

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

RECKITT BENCKISER  
PHARMACEUTICALS INC., RB  
PHARMACEUTICALS LIMITED, and  
MONOSOL RX, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WATSON LABORATORIES, INC. and  
ACTAVIS LABORATORIES UT, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 13-1674-RGA

RECKITT BENCKISER  
PHARMACEUTICALS INC., RB  
PHARMACEUTICALS LIMITED, and  
MONOSOL RX, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC. and  
INTELGEX TECHNOLOGIES CORP.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 14-422-RGA

TRIAL OPINION

Mary W. Bourke, Esq., Dana K. Severance, Esq., Daniel M. Attaway, Esq., WOMBLE  
CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, LLP, Wilmington, DE, attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Daniel A. Ladow, Esq., James M. Bollinger, Esq., Timothy P. Heaton, Esq., J. Magnus Essunger,  
Esq., TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP, New York, NY; Charanjit Brahma, Esq., TROUTMAN

SANDERS LLP, San Francisco, CA; Robert E. Browne, Jr., Esq., TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP, Chicago, IL; Puja Patel Lea, Esq., TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP, Atlanta, GA; Jeffrey B. Elikan, Esq., Jeffrey Lerner, Esq., Erica N. Andersen, Esq., Ashley M. Kwon, Esq., COVINGTON & BURLING LLP, Washington, DC, attorneys for Plaintiffs Reckitt Benckiser Pharmaceuticals Inc. and RB Pharmaceuticals Limited.

James F. Hibey, Esq., Timothy C. Bickham, Esq., STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP, Washington, DC; David L. Hecht, Esq., Cassandra A. Adams, Esq., STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP, New York, NY, attorneys for Plaintiff MonoSol Rx, LLC.

John C. Phillips, Jr., Esq., Megan C. Haney, Esq., PHILLIPS, GOLDMAN & SPENCE, P.A., Wilmington, DE; George C. Lombardi, Esq., Michael K. Nutter, Esq., Tyler G. Johannes, Esq., WINSTON & STRAWN LLP, Chicago, IL; Stephen Smerek, Esq., David P. Dalke, Esq., Ashlea P. Raymond, Esq., WINSTON & STRAWN LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Melinda K. Lackey, Esq., Donald Mahoney, III, Esq., WINSTON & STRAWN LLP, Houston, TX, attorneys for Defendants Watson Laboratories, Inc. and Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc.

Steven J. Fineman, Esq., Katharine Lester Mowery, Esq., RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A., Wilmington, DE; Daniel G. Brown, Esq., LATHAM & WATKINS LLP, New York, NY; James K. Lynch, Esq., LATHAM & WATKINS LLP, San Francisco, CA; Terry Kearney, Esq., LATHAM & WATKINS LLP, Menlo Park, CA; Jennifer Koh, Esq., B. Thomas Watson, Esq., LATHAM & WATKINS LLP, San Diego, CA; Emily C. Melvin, Esq., Brenda L. Danek, Esq., LATHAM & WATKINS LLP, Chicago, IL, attorneys for Defendants Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. and IntelGenx Technologies Corp.

June 3, 2016

  
ANDREWS, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE:

Plaintiffs Reckitt Benckiser Pharmaceuticals, Inc., RB Pharmaceuticals Limited, and MonoSol Rx, LLC (collectively, “Reckitt”) brought this suit against Defendants Watson Laboratories, Inc. and Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc. (collectively, “Watson”) (D.I. 1, 11, 287)<sup>1</sup> and Defendants Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. and IntelGenx Technologies Corporation (collectively, “Par”) (C.A. No. 14-422 D.I. 1, 9, 14; D.I. 80) alleging infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,475,832 (“the ’832 patent”); 8,603,514 (“the ’514 patent”); and 8,017,150 (“the ’150 patent”). Reckitt’s suits against Watson and Par were consolidated for all pretrial proceedings. (D.I. 66; C.A. No. 14-422 D.I. 19). The Court held a four day bench trial. (D.I. 414, 415, 416, 417).<sup>2</sup> On November 3–4, 2015, the parties addressed the validity of the ’150 and ’514 patents and infringement of the ’150 patent by Watson (D.I. 414, 415). On December 17–18, 2015, the parties addressed the validity of the ’832 patent, infringement of the ’150 patent by Par, and infringement of the ’832 and ’514 patents by Watson and Par (D.I. 416, 417). The parties filed post-trial briefing (D.I. 396, 397, 406, 407, 408, 410, 411) and proposed findings of fact (D.I. 400).<sup>3</sup> Having considered the documentary evidence and testimony, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52(a).

---

<sup>1</sup> Citations to “D.I. \_\_\_” are to the docket in C.A. No. 13-1674 unless otherwise noted.

<sup>2</sup> Although the official transcript is filed in four parts (D.I. 414, 415, 416, 417), citations to the transcript herein are generally cited as “Tr.”

<sup>3</sup> Reckitt also submitted a notice of supplemental authority on March 28, 2016 (D.I. 424), informing the Court of the final written decisions of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in *inter partes* review proceedings of a patent related to the ’514 patent.

## I. BACKGROUND

### A. Overview

Plaintiff Reckitt Benckiser Pharmaceuticals is the holder of approved New Drug Application (“NDA”) No. 22-410 for Suboxone® sublingual film, which is indicated for maintenance treatment of opioid dependence. (D.I. 353-1 at ¶¶ 10, 16). The active ingredients of Suboxone® sublingual film are buprenorphine hydrochloride and naloxone hydrochloride. (*Id.* at ¶ 17). Buprenorphine is an opioid. (Tr. 1292:7–11; DFF137).<sup>4</sup> Naloxone is an opioid antagonist that prevents the action of opioids like buprenorphine when delivered simultaneously to the bloodstream of a user. (Tr. 1293:3–17, 1474:9–14). Suboxone® sublingual film includes both buprenorphine and naloxone to prevent unintended diversion of the product for abuse. (Tr. 1474:9–14).

Suboxone® sublingual film is available in four dosage strengths (buprenorphine hydrochloride/naloxone hydrochloride): 2 mg/0.5 mg, 4 mg/1 mg, 8 mg/2 mg, and 12 mg/3 mg. (D.I. 353-1 at ¶ 17). Plaintiff RB Pharmaceuticals Limited is the assignee of the ’832 patent, entitled “Sublingual and Buccal Film Compositions.” (*Id.* at ¶ 24; ’832 patent, (54) & (73)). Plaintiff MonoSol Rx, LLC is the assignee of the ’514 patent, entitled “Uniform Films for Rapid Dissolve Dosage Form Incorporating Taste-Masking Compositions,” and the ’150 patent, entitled “Polyethylene Oxide-Based Films and Drug Delivery Systems Made Therefrom.” (D.I. 353-1 at ¶¶ 28, 32; ’514 patent, (54) & (73); ’150 patent, (54) & (73)). Plaintiff Reckitt Benckiser Pharmaceuticals is an exclusive licensee of the ’832, ’514, and ’150 patents. (D.I. 353-1 at ¶¶ 25, 29, 33). The ’832, ’514, and ’150 patents are listed in the Food and Drug

---

<sup>4</sup> Citations to “PFF,” “DFF,” “DPRF,” and “DWRP” herein are to the Corrected Joint Proposed Findings of Fact and related responses filed at D.I. 400.

Administration's "Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations" (the "Orange Book") entry for Suboxone® sublingual film. (*Id.* at ¶ 34).

Watson and Par each filed Abbreviated New Drug Applications ("ANDAs") seeking FDA approval to market generic versions of the 2 mg/0.5 mg, 4 mg/1 mg, 8 mg/2 mg, and 12 mg/3 mg dosage strengths of Suboxone® sublingual film prior to the expiration of the '832, '514, and '150 patents. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 42, 45, 118). Watson seeks approval for its ANDA Product through ANDA Nos. 204383 and 207087.<sup>5</sup> (*Id.* at ¶¶ 43, 45). Par seeks approval for its ANDA Product through ANDA No. 205854. (*Id.* at ¶ 118). Watson's ANDAs and Par's ANDA contain Paragraph IV certifications alleging that the '832, '514, and '150 patents are invalid, unenforceable, and/or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of the generic products proposed in the ANDAs. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 43, 44, 46, 119). Reckitt received notices of Watson's and Par's Paragraph IV certifications and initiated the present litigation. (*Id.*; D.I. 1, 11, 80, 287).

B. Asserted Patents

1. '832 Patent

The '832 patent is directed to pharmaceutical film compositions and formulations that contain buprenorphine and naloxone. ('832 patent, 23:58–25:6). Reckitt asserts independent claims 1 and 15 and dependent claims 3, 6, and 16–19 against Watson and Par. (PFF21). The '832 patent issued on July 2, 2013. ('832 patent, (45)). The asserted claims of the '832 patent are entitled to a priority date of August 7, 2009. (D.I. 353-1 at ¶ 120).

Claim 1 of the '832 patent reads:

A film dosage composition comprising:

---

<sup>5</sup> "Watson's ANDA Product" and "Par's ANDA Product" refer to the parties' respective proposed generic drug formulations.

# 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.