

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

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. OVERVIEW5

 A. The Problem Addressed By The '514 Patent.....5

 B. The Relative Experience Of The Experts.....7

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION8

 A. Even The Broadest Reasonable Claim Interpretation Requires That Multiple Unit Doses Be Taken From A Single Cast Film Matrix8

 1. The Express Claim Language Requires Individual Unit Doses That Are Taken From A Single Cast Film Matrix.....9

 2. This Multi-Dose Film Interpretation Is The Only One That Is Consistent With The Intrinsic Evidence.....12

 B. Terms Construed By Board.....15

IV. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '514 PATENT ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER THE COMBINATION OF ILANGO AND CHEN15

 A. State Of The Art At The Date Of Invention.....15

 1. Pharmaceutical Films Were A Relatively New Dosage Form15

 2. Little Was Known About The Causes Of Loss Of Drug Content Uniformity In Multi-Dose Films, Much Less Solutions For That Problem18

 B. Deficiencies In Ilango And Chen.....19

 1. Ilango.....19

 a) Ilango's limited disclosure renders it unreliable19

 b) Ilango does not teach making a multi-dose film22

 c) Ilango's statement about content variation is not tied to a "desired amount" of drug in each strip unit dose.....23

d) Ilango’s statement of “5% variation” can reasonably be interpreted as derived from drug content measured from one strip for each film formulation, not multiple “unit doses”26

e) Ilango’s dissolution and density data indicate the films lacked DCU27

f) Ilango provides no evidence that the drug remained in particle form, as opposed to being dissolved31

g) Ilango fails to disclose viscosity of the film-forming matrix sufficient to aid in maintaining uniformity33

2. Chen36

C. Motivation To Combine Ilango With Chen’s Taste-Masking Agent And Reasonable Expectation of Success.....36

D. Objective Indicia Show That The Challenged ’514 Patent Claims Were Not Obvious38

1. There Was A Long-Felt Need For A Cast Film Meeting The Claimed 10% DCU Limitation And Others Previously Failed In Their Attempts To Create Such Films.....39

2. The Inventors Of The ’514 Patent Garnered Praise From Others For Their Solution To The DCU Problem43

3. The Objective Evidence Of Non-Obviousness Has A Strong Nexus To The Claimed Invention44

V. CONCLUSION.....46

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Trial Transcript, <i>Reckitt Benckiser Pharms Inc. v. Watson Laboratories, Inc. et al.</i> , CA No. 14-1574-RGA (Nov. 3-4, 2015) (“Trial Tr.”)
2002	<i>Reckitt Benckiser Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Watson Laboratories, Inc. et al.</i> , Civil Case No. 1:13-1674, slip opinion (D. Del. June 3, 2016) (Richard G. Andrews, J.) (<i>Reckitt v. Watson</i>)
2003	J. O. Morales and J. T. McConville, Manufacture and Characterization of Mucoadhesive Buccal Films, <i>European Journal of Pharmaceutics and v Biopharmaceutics</i> 77, pp. 187-99 (2011)
2004	A. F. Borges et al., Oral Films: Current Status and Future Perspectives II – Intellectual Property, Technologies and Market Needs, <i>Journal of Controlled Release</i> 206, pp. 108–21
2005	V.A. Perumal et al., Investigating a New Approach to Film Casting for Enhanced Drug Content Uniformity in Polymeric Films, <i>Drug Dev. & Indust. Pharm.</i> 34, pp. 1036-47 (2008)
2006	H. Kathpalia and A. Gupte, An Introduction to Fast Dissolving Oral Thin Film Drug Delivery Systems: A Review, <i>Drug Delivery & Formulation</i> 10, pp. 667-84 (2013)
2007	Declaration of Dr. Robert Langer
2008	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Graham Buckton
2009	V. A. Perumal, “Multipolymeric Monolayered Mucoadhesive Films for Drug Therapy,” Master’s Thesis (2007)
2010	Morales et al., “The Influence of Recrystallized Caffeine on Water-Swellable Polymethacrylate Mucoadhesive Bucca Films,” <i>AAPS PharmSciTech</i> , Vol. 14, No. 2, 475–484 (2013)
2011	U.S. Provisional App. Ser. No. 60/443,741
2012	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Robert Langer

2013	C.A. No. 1:14-cv-01451-RGA, Trial Tr.
2014	Lachman, L. et al., The Theory and Practice of Industrial Pharmacy (3d ed. 1986)
2015	S. Puttipipatkachorn et al., “Drug physical state and drug-polymer interaction on drug release from chitosan matrix films” (2001)
2016	J. Siepmann and N. Peppas entitled “Modeling of drug release from delivery systems based on hydroxypropyl methylcellulose” (2001)
2017	Compos-Aldrete et al., “Influence of the viscosity grade and the particle size of HPMC on metronidazole release from matrix tablets”, European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 43:173–178 (1997)
2018	James E. De Muth, Basic Statistics and Pharmaceutical Statistical Applications (2d ed. 2006)
2019	Staniforth, J.N., “Particle size analysis,” Pharmaceutics – The Science of Dosage Form Design (Aulton ed.), Ch. 33 at p. 578 (1988)
2020	P. Perugini et al., “Periodontal delivery of ipriflavone: new chitosan/PLGA film delivery system for a lipophilic drug,” Int’l J. of Pharmaceutics, 252:1–9 (2003)
2021	J. Yoo et al., “The physico-dynamic properties of mucoadhesive polymeric films developed as female controlled drug delivery system,” Int’l J. of Pharmaceutics, 309:139–145 (2006)
2022	A. Dhanikula et al., “Development and Characterization of Biodegradable Chitosan Films for Local Delivery of Paclitaxel,” The AAPS Journal, 6(3):1–12 (2004)
2023	A. Ahmed et al., “Penciclovir solubility in Eudragit films: a comparison of X-ray, thermal, microscopic and release rate techniques,” J. Pharm. & Biomedical Analysis, 34:945–956 (2004)
2024	C. Annuaikit et al., “Skin permeation of propranolol from polymeric film containing terpene enhancers for transdermal use,” Int’l J. of Pharmaceutics, 289:167–178 (2005)
2025	U.S. Patent No. 7,425,292 to Yang et al.
2026	Sigma-Aldrich Product Information Sheet re Caffeine (Anhydrous)
2027	Shakeel et al., “Thermodynamics-based mathematical model for

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.