

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re *Inter Partes* Review of:)
U.S. Patent No. 8,603,514)
Issued: December 10, 2013)
Application No.: 11/775,484)
Filing Date: July 10, 2007)

For: **Uniform Films for Rapid Dissolve Dosage Form Incorporating Taste-Masking Compositions**

FILED VIA E2E

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,603,514**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Brief Overview of the '514 Patent	3
B. Brief Overview of the Prosecution History	5
C. Brief Overview of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art.....	9
D. Brief Overview of the Level of Skill in the Art	13
E. Background Knowledge in the Art Prior to October 12, 2001	14
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	20
III. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	21
IV. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED FOR EACH CLAIM CHALLENGED.....	23
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	24
A. “Flowable”Film-Forming Matrix.....	24
B. “viscosity sufficient to aid in substantially maintaining non-selfaggregating uniformity”	26
C. “active substantially uniformly stationed in the matrix”	27
D. “taste-masking of the active”	27
E. “capable of being dried without loss of substantial uniformity”	28
VI. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY	30
A. [Ground 1] Claims 1-3, 9, 15, 62-65, 69-73, and 75 are Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the Ilango (EX1005) in view of Chen (Ex1006).	30
VII. SECONDARY INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS.....	60

VIII. CONCLUSION.....61

IX. CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE62

X. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(A) AND 42.103.....63

XI. APPENDIX – LIST OF EXHIBITS.....63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.,
805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....14

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,
579 U.S. ---, 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)..... 24, 25, 30

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 9, 60

In re Translogic Tech., Inc.,
504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....24

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007)..... 9, 14

Randall Mfg. v. Rea,
733 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....14

Richdel, Inc. v. Sunspool Corp.,
714 F.2d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....61

Tokai Corp. v. Easton Enterprises, Inc.,
632 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....61

RULES

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)24

I. INTRODUCTION

Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. (“Par”) and IntelGenx Corp. (“IntelGenx”) (collectively “Petitioners”) request review of U.S. Patent No. 8,603,514 to Yang *et al.* (“the ’514 patent,” EX1001), which issued on December 10, 2013. PTO records indicate that the ’514 patent is assigned to MonoSol Rx, LLC (“Patent Owner”). This Petition demonstrates that there is a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-3, 9, 15, 62-65, 69-73, and 75 (“the challenged claims”) are unpatentable for failure to distinguish over newly applied prior art. This petition is substantively identical to that submitted in IPR2017-00200, the proceedings Petitioners seek to join with their simultaneously submitted motion for joinder. This petition relies on the testimony of Dr. Buckton (EX1002) submitted with IPR2017-00200. No new arguments or art are raised or relied on in this petition as compared to the petition in IPR2017-00200.

The challenged claims are directed to a drug delivery film comprising a particulate active ingredient and a taste-masking agent. Each component of the claimed composition was described in the prior art, including the oral drug delivery film, the polymer used to form the film, the viscosity of the film-forming matrix, the particle size of the active ingredient, the uniform distribution of the active ingredient, and the type of taste-masking agents as well as the manner of taste-masking used in the film. EX1001, 67:34-56 & 73:48-74:9. The challenged claims

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.