

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.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 13-1674-RGA

Consolidated

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., and
INTELGENX TECHNOLOGIES CORP.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 14-422-RGA

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Daniel A. Ladow (argued), Esq., Troutman Sanders LLP, New York, NY; James M. Bollinger, Esq., Troutman Sanders LLP, New York, NY; Timothy P. Heaton, Esq., Troutman Sanders LLP, New York, NY; J. Magnus Essunger, Esq., Troutman Sanders LLP, New York, NY; Timothy C. Bickham, Esq. (argued), Steptoe & Johnson LLP, Washington, DC; James F. Hibey, Esq., Steptoe & Johnson LLP, Washington, DC; Houda Morad, Esq., Steptoe & Johnson LLP, Washington, DC; Mary W. Bourke, Esq. (argued), Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, LLP, Wilmington, DE; Daniel Attaway, Esq., Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, LLP, Wilmington, DE; attorneys for plaintiffs.

Daniel G. Brown (argued), Esq., Latham & Watkins LLP, New York, NY; Emily C. Melvin, Esq., Latham & Watkins LLP, Chicago IL; David P. Dalke (argued), Esq., Winston & Strawn LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Peter Perkowski, Winston & Strawn LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Steven J.

Fineman (argued), Esq., Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.; John C. Phillips, Jr., Esq., Phillips, Goldman & Spence, P.A., Wilmington, DE; attorneys for defendants.

December 12, 2014


ANDREWS, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE:

Before this Court is the issue of claim construction of disputed terms found in three U.S. Patents, 8,017,150 (“the ‘150 patent”), 8,475,832 (“the ‘832 patent”), and 8,603,514 (“the ‘514 patent”).

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs assert that Defendants’ ANDAs infringe the ‘150 patent, the ‘832 patent, and the ‘514 patent. (D.I. 106). The Court has considered the parties’ claim construction briefing (D.I. 106, 107, 108) and held a *Markman* hearing on December 3, 2014.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

“It is a bedrock principle of patent law that the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude.” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) (internal quotation marks omitted). “[T]here is no magic formula or catechism for conducting claim construction.’ Instead, the court is free to attach the appropriate weight to appropriate sources ‘in light of the statutes and policies that inform patent law.’” *SoftView LLC v. Apple Inc.*, 2013 WL 4758195, at *1 (D. Del. Sept. 4, 2013) (quoting *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1324). When construing patent claims, a matter of law, a court considers the literal language of the claim, the patent specification, and the prosecution history. *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 977–80 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff’d*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996). Of these sources, “the specification is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1315 (internal quotations and citations omitted).

Furthermore, “the words of a claim are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning . . . [which is] the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the invention, i.e., as of the effective filing date of the patent application.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312–13 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). “[T]he ordinary meaning of a claim term is its meaning to [an] ordinary artisan after reading the entire patent.” *Id.* at 1321 (internal quotation marks omitted). “In some cases, the ordinary meaning of claim language as understood by a person of skill in the art may be readily apparent even to lay judges, and claim construction in such cases involves little more than the application of the widely accepted meaning of commonly understood words.” *Id.* at 1314 (internal citations omitted).

A court may consider extrinsic evidence, which “consists of all evidence external to the patent and prosecution history, including expert and inventor testimony, dictionaries, and learned treatises,” in order to assist the court in understanding the underlying technology, the meaning of terms to one skilled in the art and how the invention works. *Id.* at 1317–19 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). However, extrinsic evidence is less reliable and less useful in claim construction than the patent and its prosecution history. *Id.*

Moreover, “[a] claim construction is persuasive, not because it follows a certain rule, but because it defines terms in the context of the whole patent.” *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa’ per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1998). It follows that “a claim interpretation that would exclude the inventor’s device is rarely the correct interpretation.” *Osram GmbH v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 505 F.3d 1351, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

III. CONSTRUCTION OF DISPUTED TERMS

A. The '150 Patent

Claim 1 of the '150 patent is representative:

A mucosally-adhesive water-soluble film product comprising:

an analgesic opiate pharmaceutical active; and

at least one water-soluble polymer component consisting of polyethylene oxide in combination with a hydrophilic cellulosic polymer;

wherein:

the water-soluble polymer component comprises greater than 75% polyethylene oxide and up to 25% hydrophilic cellulosic polymer;

the polyethylene oxide comprises one or more low molecular weight polyethylene oxides and one or more higher molecular weight polyethylene oxides, the molecular weight of the low molecular weight polyethylene oxide being in the range 100,000 to 300,000 and the molecular weight of the higher molecular weight polyethylene oxide being in the range 600,000 to 900,000; and

the polyethylene oxide of low molecular weight comprises about 60% or more in the polymer component.

('150 patent, claim 1).

1. "the polyethylene oxide comprises one or more low molecular weight polyethylene oxides and one or more higher molecular weight polyethylene oxides, the molecular weight of the low molecular weight polyethylene oxide being in the range of 100,000 to 300,000 and the molecular weight of the higher molecular weight polyethylene oxide being in the range of 600,000 to 900,000; and the polyethylene oxide of low molecular weight comprises about 60% or more in the polymer component" (claims 1, 10)

a. *Plaintiffs' proposed construction:* The plain and ordinary meaning is a polyethylene oxide component comprising polyethylene oxide within the molecular weight range

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.