

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES S.A. and  
DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

MONOSOL RX, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-01582  
Patent 8,603,514

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. OVERVIEW .....	4
III. THE PETITION IS TIME-BARRED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) .....	6
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	7
A. Even The Broadest Reasonable Claim Interpretation Requires That Multiple Unit Doses Be Taken From A Single Cast Film Matrix .....	7
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 .....	11
B. Terms Previously Construed By Board .....	14
V. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '514 PATENT ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER THE COMBINATION OF ILANGO AND CHEN .....	15
A. State Of The Art At The Date Of Invention .....	15
1. Pharmaceutical Films Were A Relatively New Dosage Form .....	15
2. Little Was Known About The Causes Of Loss Of Drug Content Uniformity In Multi-Dose Films, Much Less Solutions For That Problem .....	17
B. Deficiencies In Ilango And Chen .....	18
1. Ilango does not teach making a multi-dose film .....	18
2. Chen .....	21
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) AND 325(d) TO DENY THE PETITION .....	21
VII. CONCLUSION .....	29

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	Reckitt Benckiser v. Watson Trial Opinion
2002	Redline comparison of Teva Petition and Dr. Reddy's Petition
2003	Redline comparison of Dr. Panyam's and Dr. Celik's declarations
2004	Reckitt Benckiser v. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Trial Opinion, C.A. 1:14-cv-01451, D.I. 312

Patent Owner MonoSol Rx, LLC (“PO”) respectfully submits this Patent Owner Preliminary Response to the Petition seeking *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,603,514 (“the ’514 Patent”) filed by Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories S.A. and Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories, Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) alleging that Claims 1–3, 9, 15, 62–65, 69–73, and 75 of the ’514 Patent (“the Challenged Claims”) are unpatentable. The Petition is one of five IPR petitions filed against the ’514 patent, and one of eleven overall challenges to the patent over the past four years. Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response is timely under 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107 because it is filed within three months of the Notice of Filing Date. Paper 4 at 2. PO submits that the Petition (1) is time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b), (2) fails to establish that any of the Challenged Claims is unpatentable, and (3) should be denied using the Board’s discretion under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 325(d).

## I. INTRODUCTION

The ’514 Patent is directed to pharmaceutical films and is listed in FDA’s Orange Book for Suboxone<sup>®</sup> Film, a treatment for opioid dependence and the first sublingual film ever approved by FDA. Prior to the ’514 Patent, it was widely acknowledged that it was difficult to manufacture pharmaceutical films in a manner that kept an active drug ingredient substantially uniformly distributed throughout the film matrix during casting and drying, *i.e.*, drug content uniformity

or “DCU.” The inventors of the ’514 Patent discovered an elegant solution to the DCU problem—controlling, among other things the viscosity of the wet matrix of a cast film and various drying parameters, *e.g.*, air flow, in order to prevent active particles from migrating from one unit dose to the next and agglomerating before the film was sufficiently dried to lock them in a substantially uniform distribution. While the Claims do not use the phrase, drug content uniformity is shorthand for the heart of the invention maintaining drug content uniformity throughout the manufacturing process such that “the uniformity subsequent to casting and drying of the matrix is measured by substantially equally sized individual unit doses which do not vary by more than 10% of said desired amount of said at least one active.” Ex. 1001, ’514 Patent at 67:53–56 (Claim 1), 74:6–9 (Claim 62).

The ’514 Patent has been the subject of multiple validity attacks in both district court and at the PTAB—even withstanding attacks by this same Petitioner. For this reason alone, the Board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and 325(d) to deny the petition. Indeed, Petitioner and the predecessor of Petitioner’s ANDA for a generic version of Suboxone® Sublingual Film—Teva Pharmaceuticals—have twice filed petitions for *inter partes* review of the ’514 Patent. The Board denied institution in both proceedings, finding that Teva’s petition was time-barred (IPR2016-00281, Paper 21 at 13-14) and that Petitioner failed to establish a reasonable likelihood any challenged claim was unpatentable

# 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.