

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, LTD. AND DR. REDDY'S
LABORATORIES, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

MONOSOL RX, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,603,514
Issue Date: December 10, 2013
Title: UNIFORM FILMS FOR RAPID DISSOLVE DOSAGE FORM
INCORPORATING TASTE-MASKING COMPOSITIONS
Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-01111

REQUEST FOR REHEARING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	1
A. Request for Rehearing	1
B. Collateral Estoppel	2
III. BACKGROUND	2
IV. THE BOARD MISAPPREHENDED PETITIONER’S ARGUMENT REGARDING COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND OVERLOOKED SPECIFIC EVIDENCE	3
A. The Board Overlooked Specific Evidence in the ‘588 Patent Decision Finding that Dependent Claim 3 in the ‘588 patent was Found Separately Unpatentable over Chen.....	4
B. The Board overlooked specific evidence in the ‘588 patent decision finding that Chen teaches a substantially identical process and inherently teaches the same product.....	8
V. THE BOARD MISAPPREHENDED THE EVIDENCE PROVIDED IN PATENT OWNER’S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE.....	11
VI. CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Ex parte Smith</i> , No. 2009-014595 (B.P.A.I. August 17, 2010)	2
<i>Innolux Corp. v. Semiconductor Energy Lab. Co.</i> , IPR2013-00064, Paper 11 (PTAB April 30, 2013).....	2
<i>Interthinx, Inc. v. Corelogic Solutions, LLC</i> , CBM2012-00007, Paper 15 (PTAB January 31, 2013).....	14
<i>S.A.P. Am., Inc. v. Versata Dev. Grp., Inc.</i> , CBM2012-00001, Paper 36 (PTAB January 9, 2013).....	14

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....	4, 6, 7
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	4, 6, 7
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	5, 6

Other Authorities

MPEP § 2286.....	14
MPEP § 2659.....	14

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.63.....	1, 12
37 C.F.R. § 42.71.....	1

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c) and (d), Petitioners, Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd. and Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc. (collectively, "Petitioners"), hereby submit this Request for Rehearing on the Decision Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review in the above-captioned matter. Paper No. 14, "Inst. Dec." In the Institution Decision, all of Petitioner's grounds for obviousness of claims 1-3, 9, 15, 62-65, 69-73 and 75 of U.S. Patent No. 8,603,514 ("the '514 patent") were denied.

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

A. Request for Rehearing

A request for rehearing is appropriate when the requesting party believes "the Board misapprehended or overlooked" a matter that was previously addressed in the record. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The request "must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply." *Id.* In reviewing such a request, the "panel will review the decision for an abuse of discretion." 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). Moreover, for evidence to be considered by the Board, "all evidence must be filed in the form of an exhibit." 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a).

B. Collateral Estoppel

The PTO affords preclusive effect to its own findings in subsequent PTO proceedings under certain circumstances. For example, “administrative estoppel” may be used to give preclusive effect to an examiner’s findings in subsequent reexamination proceedings if the patent owner did not traverse those findings during prosecution.¹

III. BACKGROUND

On December 5, 2016, the Board (“Instant Board”) denied institution of Petitioner’s Petition on the grounds that the “Petition has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of establishing that it would prevail in showing unpatentability of independent claims 1 and 62 or their respective dependent claims, 2-3, 9, 15, 63-65, 69-73 and 75 over Bess and Chen” and that the “Petition has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of establishing that it would prevail in showing unpatentability of claims 1-3, 9, 15, 62-65, 69-73 and 75 over the combination of Chen and Cremer.” Inst. Dec. 14 at 17, 19.

¹ See *Ex parte Smith*, No. 2009-014595 (B.P.A.I. Aug. 17, 2010); see also *Innolux Corp. v. Semiconductor Energy Lab. Co.*, IPR2013-00064, Paper No. 11 (PTAB April 30, 2013) (rejecting petitioner’s administrative estoppel argument because claims challenged in the petition were not “patentably indistinct” from claims cancelled in prior reexamination proceeding).

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.