

**IN THE 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.

Case No. IPR2016-01111  
Patent No. 8,603,514

---

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner, MonoSol Rx, LLC, respectfully requests rehearing under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) for reconsideration of the Decision Denying Patent Owner’s Motion for Additional Discovery (“Decision Denying Discovery”; Paper No. 9) with respect to Patent Owner’s second Request for Production. The Board stated that “authorizing the second . . . Request[] would be unproductive” because “Petitioner represents that no responsive documents exist. Opp. 18” Paper 9, p. 8.

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Board misapprehended Petitioner’s carefully crafted response to the second Request for Production (“Second Request”). Petitioner’s Opposition (Paper 8) at page 18 does not state that no responsive documents exist, but rather, addresses only correspondence or communications related to selected items, *i.e.*, term sheets, letters of intent, common interest agreements, or other agreements related to the “‘definitive agreement’ referenced in Petitioner’s June 11, 2016 press release (the ‘Agreement’).” Paper 8, pp. 17-18. Notably absent from Petitioner’s response is correspondence or communications related to the Agreement itself, or drafts of the Agreement, all of which fall within the scope of the Second Request and would have come into existence in the months leading up to the August 3, 2016 press release (Ex. 1042) announcing the successful acquisition of Teva’s ANDAs. Correspondence or communications related to the Agreement, or to drafts of the Agreement, dated prior to the filing of the present

petition, would be indicia that privity existed between Teva and Petitioner at that time, but Petitioner has made no representations whether these documents exist. Ex. 2001, 24:14-26:23; Paper 8, pp. 17-18. Accordingly, Patent Owner requests the Board to authorize the Second Request with respect to correspondence or communications related to the Agreement or drafts of the Agreement.

Patent Owner submits that the present request is timely filed, within fourteen days of the Decision Denying Discovery in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(1).

## **II. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED**

Patent Owner requests that the Board reconsider the Decision Denying Discovery, and authorize the Second Request with respect to correspondence or communications related to the Agreement or drafts of the Agreement.

## **III. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

A request for rehearing “must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed . . . .” 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). “When rehearing a decision on petition, the panel will review the decision for an abuse of discretion.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). An abuse of discretion occurs when a “decision was based on an erroneous conclusion of law or clearly erroneous factual findings, or . . . a clear error of judgment.” *PPG Indus. Inc. v. Celanese Polymer Specialties Co. Inc.*, 840 F.2d 1565, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (citations omitted).

#### IV. ARGUMENT

##### A. Petitioner Never Addresses Correspondence or Communications Related to the Agreement or Drafts of the Agreement

The Second Request seeks, in relevant part, “[c]orrespondence or communications related to (a) the agreements or term sheets identified in category (1) above,” where category (1) is “[t]he ‘definitive agreement’ referenced in Petitioner’s June 11, 2016 press release (*the ‘Agreement’*), any *drafts of the Agreement*, any term sheets or letter of intent related to the Agreement, and any common interest or other agreement related to the Agreement.” Paper 7, p. 17 (emphasis added). The Board stated that “authorizing the second . . . Request[] would be unproductive” because “Petitioner represents that no responsive documents exist. Opp. 18” Paper 9, p. 8. However, Petitioner’s response to the Second Request omits any reference to *the Agreement or drafts of the Agreement*, stating only that “no correspondence or communications directed to terms sheets or letters of intent exist,” and that “[n]o common interest agreements or other agreements related to the Agreement prior to the execution of the ‘definitive agreement’ identified in category (1) exist.” Paper 8, pp. 17-18. Nowhere does Petitioner’s response to the Second Request ever mention correspondence or communications related to the Agreement or drafts of the Agreement, much less represent that no such documents exist.

Patent Owner sought clarification from Petitioner regarding the response to the Second Request in light of the Board’s understanding that “Petitioner represents that

no responsive documents exist.” Paper 9, p. 8. In particular, Patent Owner requested confirmation that Petitioner represents that no documents responsive to the Second Request exist, and to confirm that no correspondence or communications related to the Agreement or drafts of the Agreement exist. Ex. 2014 (email correspondence between Patent Owner and Petitioner dated September 8-9, 2016). Petitioner “decline[d] to comment” on the Board’s understanding that “Petitioner represents that no responsive documents exist,” or provide any response regarding the existence of correspondence or communications related to the Agreement or drafts of the Agreement. *Id.*

**B. The Board Misapprehended the Response to the Second Request and Overlooked that the Documents Petitioner Fails to Address Would be Indicia of Privity Prior to the Filing of the Petition**

Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Board misapprehended the response to the Second Request when stating that “Petitioner represents that no responsive documents exist.” Paper 9, p. 8. As explained above, nowhere does Petitioner’s response to the Second Request ever mention correspondence or communications related to the Agreement or drafts of the Agreement, much less represent that no such documents exist. And Petitioner’s refusal to clarify the accuracy of the Board’s understanding is telling. To this day, Petitioner has never represented that no preliminary documents (*e.g.*, drafts of the Agreement or

# 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.