

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MYLAN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

MONOSOL RX, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

**Case: IPR2017-00200**

**Patent 8,603,514**

---

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES*  
REVIEW OF US PATENT NO. 8,603,514**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	4
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	7
	A. “flowable” film-forming matrix.....	8
	B. “viscosity sufficient to aid in substantially maintaining non-self-aggregating uniformity”.....	8
	C. “active substantially uniformly stationed in the matrix” .....	10
	D. “taste-masking of the active” .....	11
	E. “capable of being dried without loss of substantial uniformity” .....	11
IV.	PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED “A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING” AGAINST AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ’514 PATENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A) .....	11
	A. Petitioner fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that any challenged claim is unpatentable in light of the prior art. ....	12
	1. DCU was a significant problem that was solved by the ’514 inventors .....	13
	2. Ilango fails to disclose or teach each element of the challenged independent claims. ....	16
	a. Ilango does not teach or disclose how to use matrix viscosity combined with drying to form a uniform cast film.....	17
	b. Ilango does not teach or disclose a particulate active with a particle size of 200 microns or less. ....	21
	c. Ilango does not teach or disclose how to make a film having the claimed uniformity. ....	22
	d. Ilango’s other disclosures are also insufficient.....	27

3. Petitioner’s additional reference has already been considered by the Board and  
found insufficient. .... 30

V. CONCLUSION..... 32

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	13
<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	10
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00165, Paper 70 (PTAB March 24, 2016) .....	4, 24-25
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00165, Paper 76 (PTAB August 11, 2016) .....	4
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00167, Paper 9 (PTAB November 12, 2015).....	4
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00168, Paper 69 (PTAB March 24, 2016) .....	25
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00168, Paper 73 (PTAB August 11, 2016) .....	4
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00169, Paper 69 (PTAB March 24, 2016) .....	4, 25
<i>Biodelivery Sciences Int’l, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00169, Paper 74 (PTAB August 11, 2016) .....	4
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	13
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	7
<i>Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories, Ltd. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01111, Paper 14 ( PTAB Dec. 5, 2016) .....	3

*In re Suitco Surface, Inc.*,  
603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....7

*Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*,  
783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....14

*Institut Pasteur v. Focarino*,  
738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....14

*Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.*,  
IPR2012-00026, Paper 17 (PTAB Dec. 21, 2012) .....7

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*) .....9

*Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. MonoSol Rx, LLC*,  
IPR2016-00281, Paper 21 (PTAB May 23, 2016) .....3

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....1

35 U.S.C. § 313 .....1

35 U.S.C. § 314(A) .....11, 32

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. 42.107 .....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....7

77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48763, 48766 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....7, 22, 25

# 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.