 2011, payable in the third quarter 2011. On September 26, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2007 VAT in the amount of 0.1 million or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 26, 2011. On October 18, 2011, the Tax Court issued decision no. 276/21/11 (jointly with the 2006 VAT case) in which the Tax Court (i) fully accepted the merits of our appeal, (ii) declared that no penalties can be imposed against us, and (iii) found for the 2006 and 2007 VAT cases the Tax Office liable to pay us €10,000, or approximately \$14,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of October 18, 2011, as partial refund of the legal expenses we incurred for our appeal. The Tax Office is entitled to appeal this decision to a higher court within six months. We have not been notified of any appeal from the Tax Office.

On August 3, 2009, Sicor Italia, or Sicor, filed a lawsuit in the Court of Milan to compel us to source Pixuvri from Sicor according to the terms of a supply agreement executed between Sicor and NovusPharma on October 4, 2002. Sicor alleges that the agreement was not terminated according to its terms. We assert that the supply agreement in question was properly terminated and that we have no further obligation to comply with its terms. A hearing was held on January 21, 2010 to discuss preliminary matters and set a schedule for future filings and hearings. The parties filed the authorized pleadings and submitted to the Court their requests for evidence. On November 11, 2010, a hearing was held to examine and discuss the requests for evidence submitted by the parties in the briefs filed pursuant to article 183, paragraph 6 of the Italian code of civil procedure. At the hearing of November 11, 2010, the judge declared that the case does not require any discovery or evidentiary phase, and may be decided on the basis of the documents and pleadings already filed by the parties. A final hearing is scheduled for October 11, 2012, for the parties to definitively submit to the judge their requests. No estimate of a loss, if any, can be made at this time in the event that we do not prevail.

In March 2010, three purported securities class action complaints were filed against the Company and certain of its officers and directors in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. On August 2, 2010, Judge Marsha Pechman consolidated the actions, appointed lead plaintiffs, and approved lead plaintiffs' counsel. On September 27, 2010, lead plaintiff filed an amended consolidated complaint, captioned *Sabbagh v. Cell Therapeutics, Inc.* (Case No. 2:10-cv-00414-MJP), naming the Company, Dr. James A. Bianco, Louis A. Bianco, and Craig W. Philips as defendants. The amended consolidated complaint alleges that defendants violated the federal securities laws by making certain alleged false and misleading statements related to the FDA approval process for Pixuvri. The action seeks damages on behalf of purchasers of the Company's stock during a purported class period of March 25, 2008 through March 22, 2010. On October 27, 2010, defendants moved to dismiss the amended consolidated complaint. On February 4, 2011, the Court denied in large part the defendants' motion. Defendants answered the amended consolidated complaint on March 28, 2011. Discovery has commenced, and the Court has set a trial date of June 25, 2012.

In April 2010, three shareholder derivative complaints were filed against the Company and certain of its officers and directors in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. These derivative complaints allege that defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Company by making or failing to prevent the issuance of certain alleged false and misleading statements related to the FDA approval process for Pixuvri. The allegations in the derivative actions are substantially similar to those in the securities action. On May 10, 2010, Judge Marsha Pechman consolidated the shareholder derivative actions under the caption *Shackleton v. Bauer* (Case No. 2:10-cv-00414-MJP), and appointed the law firms of Robbins Umeda LLP and Federman & Sherwood as co-lead counsel for derivative plaintiffs. Three more derivative complaints were filed in June, July and October 2010, and they have also been consolidated with *Shackleton v. Bauer*. The parties have agreed to coordinate discovery in the derivative and securities actions. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the Court has stayed the deadline for the derivative plaintiffs to file an amended complaint until March 12, 2012 (45 days after the scheduled close of discovery in the securities class action), and briefing on any motion to dismiss will follow. The court has set a trial date of December 3, 2012 for the shareholder derivative action.

Discovery has commenced in the securities class action, and as such, the lawsuits are at a preliminary stage in the proceedings. We believe that the securities class action is without merit and intend to defend it vigorously. For the shareholder derivative action, no estimate of a loss, if any, can be made at this time in the event that we do not prevail.

In addition to the litigation discussed above, we are from time to time subject to legal proceedings and claims arising in the ordinary course of business, some of which may be covered in whole or in part by insurance.

Table of Contents

Item 1A. Risk Factors

This Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q contains forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties. The occurrence of any of the following risks described below and elsewhere in this document, including the risk that our actual results may differ materially from those anticipated in these forward-looking statements, could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition, operating results or prospects and the trading price of our securities. Additional risks and uncertainties that we do not presently know or that we currently deem immaterial may also impair our business, financial condition, operating results and prospects and the trading price of our securities.

Factors Affecting Our Operating Results and Financial Condition

We need to raise additional funds and expect that we will need to continue to raise funds in the future, and additional funds may not be available on acceptable terms, or at all; failure to raise significant additional funds may cause us to cease development of our products and operations.

We have substantial operating expenses associated with the development of our product candidates and as of September 30, 2011, we had cash and cash equivalents of \$45.2 million. This amount does not include \$8.2 million received in October 2011 related to our settlement with The Lash Group, Inc. As of September 30, 2011, our total current liabilities were \$30.8 million, including \$10.9 million outstanding principal balance related to our 5.75% convertible senior notes, which are due in December 2011. We do not expect that our existing cash and cash equivalents, including additional funds received to date, will provide sufficient working capital to fund our presently anticipated operations beyond the first quarter of 2012.

Raising additional capital will likely require that we issue additional shares of our common stock. Because of the number of shares reserved for issuance under various convertible securities, derivative securities and otherwise, we have very few authorized shares of common stock available for issuance and it is difficult for us to obtain an increase in our authorized shares. We are seeking shareholder approval to increase our authorized shares from 284,999,999 to 384,999,999 and to increase the total number of our authorized shares of common stock from 283,333,333 to 383,333,333 shares at our upcoming annual meeting of shareholders scheduled for November 11, 2011, or the Annual Meeting. If we do not have enough shares authorized to effect an equity financing, our ability to raise capital through equity financings may be adversely affected.

To the extent that we raise additional capital through the sale of equity securities, or securities convertible into our equity securities, our shareholders may experience dilution of their proportionate ownership of us. We have held preliminary discussions with several investment funds regarding a potential investment in our company, but we have no current agreements or commitments with respect to any investment by these investment funds or any other investors. There can be no assurance that our discussions with these investment funds or any other investors will result in an investment in our company or that we will have sufficient earnings, access to liquidity or cash flow in the future to meet our operating expenses and other obligations, including our debt service obligations.

We may not be able to raise such capital or, if we can, it may not be on favorable terms. We may seek to raise additional capital through public or private equity financings, partnerships, joint ventures, dispositions of assets, debt financings or restructurings, bank borrowings or other sources. To obtain additional funding, we may need to enter into arrangements that require us to relinquish rights to certain technologies, drug candidates, products and/or potential markets. In addition, some financing alternatives may require us to meet additional regulatory requirements in the E.U. (including Italy) and the United States and we may be subject to certain contractual limitations, which may increase our costs and harm our ability to obtain additional funding. If adequate funds are not otherwise available, we will further curtail operations significantly, including the delay, modification or cancellation of operations and plans related to Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates and may be forced to cease operations, liquidate our assets and possibly seek bankruptcy protection. Bankruptcy may result in the termination of agreements pursuant to which we license certain intellectual property rights, including the rights to Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates.

We need to implement a reduction in expenses across our operations.

We need substantial additional capital to fund our current operations. If we are unable to secure additional financing on acceptable terms in the near future, we will need to implement additional cost reduction initiatives, such as further reductions in the cost of our workforce and the discontinuation of a number of business initiatives to further reduce our rate of cash utilization and extend our existing cash balances. We believe that these additional

Table of Contents

cost reduction initiatives, if undertaken, could provide us with additional time to continue our pursuit of additional funding sources and also strategic alternatives. In the event that we are unable to obtain financing on acceptable terms and reduce our expenses, we may be required to limit or cease our operations, pursue a plan to sell our operating assets, seek bankruptcy protection, or otherwise modify our business strategy, which could materially harm our future business prospects.

Our common stock is listed on The NASDAQ Capital Market and the MTA in Italy and we may not be able to maintain those listings or trading on these exchanges may be halted or suspended, which may make it more difficult for investors to sell shares of our common stock.

Effective with the opening of trading on January 8, 2009, the U.S. listing of our common stock was transferred to The NASDAQ Capital Market, subject to meeting a minimum market value of listed securities of \$35.0 million. NASDAQ's Listing Qualifications Panel, or the Panel, of The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC, or the NASDAQ, approved this transfer after our market capitalization did not comply with the minimum market capitalization required for companies listed on The NASDAQ Global Market, and we presented a plan to the Panel for regaining compliance with the NASDAQ Marketplace Rules. On January 23, 2009, we received an Additional Staff Determination Letter from NASDAQ that stated that the NASDAQ staff had concluded that we had violated NASDAQ Marketplace Rule 4350(i)(1)(C) (now NASDAQ Marketplace Rule 5635), which requires shareholder approval in connection with an acquisition if the issuance or potential issuance is greater than 20% of the pre-acquisition shares outstanding, and that we had at times not complied with Marketplace Rule 4310(c)(17) regarding submission of a Listing of Additional Shares form. On February 18, 2009, we updated the Panel on our plan for regaining compliance and requested an extension of the deadline to regain compliance with the minimum market capitalization requirement for The NASDAQ Capital Market. On March 6, 2009, we were notified by NASDAQ that the Panel determined to continue the listing of our common stock on The NASDAQ Capital Market, subject to the condition that, on or before April 6, 2009, we demonstrated compliance with all applicable standards for continued listing on The NASDAQ Capital Market, including the \$35.0 million minimum market capitalization requirement. In addition, the Panel issued a public reprimand for our prior failures to comply with the shareholder approval requirements and late filing of Listing of Additional Shares forms. On April 2, 2009, we were notified by NASDAQ that we had complied with the Panel's decision dated March 6, 2009, and, accordingly, the Panel determined to continue the listing of our common stock on The NASDAQ Capital Market.

NASDAQ reinstated the \$1.00 minimum bid price requirement on August 3, 2009. On May 3, 2010, we received notice from NASDAQ indicating that for the last 30 consecutive business days the closing bid price of our common stock was below the minimum \$1.00 per share requirement for continued listing of our common stock on The NASDAQ Capital Market under NASDAQ Marketplace Rule 5550(a)(2). This notification had no immediate effect on the listing of or the ability to trade our common stock on The NASDAQ Capital Market. In accordance with NASDAQ Marketplace Rule 5810(c)(3)(A), we were provided a grace period of 180 calendar days, or until November 1, 2010, to regain compliance. We would have achieved compliance if the bid price of our common stock closed at \$1.00 per share or more for a minimum of ten consecutive trading days before November 1, 2010. In addition, we were eligible for an additional 180-day grace period if we met all of the initial listing standards of NASDAQ, with the exception of the closing bid price. On November 2, 2010, we received notice from NASDAQ that it granted us an additional 180 days, or until May 2, 2011, to regain compliance with the minimum \$1.00 per share requirement for continued listing of our common stock on The NASDAQ Capital Market under NASDAQ Marketplace Rule 5550(a)(2).

On May 3, 2011, we received a notice from NASDAQ stating that we had not regained compliance with NASDAQ's \$1.00 minimum bid price rule under NASDAQ Marketplace Rule 5550(a)(2). On May 5, 2011, in an effort to regain compliance with the NASDAQ listing requirements and increase the per-share trading price of our common stock, our board of directors approved a one-for-six reverse stock split. The reverse stock split became effective on May 15, 2011. On June 1, 2011, we announced that we received a letter from NASDAQ indicating that as of that date we had regained compliance with NASDAQ Marketplace Rule 5550(a)(2) and that as of that date we were in compliance with all applicable listing standards. As a result, our common stock will continue to be listed and traded on The NASDAQ Capital Market. However, notwithstanding our current compliance with NASDAQ listing standards, there can be no assurance that we will be able to maintain our continued listing on The NASDAQ Capital Market in the future.

The level of trading activity of our common stock may decline if it is no longer listed on The NASDAQ Capital Market. Furthermore, our failure to maintain a listing on The NASDAQ Capital Market may constitute an event of default under certain of our indebtedness which would accelerate the maturity date of such debt. As such, if our

Table of Contents

common stock ceases to be listed for trading on The NASDAQ Capital Market for any reason, it may harm our stock price, increase the volatility of our stock price and make it more difficult for investors to sell shares of our common stock. In the event our common stock is delisted from The NASDAQ Capital Market, we currently expect that our common stock would be eligible to be listed on the OTC Bulletin Board or Pink Sheets. We do not know what impact delisting from The NASDAQ Capital Market may have on our listing with the Borsa Italiana.

Although we continue to be listed on The NASDAQ Capital Market, trading in our common stock may be halted or suspended due to market conditions or if NASDAQ, CONSOB or the Borsa Italiana determine that trading in our common stock is inadvisable. Trading in our common stock was halted by the Borsa Italiana on February 10, 2009, and, as a consequence, trading in our common stock was also halted by NASDAQ. After we provided CONSOB with additional information and clarification on our business operations and financial condition, as requested, and published a press release containing such information in Italy, the Borsa Italiana, and NASDAQ lifted the trading halts on our common stock. In addition, on March 23, 2009, the Borsa Italiana halted trading of our common stock on the MTA and resumed trading prior to the opening of the MTA the next day after we filed a press release regarding the explanatory paragraph in our auditor's reports on our December 31, 2008 and 2007 consolidated financial statements regarding their substantial doubt as to our ability to continue as a going concern. As a consequence, NASDAQ also halted trading in our common stock on March 23, 2009, but re-initiated trading later that day. Although we file press releases with CONSOB at the end of each month regarding our business and financial condition, CONSOB may make additional inquiries about our business and financial condition at any time, and there can be no guarantee that the Borsa Italiana, CONSOB or NASDAQ will not halt trading in our shares again in the future. If our common stock ceases to be listed for trading on The NASDAQ Capital Market or the MTA, or both, for any reason, or if trading in our stock is halted or suspended on The NASDAQ Capital Market or the MTA, or both, such events may harm the trading price of our securities, increase the volatility of the trading price of our securities and make it more difficult for investors to buy or sell shares of our common stock. Moreover, if our common stock ceases to be listed for trading on The NASDAQ Capital Market or if trading in our stock is halted or suspended on The NASDAQ Capital Market, we may become subject to certain obligations. In addition, if we are not listed on The NASDAQ Capital Market and/or if our public float falls below \$75 million, we will be limited in our ability to file new shelf registration statements on SEC Form S-3 and/or to fully use one or more registration statements on SEC Form S-3. We have relied significantly on shelf registration statements on SEC Form S-3 for most of our financings in recent years, so any such limitations may harm our ability to raise the capital we need.

We may be unable to obtain a quorum for meetings of our shareholders or obtain necessary shareholder approvals and therefore be unable to take certain corporate actions.

Our Annual Meeting is scheduled to be held on November 11, 2011. As described in the proxy statement for the Annual Meeting, which was filed with the SEC on October 17, 2011, we are asking shareholders to approve a proposal to increase the total number of authorized shares from 284,999,999 to 384,999,999 and to increase the total number of authorized shares of common stock from 283,333,333 to 383,333,333. If we are unable to obtain a quorum at our shareholder meetings, including the Annual Meeting, and/or fail to obtain shareholder approval of corporation actions, such failure could harm us. Our amended and restated articles of incorporation, or our articles of incorporation, require that a quorum, generally consisting of one-third of the outstanding shares of voting stock, be represented in person, by telephone or by proxy in order to transact business at a meeting of our shareholders. In addition, amendments to our articles of incorporation, such as an amendment to increase our authorized capital stock, generally require the approval of a majority of our outstanding shares. As a result, there is a risk that we may not get shareholder approval for amendments to our articles of incorporation, including the amendment to increase the number of authorized shares of common stock at the Annual Meeting or at a time when we need those shares to effect a future equity financing. If we do not receive shareholder approval for such increase in authorized shares at the Annual Meeting, our ability to raise capital through equity financings will be significantly harmed.

A substantial majority of our common shares are held by Italian institutions and, under Italian laws and regulations, it is difficult to communicate with the beneficial holders of those shares to obtain votes. In 2006, when a quorum required a majority of the outstanding shares of our voting stock be represented in person or by proxy, we scheduled two annual meetings of shareholders, but were unable to obtain quorum at either meeting. Following that failure to obtain quorum, we contacted certain depository banks in Italy where significant numbers of shares of our common stock were held and asked them to cooperate by making a book-entry transfer of their share positions at Monte Titoli to their U.S. correspondent bank, who would then transfer the shares to an account of the Italian bank at a U.S. broker-dealer that is an affiliate of that bank. Certain of the banks contacted agreed to make the share transfer pursuant to these arrangements as of the record date of the meeting, subject to the relevant beneficial owner

Table of Contents

being given notice before such record date and taking no action to direct the voting of such shares. We were able to obtain a quorum to hold special meetings of the shareholders in April 2007, January 2008, March 2009 and June 2011 and annual meetings of the shareholders in September 2007, June 2008, October 2009 and September 2010. Nevertheless, obtaining a quorum at future meetings, including the Annual Meeting, even at the lower threshold and obtaining necessary shareholder approvals will depend in part upon the willingness of the Italian depository banks to continue participating in the custody transfer arrangements, and we cannot be assured that those banks that have participated in the past will continue to participate in custody transfer arrangements in the future. We are continuing to explore other alternatives to achieve a quorum for and shareholder representation at our meetings; however, we cannot be certain that we will find an alternate method if we are unable to continue to use the custody transfer arrangements. As a result, we may be unable to obtain a quorum at the Annual Meeting, future annual or special meetings of shareholders or obtain shareholder approval of proposals when needed.

Even if we obtain a quorum at our shareholder meetings, including the Annual Meeting, we may not obtain enough votes to approve matters to be resolved upon at those meetings. Under Rule 452 of the New York Stock Exchange, or Rule 452, the U.S. broker-dealer may only vote shares absent direction from the beneficial owner on certain specified routine matters, such as certain amendments to our articles of incorporation to increase authorized shares that are to be used for general corporate purposes and the ratification of our auditors. If our shareholders do not instruct their brokers on how to vote their shares on non-routine matters, then we may not obtain the necessary number of votes for approval.

Non-routine matters include, for example, proposals that relate to the authorization or creation of indebtedness or preferred stock. Revisions to Rule 452 that further limit matters for which broker discretionary voting is allowed, such as the recent revisions imposed by the Dodd-Frank Act to prohibit broker discretionary voting on matters related to executive compensation and in the election of directors, may further harm our ability to obtain a quorum and shareholder approval of certain matters. Therefore, it is possible that even if we are able to obtain a quorum for our meetings of the shareholders, including the Annual Meeting, we still may not receive enough votes to approve proxy proposals presented at such meeting and, depending on the proposal in question, including if a proposal is submitted to our shareholders to increase the number of authorized shares of common stock, such failure could harm us. For example, a proposal to approve a reverse stock split failed to receive sufficient votes to pass at the March 2009 shareholders meeting.

We may continue to incur net losses, and we may never achieve profitability.

We were incorporated in 1991 and have incurred a net operating loss every year since our formation. As of September 30, 2011, we had an accumulated deficit of \$1.7 billion. We are pursuing regulatory approval for Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates. We will need to conduct research, development, testing and regulatory compliance activities and undertake manufacturing and drug supply activities the costs of which, together with projected general and administrative expenses, may result in operating losses for the foreseeable future. We may never become profitable even if we are able to commercialize products currently in development or otherwise.

Our debt and operating expenses exceed our net revenues.

We have a substantial amount of debt outstanding, and our annual interest expense with respect to our debt is significant. Unless we raise substantial additional capital and reduce our operating expenses, we may not be able to pay all of our operating expenses or repay our debt or the interest on our debt, liquidated damages or other payments that may become due with respect to our debt. In the event we are unable to reduce our expenses and/or repay our debt or the interest on our debt, we may be required to limit or cease our operations, pursue a plan to sell our operating assets, seek bankruptcy protection, or otherwise modify our business strategy, which could materially harm our future business prospects. Bankruptcy may result in the termination of agreements pursuant to which we license certain intellectual property rights, including the rights to Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates.

We may be unable to use our net operating losses to reduce future income tax liability.

We have substantial tax loss carryforwards for U.S. federal income tax purposes. As a result of prior changes in the stock ownership of the Company, our ability to use such carryforwards to offset future income or tax liability is limited under section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended. Moreover, future changes in the ownership of our stock, including those resulting from the issuance of shares of our common stock upon exercise of outstanding warrants, may further limit our ability to use our net operating losses.

Table of Contents

We have received audit reports with a going concern disclosure on our consolidated financial statements.

As we may need to raise additional financing to fund our operations and satisfy obligations as they become due, our independent registered public accounting firm has included an explanatory paragraph in their reports on our December 31, 2010, 2009 and 2008 consolidated financial statements regarding their substantial doubt as to our ability to continue as a going concern. This may have a negative impact on the trading price of our common stock and we may have a more difficult time obtaining necessary financing.

If we make any acquisitions, we will incur a variety of costs and may never realize the anticipated benefits.

If appropriate opportunities become available, we may attempt to acquire businesses and assets that we believe are a strategic fit with our business. We currently have no agreements to consummate any pending material acquisitions. If we pursue any such transaction, the process of negotiating the acquisition and integrating an acquired business and assets may result in operating difficulties and expenditures and may require significant management attention that would otherwise be available for ongoing development of our business, whether or not any such transaction is ever consummated. Moreover, we may never realize the anticipated benefits of any acquisition. Future acquisitions could result in potentially dilutive issuances of equity securities, the incurrence of debt, contingent liabilities and/or amortization expenses related to goodwill and other intangible assets, which could harm our business, financial condition, operating results and prospects and the trading price of our securities.

The global financial crisis may have an impact on our business and financial condition in ways that we currently cannot predict, and may further limit our ability to raise additional funds.

The ongoing credit crisis and related turmoil in the global financial system has had and may continue to have an impact on our business and our financial condition. We may face significant challenges if conditions in the financial markets do not improve or continue to worsen. In particular, our ability to access the capital markets and raise funds required for our operations may be severely restricted at a time when we would like, or need, to do so, which could have an adverse effect on our ability to meet our current and future funding requirements and on our flexibility to react to changing economic and business conditions.

We are required to comply with the regulatory structure of Italy because our stock is traded on the Mercato Telematico Azionario stock market in Italy, or the MTA, which could result in administrative and other challenges and additional expenses.

Our common stock is traded on the MTA and we are required to also comply with the rules and regulations of the Commissione Nazionale per le Società e la Borsa, or CONSOB, which is the public authority responsible for regulating the Italian securities market, and the Borsa Italiana, which ensures the development of the managed market in Italy. Collectively, these entities regulate companies listed on Italy's public markets. Conducting our operations in a manner that complies with all of the applicable laws and rules requires us to devote additional time and resources to regulatory compliance matters. For example, the process of seeking to understand and comply with the laws of each country, including tax, labor and regulatory laws, might require us to incur the expense of engaging additional outside counsel, accountants and other professional advisors and might result in delayed business initiatives as we seek to ensure that each new initiative will comply with all of the applicable regulatory regimes. In addition, the Borsa Italiana and CONSOB have made several requests for information asking us to provide additional clarifications about our business operations and financial condition, and we have complied with such requests and have met with CONSOB on several occasions to answer questions. Compliance with Italian regulatory requirements may delay additional issuances of our common stock; we are currently taking steps to attempt to conform to the requirements of the Italian stock exchange and CONSOB to allow such additional issuances.

In addition, under Italian law, we must publish a listing prospectus that has been approved by CONSOB prior to issuing common stock that exceeds, in any twelve-month period, 10% of the number of shares of our common stock outstanding at the beginning of that period (except for certain applicable exceptions).

If we are unable to maintain a listing prospectus to cover general financing efforts under Italian law, we may be required to raise money using alternative forms of securities. For example, we may need to use convertible preferred stock and convertible debt since the common stock resulting from the conversion of such securities, subject to the provisions of European Directive No. 71/2003 and according to the interpretations of the Committee of European Securities Regulators, is not subject to the 10% limitation imposed by EU and Italian law.

Moreover, on December 10, 2009, CONSOB sent us a notice claiming two violations of the provisions of Section 114, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 due to the asserted late disclosure of certain information then reported, at CONSOB's request, in press releases disseminated on December 19, 2008 and March 23, 2009. Such information concerned, respectively: (i) the conversion by BAM Opportunity Fund LP of

Table of Contents

9.66% notes into shares of common stock that occurred between October 24, 2008 and November 19, 2008; and (ii) the contents of the opinion expressed by Stonefield Josephson, Inc., an independent registered public accounting firm, with respect to our 2008 financial statements. The sanctions established by Section 193, paragraph 1 of the Italian Legislative Decree no. 58/98 for such violations are pecuniary administrative sanctions amounting to between 5,000 and 500,000, or approximately \$7,000 to \$672,000 converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, applicable to each of the two asserted violations. According to the applicable Italian legal provisions, CONSOB may impose such administrative sanctions by means of a decree stating the grounds of its decision only after evaluating our possible defenses that were submitted to CONSOB on January 8, 2010 (within 30 days of December 10, 2009, the notification date of the relevant charges, according to the applicable Italian rules). On July 12, 2010, CONSOB (a) notified us that it had begun the preliminary investigation for its decision on these administrative proceedings and (b) provided us with a preliminary investigation report in response to our defenses submitted on January 8, 2010. On August 12, 2010 (within 30 days of July 12, 2010, the notification date of the beginning of the aforesaid preliminary investigation, according to the applicable Italian rules), we submitted further defenses that CONSOB would have to evaluate before imposing any possible administrative sanctions. In a letter dated March 10, 2011, CONSOB notified us of a resolution confirming the occurrence of the violation asserted in clause (i) above and applied a fine in the amount of 40,000, or approximately \$55,000 converted using the foreign currency exchange rate as of March 10, 2011, which we paid on April 5, 2011. CONSOB has not yet notified us of a resolution with respect to the violation asserted in clause (ii) above, but based on our assessment, we believe the likelihood that a pecuniary administrative sanction will be imposed on the Company for such asserted violation (ii) is probable.

Our assets and liabilities that remain in our Italian branches make us subject to increased risk regarding currency exchange rate fluctuations.

We are exposed to risks associated with the translation of euro-denominated financial results and accounts into U.S. dollars. As long as we continue to have assets and liabilities held in our Italian branches the carrying value of these assets and liabilities will be affected by fluctuations in the value of the U.S. dollar as compared to the euro. Changes in the value of the U.S. dollar as compared to the euro might have an adverse effect on our reported results of operations and financial condition.

We may owe additional amounts for value added taxes related to our operations in Europe.

Our European operations are subject to value added tax, or VAT, which is usually applied to all goods and services purchased and sold throughout Europe. The VAT receivable is \$5.2 million and 5.3 million as of September 30, 2011 and December 31, 2010, respectively. On April 14, 2009 and December 21, 2009, the Italian Tax Authority, or the ITA, issued notices of assessment to CTI (Europe) based on the ITA's audit of CTI (Europe)'s VAT returns for the years 2003 and 2005, respectively. On June 25, 2010, the ITA issued notices of assessment to CTI (Europe) for the years 2006 and 2007 based on similar findings for the 2003 and 2005 assessments. The ITA audits concluded that CTI (Europe) did not collect and remit VAT on certain invoices issued to non-Italian clients for services performed by CTI (Europe). The assessments, including interest and penalties, for the years 2003, 2005, 2006 and 2007 are 0.5 million, 5.5 million, 2.5 million and 0.8 million, or approximately \$0.7 million, \$7.4 million, \$3.4 million and \$1.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, respectively. We believe that the services invoiced were non-VAT taxable consultancy services and that the VAT returns are correct as originally filed. We are vigorously defending ourselves against the assessments both on procedural grounds and on the merits of the case. If the decisions of the Tax Court for the different VAT cases are unfavorable, then we expect to appeal to the higher courts in order to further defend our interests. However, if we are unable to successfully defend ourselves against the assessments issued by the ITA, we may be requested to pay to the ITA an amount ranging from 4.9 million to 9.4 million, or approximately \$6.6 million to \$12.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 30, 2011, plus collection fees, notification expenses and additional interest for the period lapsed between the date in which the assessments were issued and the date of effective payment. On February 2, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2005 VAT in the amount of 1.5 million, or approximately \$2.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of February 2, 2011. On March 4, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2006 VAT in the amount of 0.4 million, or approximately \$0.6 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 4, 2011. On March 25, 2011, we paid to the Italian collection agent an additional 0.1 million, or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of March 25, 2011. On September 26, 2011, we paid to the ITA the required deposit in respect of the 2007 VAT in the amount of 0.1 million or approximately \$0.1 million converted using the currency exchange rate as of September 26, 2011. Further information pertaining to these cases can be found in Part I under the caption Item 1. Financial Statements Note 8. Legal Proceedings and is incorporated by reference herein.

Table of Contents

Our financial condition may be adversely affected if third parties default in the performance of contractual obligations.

Our business is dependent on the performance by third parties of their responsibilities under contractual relationships and if third parties default on their performance of their contractual obligations, we could suffer significant financial losses and operational problems, which could in turn adversely affect our financial performance, cash flows or results of operations and may jeopardize our ability to maintain our operations.

We may not realize any royalties, milestone payments or other benefits under the License and Co-Development Agreement entered into with Novartis.

We have entered into a License and Co-Development agreement related to OPAXIO and Pixuvri with Novartis pursuant to which Novartis received an exclusive worldwide license for the development and commercialization of OPAXIO and an option to enter into an exclusive worldwide license to develop and commercialize Pixuvri. We will not receive any royalty or milestone payments under this agreement unless Novartis exercises its option related to Pixuvri and we are able to reach a definitive agreement or Novartis elects to participate in the development and commercialization of OPAXIO. Novartis is under no obligation to make such election and enter into a definitive license agreement or exercise such right and may never do so. In addition, even if Novartis exercises such rights, any royalties and milestone payments we may be eligible to receive from Novartis are subject to the receipt of the necessary regulatory approvals and the attainment of certain sales levels. We may never receive the necessary regulatory approvals and our products may not reach the necessary sales levels to generate royalty or milestone payments even if Novartis elects to exercise its option with regard to Pixuvri and enter into a definitive license agreement or to participate in the development and commercialization of OPAXIO. Novartis has the right under the agreement in its sole discretion to terminate such agreement at any time upon written notice to us.

In the event Novartis does not elect to participate in the development of OPAXIO or Pixuvri, we may not be able to find another suitable partner for the commercialization and development of those products, which may have an adverse effect on our ability to bring those drugs to market. In addition, we would need to obtain a release from Novartis prior to entering into any agreement to develop and commercialize Pixuvri or OPAXIO with a third party.

We cannot guarantee that we will obtain regulatory approval to manufacture or market any of our drug candidates.

Obtaining regulatory approval to market drugs to treat cancer is expensive, difficult and risky. Preclinical and clinical data can be interpreted in different ways, which could delay, limit or preclude regulatory approval. Negative or inconclusive results or adverse medical events during a clinical trial could delay, limit or prevent regulatory approval.

At the ODAC meeting on March 22, 2010, the ODAC panel did not recommend approval of our NDA for Pixuvri. Subsequently, in April 2010, we received a Complete Response Letter from the FDA regarding our NDA for Pixuvri. The FDA cited as its primary reason for the action its concerns previously raised at the ODAC meeting on March 22, 2010, and recommended that we conduct one additional clinical trial to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of Pixuvri. In December 2010, we filed an appeal with the OND's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research regarding the FDA's April 2010 decision to not approve Pixuvri for relapsed or refractory aggressive NHL. We filed our appeal under the FDA's formal dispute resolution process asking the OND to conclude that PIX301 demonstrated efficacy.

On May 3, 2011, we announced that the OND responded to our December 2010 appeal of the FDA's April 2010 decision to not approve Pixuvri for relapsed or refractory aggressive NHL. In its response, the OND indicated that after considering the data available in the appeal, it does not believe that accelerated approval of our NDA is necessarily out of reach based on a single controlled clinical trial, provided that two key matters can be resolved satisfactorily. First, the circumstances of stopping the PIX301 trial early must be resolved to assure that ongoing results assessment were not dictating the decision to stop. Second, ascertainment of the primary endpoint in the PIX301 study must be determined to have been sound and not subject to bias. The OND also indicated that our request that the OND find that the data in the NDA demonstrate efficacy and return the NDA to the Office of Oncology Drug Products for consideration of safety and other issues was denied because the OND was not able to conclude that efficacy had been demonstrated. However, the OND also did not find that it could be concluded that PIX301 was a failed study, which warranted application of interim analysis statistical thresholds.

Table of Contents

On June 14, 2011, we announced that we had met with the DODP in a meeting that focused on the documents we proposed to provide regarding the circumstances of stopping the enrollment of PIX301 prior to achieving the original planned patient accrual and the make-up of the new radiology expert panel as well as our plan to address items noted in the FDA's Complete Response Letter. The DODP confirmed that the NDA would be reviewed within six months from the resubmission of the NDA. We anticipate filing the additional information by the end of October 2011; accordingly, it is possible that we could obtain FDA approval as early as the first half of 2012. However, you should not infer that the aforementioned developments increase the likelihood of FDA approval of the NDA or that the FDA, OND or DODP will not require additional actions or information.

Moreover, the FDA may request that we conduct more clinical trials in addition to PIX-R to obtain FDA approval of our NDA for Pixuvri and we do not know what this trial will cost or how long it would take to execute this study and provide additional information to the FDA. In March 2011, we initiated a randomized pivotal trial of Pixuvri for the treatment of relapsed or refractory DLBCL. This clinical trial, referred to as PIX306 or PIX-R, is now open to patient enrollment. PIX-R will compare a combination of Pixuvri plus rituximab to a combination of gemcitabine plus rituximab in patients with relapsed or refractory DLBCL who have received one to three prior lines of therapy. We cannot predict the outcome of PIX-R or whether PIX-R will serve as either a post-marketing commitment trial or as a pivotal trial. We may also need to take additional steps to obtain regulatory approval of Pixuvri. The expense to design and conduct clinical trials are substantial and any additional clinical trials or actions we may need to pursue to obtain approval of our NDA for Pixuvri may negatively affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We may be delayed, limited or precluded from obtaining regulatory approval of OPAXIO as a maintenance therapy for advanced stage ovarian cancer.

Our future financial success depends in part on obtaining regulatory approval of OPAXIO. We are currently focusing our development of OPAXIO as a potential maintenance therapy for women with advanced stage ovarian cancer who achieve a complete remission following first-line therapy with paclitaxel and carboplatin. This study, the GOG0212 trial, is under the control of the GOG and is expected to enroll 1,100 patients with 817 patients enrolled as of September 30, 2011. The GOG Data Monitoring Committee plans to conduct an interim analysis of overall survival and, based on feedback provided by the GOG, an interim analysis is currently expected in mid-2012. If successful, we could utilize those results to form the basis of an NDA for OPAXIO. However, prior clinical trials for OPAXIO have not been successful. In March 2005, we announced the results of STELLAR 3, and in May 2005, we announced the results of STELLAR 2 and 4, our phase III clinical trials of OPAXIO in NSCLC. All three trials failed to achieve their primary endpoints of superior overall survival compared to current marketed agents for treating NSCLC. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that the GOG0212 will provide compelling evidence or any positive results, which would preclude our planned submission of an NDA to the FDA. In addition, we cannot predict the outcome of the GOG0212 study and that study may not demonstrate or be adequate to support regulatory approval of OPAXIO by the FDA.

In March 2008, we submitted an MAA to the EMA for first-line treatment of patients with advanced NSCLC who are poor performance status, or PS2, based on a non-inferior survival and improved side effect profile which we believe was demonstrated in our previous clinical trials. The application was based on a positive opinion we received from the SAWP; the EMA agreed that switching the primary endpoint from superiority to non-inferiority is feasible if the retrospective justification provided in the marketing application is adequate. In September 2009, we notified the EMA of our decision to withdraw the MAA and we refocused our resources on the approval of OPAXIO for its potential superiority indication in maintenance therapy for ovarian cancer and as a radiation sensitizer in the treatment of esophageal cancer.

We are subject to extensive government regulation.

We are subject to rigorous and extensive regulation by the FDA in the United States and by comparable agencies in other states and countries, including the EMA's review of our MAA for Pixuvri. Failure to comply with regulatory requirements could result in various adverse consequences, including possible delay in approval or refusal to approve a product, withdrawal of approved products from the market, product seizures, injunctions, regulatory restrictions on our business and sales activities, monetary penalties, or criminal prosecution.

Our products may not be marketed in the United States until they have been approved by the FDA and may not be marketed in other countries until they have received approval from the appropriate agencies. None of our current product candidates have received approval for marketing in any country. On April 13, 2009, we began submission of a rolling NDA to the FDA for Pixuvri to treat relapsed or refractory aggressive NHL. We completed

Table of Contents

the submission in June 2009 and as announced on April 9, 2010, we received a Complete Response Letter from the FDA regarding our NDA for Pixuvri. The FDA cited as its primary reason for the action its concerns previously raised at the ODAC meeting on March 22, 2010 and recommended that we conduct an additional trial to demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of Pixuvri. In December 2010, we filed an appeal with the OND's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research regarding the FDA's April 2010 decision to not approve Pixuvri for relapsed or refractory aggressive NHL. We filed our appeal under the FDA's formal dispute resolution process asking the OND to conclude that PIX301 demonstrated efficacy.

On May 3, 2011, we announced that the OND responded to our December 2010 appeal of the FDA's April 2010 decision to not approve Pixuvri for relapsed or refractory aggressive NHL. In its response, the OND indicated that after considering the data available in the appeal, it does not believe that accelerated approval of our NDA is necessarily out of reach based on a single controlled clinical trial, provided that two key matters can be resolved satisfactorily. First, the circumstances of stopping the PIX301 trial early must be resolved to assure that ongoing results assessment were not dictating the decision to stop. Second, ascertainment of the primary endpoint in the PIX301 study must be determined to have been sound and not subject to bias.

The OND also indicated that our request that the OND find that the data in the NDA demonstrate efficacy and return the NDA to the FDA's Office of Oncology Drug Products for consideration of safety and other issues was denied because the OND was not able to conclude that efficacy had been demonstrated. However, the OND also did not find that it could be concluded that PIX301 was a failed study, which warranted application of interim analysis statistical thresholds.

On June 14, 2011, we announced that we had met with the DODP in a meeting that focused on the documents we proposed to provide regarding the circumstances of stopping the enrollment of PIX301 prior to achieving the original planned patient accrual and the make-up of the new radiology expert panel. The DODP confirmed that the NDA would be reviewed within six months from the resubmission of the NDA. We anticipate filing the additional information by the end of October 2011, offering the possibility that we could obtain FDA approval as early as the first half of 2012. However, you should not infer that the aforementioned developments increase the likelihood of FDA approval of the NDA.

Obtaining regulatory approval requires substantial time, effort and financial resources, and we may not be able to obtain approval of any of our products on a timely basis, or at all. In addition, data obtained from preclinical and clinical trials are susceptible to varying interpretations, and government regulators and our collaborators may not agree with our interpretation of our clinical trial results. If our products are not approved quickly enough to provide net revenues to defray our debt and operating expenses, our business, financial condition and results of operations will be adversely affected.

In the event that we receive marketing approval for any of our product candidates, we will be subject to numerous regulations and statutes regulating the manner of selling and obtaining reimbursement for those products. For example, federal statutes generally prohibit providing certain discounts and payments to physicians to encourage them to prescribe our product. Violations of such regulations or statutes may result in treble damages, criminal or civil penalties, fines or exclusion of us or our employees from participation in federal and state health care programs. Although we have policies prohibiting violations of relevant regulations and statutes, unauthorized actions of our employees or consultants, or unfavorable interpretations of such regulations or statutes may result in third parties or regulatory agencies bringing legal proceedings or enforcement actions against us. Because we will likely need to develop a new sales force for any future marketed products, we may have a greater risk of such violations from lack of adequate training or experience. The expense to retain and pay legal counsel and consultants to defend against any such proceedings would be substantial, and together with the diversion of management's time and attention to assist in any such defense, may negatively affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In addition, both before and after approval, our contract manufacturers and our products are subject to numerous regulatory requirements covering, among other things, testing, manufacturing, quality control, labeling, advertising, promotion, distribution and export. Manufacturing processes must conform to current Good Manufacturing Practice, or cGMPs. The FDA and other regulatory authorities periodically inspect manufacturing facilities to assess compliance with cGMPs. Accordingly, manufacturers must continue to expend time, money and effort to maintain compliance. Failure to comply with FDA, EMA or other applicable regulations may cause us to curtail or stop the manufacture of such products until we obtain regulatory compliance.

Table of Contents

The marketing and promotion of pharmaceuticals is also heavily regulated, particularly with regard to prohibitions on the promotion of products for off-label uses. In April 2007, we paid a civil penalty of \$10.6 million and entered into a settlement agreement with the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington arising out of their investigation into certain of our prior marketing practices relating to TRISENOX, which was divested to Cephalon Inc. in July 2005. As part of that settlement agreement and in connection with the acquisition of Zevalin, we also entered into a corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which required us to establish a compliance committee and compliance program and adopt a formal code of conduct.

We face direct and intense competition from our competitors in the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries, and we may not compete successfully against them.

Competition in the oncology market is intense and is accentuated by the rapid pace of technological development. We anticipate that we will face increased competition in the future as new companies enter the market. Our competitors in the United States and elsewhere are numerous and include, among others, major multinational pharmaceutical companies, specialized biotechnology companies and universities and other research institutions. Specifically:

If we are successful in bringing Pixuvri to market, Pixuvri will face competition from currently marketed anthracyclines, such as mitoxantrone (Novantrone®), and new anti-cancer drugs with reduced toxicity that may be developed and marketed.

If we are successful in bringing OPAXIO to market, we will face direct competition from oncology-focused multinational corporations. OPAXIO will compete with other taxanes. Many oncology-focused multinational corporations currently market or are developing taxanes, epothilones, and other cytotoxic agents, which inhibit cancer cells by a mechanism similar to taxanes, or similar products. Such corporations include, among others, Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. and others, which market paclitaxel and generic forms of paclitaxel; Sanofi-Aventis, which markets docetaxel; Genentech, Roche and OSI Pharmaceuticals, which market Tarceva; Genentech and Roche, which market Avastin; Eli Lilly, which markets Alimta; and Abraxis, which markets Abraxane. In addition, other companies such as NeoPharm Inc. and Telik, Inc. are also developing products, which could compete with OPAXIO.

If we are successful in bringing tosedostat to market, we will face direct competition from oncology-focused multinational corporations including Eisai, Sanofi-Aventis, Celgene, and others. Currently some generic compounds are also available which may be used in treating conditions where tosedostat may have application, this could result in additional competitive pressure on price and volume. Additionally there are other products in development for AML from both large and small pharmaceutical companies which may compete with tosedostat.

If we are successful in bringing brostallicin to market, we will face direct competition from other minor groove binding agents including Yondelis®, which is currently developed by PharmaMar and has received Authorization of Commercialization from the European Commission for soft tissue sarcoma.

Many of our competitors, particularly the multinational pharmaceutical companies, either alone or together with their collaborators, have substantially greater financial resources and substantially larger development and marketing teams than us. In addition, many of our competitors, either alone or together with their collaborators, have significantly greater experience than we do in developing, manufacturing and marketing products. As a result, these companies' products might come to market sooner or might prove to be more effective, less expensive, have fewer side effects or be easier to administer than ours. In any such case, sales of our current or future products would likely suffer and we might never recoup the significant investments we are making to develop these product candidates.

Uncertainty regarding third-party reimbursement and healthcare cost containment initiatives may limit our returns.

The ongoing efforts of governmental and third-party payors to contain or reduce the cost of healthcare may affect our ability to commercialize our products successfully. Governmental and other third-party payers continue to attempt to contain healthcare costs by:

challenging the prices charged for health care products and services;

limiting both coverage and the amount of reimbursement for new therapeutic products;

Table of Contents

denying or limiting coverage for products that are approved by the FDA but are considered experimental or investigational by third-party payors;

refusing in some cases to provide coverage when an approved product is used for disease indications in a way that has not received FDA marketing approval; and

denying coverage altogether.

The continuing efforts of government and insurance companies, health maintenance organizations and other payers of healthcare costs to contain or reduce costs of health care may affect our future revenues and profitability, and the future revenues and profitability of our potential customers, suppliers and collaborative partners and the availability of capital. In the United States, given the comprehensive health care reform legislation that the President signed into law on March 23, 2010, under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (HR 3590), or the PPACA, the U.S. Congress and state legislatures will likely continue to focus on health care reform, the cost of healthcare services and products and on the reform of the Medicare and Medicaid systems. While we cannot predict whether any such legislative or regulatory proposals will be adopted, the announcement or adoption of these proposals could significantly influence the purchase of healthcare services and products, resulting in lower prices and reducing demand for our products. In addition, in almost all European markets, pricing and choice of prescription pharmaceuticals are subject to governmental control. Therefore, the price of our products and their reimbursement in Europe will be determined by national regulatory authorities.

Even if we succeed in bringing any of our proposed products to the market, they may not be considered cost-effective and third-party reimbursement might not be available or sufficient. If adequate third-party coverage is not available, we may not be able to maintain price levels sufficient to realize an appropriate return on our investment in research and product development. In addition, legislation and regulations affecting the pricing of pharmaceuticals may change in ways adverse to us before or after any of our proposed products are approved for marketing.

If users of our products are unable to obtain adequate reimbursement from third-party payers, or if new restrictive legislation is adopted, market acceptance of our products may be limited and we may not achieve anticipated revenues.

Our ability to commercialize our products will depend in part on the extent to which appropriate reimbursement levels for the cost of our products and related treatment are obtained by governmental authorities, private health insurers and other organizations, such as health maintenance organizations, or HMOs. Third-party payers are increasingly challenging the prices charged for medical care. Also, the trend toward managed health care in the United States and the concurrent growth of organizations such as HMOs, which could control or significantly influence the purchase of health care services and products, as well as legislative proposals to further reform health care or reduce government insurance programs, may all result in lower prices for our products if approved for commercialization. The cost containment measures that health care payers and providers are instituting and the effect of any health care reform could materially harm our ability to sell our products at a profit.

Products that appear promising in research and development may be delayed or fail to reach later stages of development or the market.

The successful development of pharmaceutical products is highly uncertain and obtaining regulatory approval to market drugs to treat cancer is expensive, difficult and risky. Products that appear promising in research and development may be delayed or fail to reach later stages of development or the market for several reasons, including:

clinical trial results may show the product to be less effective than desired or to have harmful or problematic side effects;

preclinical tests may show the product to be toxic or lack efficacy in animal models;

failure to receive the necessary U.S. and international regulatory approvals or a delay in receiving such approvals;

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

difficulties in formulating the product, scaling the manufacturing process or getting approval for manufacturing;

manufacturing costs, pricing, reimbursement issues or other factors may make the product uneconomical to commercialize;

Table of Contents

other companies or people have or may have proprietary rights to a product candidate, such as patent rights, and will not let the product candidate be sold on reasonable terms, or at all; or

the product candidate is not cost effective in light of existing therapeutics.

Preclinical and clinical data can be interpreted in different ways, which could delay, limit or prevent regulatory approval. Negative or inconclusive results or adverse medical events during a clinical trial could delay, limit or prevent regulatory approval. In addition, any significant problem in the production of our products, such as the inability of a supplier to provide raw materials or supplies used to manufacture our products, equipment obsolescence, malfunctions or failures, product quality or contamination problems, or changes in regulatory requirements or standards that require modifications to our manufacturing process could delay, limit or prevent regulatory approval which could harm our business, financial condition and results or the trading price of our securities. There can be no assurance as to whether or when we will receive regulatory approvals for our products.

If any of our license agreements for intellectual property underlying Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin, bisplatinates or any other products are terminated, we may lose the right to develop or market that product.

We have licensed intellectual property, including patent applications relating to intellectual property for Pixuvri, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates. We have also in-licensed the intellectual property for our drug delivery technology relating to OPAXIO which uses polymers that are linked to drugs, known as polymer-drug conjugates. Some of our product development programs depend on our ability to maintain rights under these licenses. Each licensor has the power to terminate its agreement with us if we fail to meet our obligations under these licenses. We may not be able to meet our obligations under these licenses. If we default under any license agreement, we may lose our right to market and sell any products based on the licensed technology.

We hold rights under numerous patents that protect inventions originating from our research and development, and the expiration of any one or more of these patents may allow our competitors to copy the inventions that are currently protected.

We dedicate significant resources to protecting our intellectual property, which is important to our business. We have filed numerous patent applications in the U.S. and various other countries seeking protection of inventions originating from our research and development and we have also obtained rights to various patents and patent applications under licenses with third parties. Patents have been issued on many of these applications. We have issued patents pending or issued in the U.S. and foreign countries directed to Pixuvri, OPAXIO, brostallicin, bisplatinates and other product candidates. However, the lives of these patents are limited. Patents for the individual products extend for varying periods according to the date of the patent filing or grant and the legal term of patents in the various countries where patent protection is obtained. The Pixuvri-directed patents will expire in 2014; the OPAXIO-directed patents will expire on various dates ranging from 2017 through 2018; and the brostallicin-directed patents will expire on various dates ranging from 2017 to 2023. Although such patent expiration ranges are only for U.S. issued patents and do not account for potential extensions that may be available in certain countries (for example, certain Pixuvri-directed patents may be subject to possible patent-term extensions that could provide extensions through 2019 in the U.S. and 2021 in Europe), there can be no assurance that such extensions will be obtained. The expiration of these patents may allow our competitors to copy the inventions that are currently protected and better compete with us.

If there is an adverse outcome in the securities class actions and shareholder derivative litigation that have been filed against us, our business may be harmed.

In March 2010, three purported securities class action complaints were filed against the Company and certain of its officers and directors in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. On August 2, 2010, Judge Marsha Pechman consolidated the actions, appointed lead plaintiffs, and approved lead plaintiffs' counsel. On September 27, 2010, lead plaintiff filed an amended consolidated complaint, captioned Sabbagh v. Cell Therapeutics, Inc. (Case No. 2:10-cv-00414-MJP), naming the Company, Dr. James A. Bianco, Louis A. Bianco, and Craig W. Philips as defendants. The amended consolidated complaint alleges that defendants violated the federal securities laws by making certain alleged false and misleading statements related to the FDA approval process for pixantrone. The action seeks damages on behalf of purchasers of the Company's stock during a purported class period of March 25, 2008 through March 22, 2010. On October 27, 2010, defendants moved to dismiss the amended consolidated complaint. On February 4, 2011, the Court denied in large part the defendants' motion. Defendants answered the amended consolidated complaint on March 28, 2011. Discovery has commenced, and the Court has set a trial date of June 25, 2012.

In April 2010, three shareholder derivative complaints were filed against the Company and certain of its officers and directors in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. These derivative complaints allege that defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Company by making or failing to prevent the issuance of certain alleged false and misleading statements related to the FDA approval

process for pixantrone. The allegations in the derivative actions are substantially similar to those in the

Table of Contents

securities action. On May 10, 2010, Judge Marsha Pechman consolidated the shareholder derivative actions under the caption Shackleton v. Bauer (Case No. 2:10-cv-00414-MJP), and appointed the law firms of Robbins Umeda LLP and Federman & Sherwood as co-lead counsel for derivative plaintiffs. Three more derivative complaints were filed in June, July and October 2010, and they have also been consolidated with Shackleton v. Bauer. The parties have agreed to coordinate discovery in the derivative and securities actions. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the Court has stayed the deadline for the derivative plaintiffs to file an amended complaint until March 12, 2012 (45 days after the scheduled close of discovery in the securities class action), and briefing on any motion to dismiss will follow. The court has set a trial date of December 3, 2012 for the shareholder derivative action.

As with any litigation proceeding, we cannot predict with certainty the eventual outcome of pending litigation. Furthermore, we may have to incur substantial expenses in connection with these lawsuits. In the event of an adverse outcome, our business could be materially harmed.

If we fail to adequately protect our intellectual property, our competitive position could be harmed.

Development and protection of our intellectual property are critical to our business. If we do not adequately protect our intellectual property, competitors may be able to practice our technologies. Our success depends in part on our ability to:

obtain patent protection for our products or processes both in the United States and other countries;

protect trade secrets; and

prevent others from infringing on our proprietary rights.

When polymers are linked, or conjugated, to drugs, the results are referred to as polymer-drug conjugates. We are developing drug delivery technology that links chemotherapy to biodegradable polymers. For example, OPAXIO is paclitaxel, the active ingredient in Taxol[®], one of the world's best selling cancer drugs, linked to polyglutamate. We may not receive a patent for all of our polymer-drug conjugates and we may be challenged by the holder of a patent covering the underlying drug and/or methods for its use or manufacture.

The patent position of biopharmaceutical firms generally is highly uncertain and involves complex legal and factual questions. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has not established a consistent policy regarding the breadth of claims that it will allow in biotechnology patents. If it allows broad claims, the number and cost of patent interference proceedings in the United States and the risk of infringement litigation may increase. If it allows narrow claims, the risk of infringement may decrease, but the value of our rights under our patents, licenses and patent applications may also decrease. Patent applications in which we have rights may never issue as patents and the claims of any issued patents may not afford meaningful protection for our technologies or products. In addition, patents issued to us or our licensors may be challenged and subsequently narrowed, invalidated or circumvented. Litigation, interference proceedings or other governmental proceedings that we may become involved in with respect to our proprietary technologies or the proprietary technology of others could result in substantial cost to us. Patent litigation is widespread in the biotechnology industry, and any patent litigation could harm our business. Costly litigation might be necessary to protect a patent position or to determine the scope and validity of third-party proprietary rights, and we may not have the required resources to pursue any such litigation or to protect our patent rights. Any adverse outcome in litigation with respect to the infringement or validity of any patents owned by third parties could subject us to significant liabilities to third parties, require disputed rights to be licensed from third parties or require us to cease using a product or technology.

We also rely upon trade secrets, proprietary know-how and continuing technological innovation to remain competitive. Third parties may independently develop such know-how or otherwise obtain access to our technology. While we require our employees, consultants and corporate partners with access to proprietary information to enter into confidentiality agreements, these agreements may not be honored.

Our products could infringe upon the intellectual property rights of others, which may cause us to engage in costly litigation and, if unsuccessful, could cause us to pay substantial damages and prohibit us from selling our products.

We attempt to monitor patent filings for patents that may be relevant to our products and product candidates in an effort to guide the design and development of our products to avoid infringement, but have not conducted an exhaustive search. We may not be able to successfully challenge the validity of these patents and could be required to pay substantial damages, possibly including treble damages, for past infringement and attorneys' fees if it is ultimately determined that our products infringe a third-party's patents. Further, we may be prohibited from selling our

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

products before we obtain a license, which, if available at all, may require us to pay substantial royalties. Moreover, third parties may challenge the patents that have been issued or licensed to us. Even if infringement claims against us are without merit, or if we challenge the validity of issued patents, lawsuits take significant time, may be expensive and may divert management attention from other business concerns.

Table of Contents

We could fail in financing efforts or be delisted from NASDAQ if we fail to receive shareholder approval when needed.

We are required under the NASDAQ Marketplace Rules to obtain shareholder approval for any issuance of additional equity securities that would comprise more than 20% of the total shares of our common stock outstanding before the issuance of such securities sold at a discount to the greater of book or market value in an offering that is not deemed to be a public offering by the NASDAQ Marketplace Rules or NASDAQ. Funding of our operations in the future may require issuance of additional equity securities that would comprise more than 20% of the total shares of our common stock outstanding, but we might not be successful in obtaining the required shareholder approval for such an issuance, particularly in light of the difficulties we have experienced in obtaining a quorum and holding shareholder meetings as outlined above. If we are unable to obtain financing due to shareholder approval difficulties, such failure may harm our ability to continue operations.

We may be unable to obtain the raw materials necessary to produce our OPAXIO product candidate in sufficient quantity to meet demand when and if such product is approved.

We may not be able to continue to purchase the materials necessary to produce OPAXIO, including paclitaxel, in adequate volume and quality. Paclitaxel is derived from certain varieties of yew trees and the supply of paclitaxel is controlled by a limited number of companies. We purchase the raw materials paclitaxel and polyglutamic acid from single sources. Should the paclitaxel or polyglutamic acid purchased from our sources prove to be insufficient in quantity or quality, should a supplier fail to deliver in a timely fashion or at all, or should these relationships terminate, we may not be able to qualify and obtain a sufficient supply from alternate sources on acceptable terms, or at all.

Our dependence on third-party manufacturers means that we do not always have direct control over the manufacture, testing or distribution of our products.

We do not currently have internal analytical laboratory or manufacturing facilities to allow the testing or production and distribution of drug products in compliance with cGMPs. Because we do not directly control our suppliers, these vendors may not be able to provide us with finished product when we need it.

We will be dependent upon these third parties to supply us in a timely manner with products manufactured in compliance with cGMPs or similar manufacturing standards imposed by United States and/or foreign regulatory authorities where our products will be tested and/or marketed. While the FDA and other regulatory authorities maintain oversight for cGMP compliance of drug manufacturers, contract manufacturers and contract service providers may at times violate cGMPs. The FDA and other regulatory authorities may take action against a contract manufacturer who violates cGMPs. Failure to comply with FDA, EMA or other applicable regulations may cause us to curtail or stop the manufacture of such products until we obtain regulatory compliance.

In addition, one of our other products under development, OPAXIO, has a complex manufacturing process and supply chain, which may prevent us from obtaining a sufficient supply of drug product for the clinical trials and commercial activities currently planned or underway on a timely basis, if at all. The active pharmaceutical ingredients and drug products for Pixuvri and brostallicin are both manufactured by a single vendor. Finished product manufacture and distribution for both Pixuvri and brostallicin are to be manufactured and distributed by different single vendors. We are currently disputing our right to cancel the exclusive manufacturing contract between us and the former manufacturer of Pixuvri. We assert multiple grounds for terminating this exclusive manufacturing agreement, which the former manufacturer disputes. The former manufacturer has asserted that we do not have the right to terminate the manufacturing contracts and has filed a lawsuit in the Court of Milan to compel us to source Pixuvri from that manufacturer. A hearing was held on January 21, 2010 to discuss preliminary matters and set a schedule for future filings and hearings. On November 11, 2010 a hearing was held aimed at examining and discussing the requests for evidence submitted by the parties in the briefs filed pursuant to article 183, paragraph 6 of the Italian code of civil procedure. At the hearing of November 11, the judge declared that the case does not require any discovery or evidentiary phase, as it may be decided on the basis of the documents and pleadings filed by the parties. The judge fixed accordingly the last hearing for October 11, 2012, for the parties to definitively submit to the judge their requests.

Even if our drug candidates are successful in clinical trials, we may not be able to successfully commercialize them.

Since our inception in 1991, we have dedicated substantially all of our resources to the research and development of our technologies and related compounds. All of our compounds currently are in research or development, and have not received marketing approval.

Table of Contents

Prior to commercialization, each product candidate requires significant research, development and preclinical testing and extensive clinical investigation before submission of any regulatory application for marketing approval. The development of anti-cancer drugs, including those we are currently developing, is unpredictable and subject to numerous risks. Potential products that appear to be promising at early stages of development may not reach the market for a number of reasons including that they may:

be found ineffective or cause harmful side effects during preclinical testing or clinical trials;

fail to receive necessary regulatory approvals;

be difficult to manufacture on a scale necessary for commercialization;

be uneconomical to produce;

fail to achieve market acceptance; or

be precluded from commercialization by proprietary rights of third parties.

The occurrence of any of these events could adversely affect the commercialization of our products. Products, if introduced, may not be successfully marketed and/or may not achieve customer acceptance. If we fail to commercialize products or if our future products do not achieve significant market acceptance, we will not likely generate significant revenues or become profitable.

If we do not successfully develop our product candidates into marketable products, we may be unable to generate significant revenue or become profitable.

We divested our commercial product, TRISENOX, in July 2005 and fully divested our commercial product, Zevalin, in March 2009. Currently, we do not have a marketed product, and unless we are able to develop one of our product candidates, such as Pixuvri, into an approved commercial product, we will not generate any significant revenues from product sales, royalty payments, license fees or otherwise. Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates are currently in clinical trials; these clinical trials may not be successful and, even if they are, we may not be successful in developing any of them into a commercial product. For example, our STELLAR phase III clinical trials for OPAXIO for the treatment of non-small cell lung cancer failed to meet their primary endpoints. In addition, a number of companies in the pharmaceutical industry, including us, have suffered significant setbacks in advanced clinical trials, even after reporting promising results in earlier trials. We will need to commit significant time and resources to develop these and any additional product candidates. Even if our trials are viewed as successful, we may not get regulatory approval. Our product candidates will be successful only if:

our product candidates are developed to a stage that will enable us to commercialize them or sell related marketing rights to pharmaceutical companies;

we are able to commercialize product candidates in clinical development or sell the marketing rights to third parties; and

our product candidates, if developed, are approved by the regulatory authorities.

We are dependent on the successful completion of these goals in order to generate revenues. The failure to generate such revenues may preclude us from continuing our research and development of these and other product candidates.

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

If we are unable to enter into new in-licensing arrangements, our future product portfolio and potential profitability could be harmed.

One component of our business strategy is in-licensing drug compounds developed by other pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies or academic research laboratories. All of our product candidates in clinical development are in-licensed from a third-party, including Pixuvri, OPAXIO, tosedostat, brostallicin and bisplatinates.

Competition for new promising compounds and commercial products can be intense. If we are not able to identify future in-licensing opportunities and enter into future licensing arrangements on acceptable terms, our future product portfolio and potential profitability could be harmed.

Table of Contents

We may take longer to complete our clinical trials than we expect, or we may not be able to complete them at all.

Before regulatory approval for any potential product can be obtained, we must undertake extensive clinical testing on humans to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of the product. Although for planning purposes we forecast the commencement and completion of clinical trials, the actual timing of these events can vary dramatically due to a number of factors. For example:

we may not obtain authorization to permit product candidates that are already in the preclinical development phase to enter the human clinical testing phase;

the FDA or the EMA may object to proposed protocols;

there may be shortages of available product supplies or the materials that are used to manufacture the products;

the quality or stability of the product candidates may fall below acceptable standards;

authorized preclinical or clinical testing may require significantly more time, resources or expertise than originally expected to be necessary;

clinical testing may not show potential products to be safe and efficacious and, as with many drugs, may fail to demonstrate the desired safety and efficacy characteristics in human clinical trials;

clinical testing may show that potential products are not appropriate for the specific indication for which they are being tested;

the results from preclinical studies and early clinical trials may not be indicative of the results that will be obtained in later-stage clinical trials;

we or regulatory authorities may suspend clinical trials at any time on the basis that the participants are being exposed to unacceptable health risks or for other reasons; and

the rates of patient recruitment and enrollment of patients who meet trial eligibility criteria may be lower than anticipated, which is a function of many factors, including the number of patients with the relevant conditions, the nature of the clinical testing, the proximity of patients to clinical testing centers, the eligibility criteria for tests as well as competition with other clinical testing programs involving the same patient profile but different treatments.

We have limited experience in conducting clinical trials. We expect to continue to rely on third parties, such as contract research organizations, academic institutions and/or cooperative groups, to conduct, oversee and monitor clinical trials as well as to process the clinical results and manage test requests, which may result in delays or failure to complete trials if the third parties fail to perform or to meet the applicable standards.

If we fail to commence, complete, experience delays in any of our present or planned clinical trials or need to perform more or larger clinical trials than planned, our development costs may increase and/or our ability to commercialize our product candidates may be adversely affected. If delays or costs are significant, our financial results and our ability to commercialize our product candidates may be adversely affected.

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

If we fail to establish and maintain collaborations or if our partners do not perform, we may be unable to develop and commercialize our product candidates.

We have entered into collaborative arrangements with third-parties to develop and/or commercialize product candidates and are currently seeking additional collaborations. For example, we entered into an agreement with the GOG to perform a phase III trial of OPAXIO in patients with ovarian cancer. Additional collaborations might be necessary in order for us to fund our research and development activities and third-party manufacturing arrangements, seek and obtain regulatory approvals and successfully commercialize our existing and future product candidates. If we fail to enter into additional collaborative arrangements or fail to maintain our existing collaborative arrangements, the number of product candidates from which we could receive future revenues would decline. For example, in 2005 we sold our product TRISENOX to Cephalon and, pursuant to the terms of the purchase agreement under which TRISENOX was sold, we are entitled to receive milestone payments upon the approval by the FDA of new labeled uses for TRISENOX; however, Cephalon may decide not to submit any additional information to the FDA to apply for label expansion of TRISENOX, in which case we would not receive a milestone payment under the agreement.

Table of Contents

Our dependence on collaborative arrangements with third parties will subject us to a number of risks that could harm our ability to develop and commercialize products, including that:

collaborative arrangements may not be on terms favorable to us;

disagreements with partners may result in delays in the development and marketing of products, termination of our collaboration agreements or time consuming and expensive legal action;

we cannot control the amount and timing of resources partners devote to product candidates or their prioritization of product candidates and partners may not allocate sufficient funds or resources to the development, promotion or marketing of our products, or may not perform their obligations as expected;

partners may choose to develop, independently or with other companies, alternative products or treatments, including products or treatments which compete with ours;

agreements with partners may expire or be terminated without renewal, or partners may breach collaboration agreements with us;

business combinations or significant changes in a partner's business strategy might adversely affect that partner's willingness or ability to complete its obligations to us; and

the terms and conditions of the relevant agreements may no longer be suitable.

The occurrence of any of these events could adversely affect the development or commercialization of our products.

Because we base several of our drug candidates on unproven technologies, we may never develop them into commercial products.

We base several of our product candidates upon novel technologies that we are using to develop drugs for the treatment of cancer. These technologies have not been proven. Furthermore, preclinical results in animal studies may not predict outcomes in human clinical trials. Our product candidates may not be proven safe or effective. If these technologies do not work, our drug candidates will not develop into commercial products.

Because there is a risk of product liability associated with our products, we face potential difficulties in obtaining insurance.

Our business exposes us to potential product liability risks inherent in the testing, manufacturing and marketing of human pharmaceutical products, and we may not be able to avoid significant product liability exposure. While we have insurance covering the product use in our clinical trials for our product candidates, it is possible that we will not be able to maintain such insurance on acceptable terms or that any insurance obtained will not provide adequate coverage against potential liabilities. Our inability to obtain sufficient insurance coverage at an acceptable cost or otherwise to protect against potential product liability claims could prevent or limit the commercialization of any products we develop. A successful product liability claim in excess of our insurance coverage could exceed our net worth.

Since we use hazardous materials in our business, we may be subject to claims relating to improper handling, storage or disposal of these materials.

Our research and development activities involve the controlled use of hazardous materials, chemicals and various radioactive compounds. We are subject to international, federal, state and local laws and regulations governing the use, manufacture, storage, handling and disposal of such materials and certain waste products. Although we believe that our safety procedures for handling and disposing of such materials comply with the standards prescribed by the regulations, the risk of accidental contamination or injury from these materials cannot be eliminated completely.

Edgar Filing: CELL THERAPEUTICS INC - Form 10-Q

In the event of such an accident, we could be held liable for any damages that result and any such liability not covered by insurance could exceed our resources. Compliance with environmental laws and regulations may be expensive, and current or future environmental regulations may impair our research, development or production efforts.

We may not be able to conduct animal testing in the future, which could harm our research and development activities.

Certain of our research and development activities involve animal testing. Such activities have been the subject of controversy and adverse publicity. Animal rights groups and other organizations and individuals have attempted to stop animal testing activities by pressing for legislation and regulation in these areas and by disrupting activities through protests and other means. To the extent the activities of these groups are successful, our business could be materially harmed by delaying or interrupting our research and development activities.

Table of Contents

The unfavorable outcome of litigation and other claims against us could harm our financial condition and results of operations.

We are subject to a variety of claims and lawsuits from time to time, some of which arise in the ordinary course of our business. Adverse outcomes in some or all of such pending cases may result in significant monetary damages or injunctive relief against us. While we currently believe that resolution of these matters, individually or in the aggregate, will not have a material adverse impact on our financial position, results of operations or trading price of our securities, the ultimate outcome of litigation and other claims is subject to inherent uncertainties, and our view of these matters may change in the future. It is possible that our financial condition and results of operations could be harmed in any period in which the effect of an unfavorable final outcome becomes probable and reasonably estimable.

Our financial condition and results of operations could be adversely affected by public health issues, wars and other military action, as well as terrorist attacks and threats and government responses thereto, especially if any such actions were directed at us or our facilities or customers.

Public health issues, terrorist attacks in the United States and elsewhere, government responses thereto, and military actions in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere, may disrupt our operations or those of our customers and suppliers and may affect the availability of materials needed to manufacture our products or the means to transport those materials to manufacturing facilities and finished products to customers. A health pandemic could cause damage or disruption to international commerce by creating economic and political uncertainties that may have a strong negative impact on the global economy, us, and our customers or suppliers. Should a severe public health issues arise, we could be negatively impacted by the need for more stringent employee travel restrictions, additional limitations in the availability of freight services, governmental actions limiting the movement of products between various regions and disruptions in the operations of our customers or suppliers. The long-term effects public health issues, the terrorist attacks, and the ongoing war on terrorism on our business and on the global economy remain unknown. In addition, any of these events could increase volatility in the United States and world financial markets which may depress the price of our common stock and may limit the capital resources available to us or our customers or suppliers, which could result in decreased orders from customers, less favorable financing terms from suppliers, and scarcity or increased costs of materials and components of our products. Additionally, terrorist attacks directly upon us may significantly disrupt our ability to conduct our business. Any of these occurrences could have a significant impact on our operating results, revenues and costs and may result in increased volatility of the trading price of our securities.

Higher health care costs could adversely affect our business.

We will be impacted by the recent passage of the PPACA. Under the PPACA, we may be required to amend our health care plans to, among other things, provide affordable coverage, as defined in the PPACA, to all employees, or otherwise be subject to a payment per employee based on the affordability criteria in the Act: cover adult children of our employees to age 26; delete lifetime limits; and delete pre-existing condition limitations. Many of these requirements will be phased in over a period of time. Additionally, some states and localities have passed state and local laws mandating the provision of certain levels of health benefits by some employers. Increased health care costs could harm our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Risks Related To the Securities Markets

The market price of shares of our common stock is extremely volatile, which may affect our ability to raise capital in the future and may subject the value of your investment in our securities to sudden decreases.

The market price for securities of biopharmaceutical and biotechnology companies, including ours, historically has been highly volatile, and the market from time to time has experienced significant price and volume fluctuations that are unrelated to the operating performance of such companies. For example, during the twelve-month period ended October 21, 2011, our stock price has ranged from a low of \$0.95 to a high of \$3.30 (as adjusted to reflect the one-for-six reverse stock split effected on May 15, 2011). Fluctuations in the trading price or liquidity of our common stock may adversely affect the value of your investment in our common stock.

Table of Contents

Factors that may have a significant impact on the market price and marketability of our securities include:

announcements by us or others of results of preclinical testing and clinical trials and regulatory actions;

announcements of technological innovations or new commercial therapeutic products by us, our collaborative partners or our present or potential competitors;

our issuance of additional debt, equity or other securities, which we need to pursue in 2011 to generate additional funds to cover our current debt and operating expenses;

our quarterly operating results;

developments or disputes concerning patent or other proprietary rights;

developments in our relationships with collaborative partners;

acquisitions or divestitures;

litigation and government proceedings;

adverse legislation, including changes in governmental regulation;

third-party reimbursement policies;

changes in securities analysts' recommendations;

short selling;

changes in health care policies and practices;

halting or suspension of trading in our common stock by NASDAQ, CONSOB or the Borsa Italiana;

economic and other external factors; and

general market conditions.

In the past, following periods of volatility in the market price of a company's securities, securities class action litigation has often been instituted. For example, in the case of our company, we and certain of our officers and directors are named as defendants in purported securities class action and shareholder derivative lawsuits brought on behalf of a putative class of purchasers of our securities from March 25, 2008 through March 22, 2010. These lawsuits seek unspecified damages and, as with any litigation proceeding, we cannot predict with certainty the eventual outcome of pending litigation. Furthermore, we may have to incur substantial expenses in connection with these lawsuits and our management's attention and resources could be diverted from operating our business as we respond to the litigation. We maintain significant insurance to cover these risks for us and our directors and officers, but our insurance is subject to high deductibles to reduce premium expense, and there is no guarantee that the insurance will cover any specific claim that we currently face or may face in the future, or that it will be adequate to cover all potential liabilities and damages.

Shares of common stock are equity securities and are subordinate to our existing and future indebtedness.

Shares of our common stock are common equity interests. This means that our common stock ranks junior to any preferred stock that we may issue in the future, to our indebtedness and to all creditor claims and other non-equity claims against us and our assets available to satisfy claims on us, including claims in a bankruptcy or similar proceeding. Our existing and future indebtedness and our preferred stock may restrict payment of dividends on our common stock.

Additionally, unlike indebtedness, where principal and interest customarily are payable on specified due dates, in the case of our common stock, (i) dividends are payable only when and if declared by our board of directors or a duly authorized committee of our board of directors, and (ii) as a corporation, we are restricted to making dividend payments and redemption payments out of legally available assets. We have never paid a dividend on our common stock and have no current intention to pay dividends in the future. Furthermore, our common stock places no restrictions on our business or operations or on our ability to incur indebtedness or engage in any transactions, subject only to the voting rights available to shareholders generally.

Table of Contents

The market price of shares of our common stock may be adversely affected by market conditions affecting the stock markets in general, including price and trading fluctuations on The NASDAQ Capital Market.

The market price of our common stock may be adversely affected by market conditions affecting the stock markets in general, including price and trading fluctuations on The NASDAQ Capital Market. These conditions may result in (i) volatility in the level of, and fluctuations in, the market prices of stocks generally and, in turn, our shares of common stock, and (ii) sales of substantial amounts of our common stock in the market, in each case that could be unrelated or disproportionate to changes in our operating performance.

There may be future sales or other dilution of our equity, which may adversely affect the market price of shares of our common stock.

We are not restricted from issuing additional shares of common stock or preferred stock, including any securities that are convertible into or exchangeable for, or that represent the right to receive, shares of common stock or preferred stock, or any substantially similar securities. The market price of our shares of common stock or preferred stock could decline as a result of sales of a large number of shares of our common stock or preferred stock or similar securities in the market, or the perception that such sales could occur in the future.

Anti-takeover provisions in our charter documents, in our Shareholder Rights Agreement, or rights plan, and under Washington law could make removal of incumbent management or an acquisition of us, which may be beneficial to our shareholders, more difficult.

Provisions of our articles of incorporation and amended and restated bylaws may have the effect of deterring or delaying attempts by our shareholders to remove or replace management, to commence proxy contests, or to effect changes in control. These provisions include:

a classified board so that only approximately one third of our board of directors is elected each year;

elimination of cumulative voting in the election of directors;

procedures for advance notification of shareholder nominations and proposals;

the ability of our board of directors to amend our amended and restated bylaws without shareholder approval; and

the ability of our board of directors to issue shares of preferred stock without shareholder approval upon the terms and conditions and with the rights, privileges and preferences as our board of directors may determine.

Pursuant to our rights plan, an acquisition of 20% or more of our common stock could result in the exercisability of the preferred stock purchase right accompanying each share of our common stock (except those held by a 20% shareholder, which become null and void), thereby entitling the holder to receive upon exercise, in lieu of a number of units of preferred stock, that number of shares of our common stock having a market value of two times the exercise price of the right. The existence of our rights plan could have the effect of delaying, deferring or preventing a third party from making an acquisition proposal for us and may inhibit a change in control that some, or a majority, of our shareholders might believe to be in their best interest or that could give our shareholders the opportunity to realize a premium over the then-prevailing market prices for their shares.

In addition, as a Washington corporation, we are subject to Washington law which imposes restrictions on some transactions between a corporation and certain significant shareholders. These provisions, alone or together, could have the effect of deterring or delaying changes in incumbent management, proxy contests or changes in control.

Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds

None.

Item 3. Defaults Upon Senior Securities

None.

Item 4. (Removed and Reserved)

Item 5. Other Information

Not applicable.

Table of Contents

Item 6. Exhibits

(a) Exhibits

- 3.1 Registrant's Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Registration Statement on Form S-3 (File No. 333-153358), filed on September 5, 2008).
- 3.2 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series F Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on February 9, 2009).
- 3.3 Registrant's Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on March 27, 2009).
- 3.4 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 1 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on April 13, 2009).
- 3.5 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 2 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on August 21, 2009).
- 3.6 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Certificate of Designation, Preferences and Rights of Series ZZ Junior Participating Cumulative Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Registration Statement on Form 8-A, filed on December 28, 2009).
- 3.7 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 3 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on January 19, 2010).
- 3.8 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 4 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on April 5, 2010).
- 3.9 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 5 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on May 27, 2010).
- 3.10 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 6 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on July 27, 2010).
- 3.11 Registrant's Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on September 17, 2010).
- 3.12 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 7 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on October 22, 2010).
- 3.13 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 8 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on January 18, 2011).
- 3.14 Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 9 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on January 18, 2011).

Table of Contents

3.15	Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 10 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on February 24, 2011).
3.16	Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 11 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on February 24, 2011).
3.17	Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 12 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on May 2, 2011).
3.18	Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation (incorporated by reference to the exhibits of the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on May 18, 2011).
3.19	Registrant's Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation (incorporated by reference to the exhibits of the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on June 17, 2011).
3.20	Registrant's Articles of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation, Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series 13 Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on July 6, 2011).
3.21	Registrant's Second Amended and Restated Bylaws (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on February 22, 2010).
4.1	Form of Series 13 Preferred Stock Certificate (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on July 6, 2011).
4.2	Form of Common Stock Purchase Warrant, dated July 5, 2011 (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on July 6, 2011).
10.1	License and Co-Development, dated September 15, 2006, by and among the Registrant, Cell Therapeutics Europe S.r.l. and Novartis International Pharmaceutical Ltd. (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on September 18, 2006).
10.2	Form of Securities Purchase Agreement, dated June 29, 2011 (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on July 6, 2011).
10.3	Restricted Stock Award Agreement, dated April 8, 2011, by and between the Registrant and James Bianco (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, filed on July 28, 2011).
10.4	Amendment to Restricted Stock Agreement, dated September 20, 2011, by and between the Registrant and James Bianco.*
10.5	Revised Director Compensation Policy (incorporated by reference to the exhibits to the Registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K, filed on September 26, 2011).
31.1	Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.*
31.2	Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.*
32	Certification of Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.*
101.INS	XBRL Instance
101.SCH	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema
101.CAL	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Calculation
101.DEF	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Definition
101.LAB	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Labels
101.PRE	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Presentation

* Filed herewith.

Portions of this exhibit have been omitted pursuant to a request for confidential treatment.

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized:

CELL THERAPEUTICS, INC.
(Registrant)

Dated: October 25, 2011

By: /s/ James A. Bianco, M.D.
James A. Bianco, M.D.
Chief Executive Officer

Dated: October 25, 2011

By: /s/ Louis A. Bianco
Louis A. Bianco
Executive Vice President,
Finance and Administration