

EXHIBIT 2

Charles M. Lizza
William C. Baton
David L. Moses
SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN & LEHR LLP
One Riverfront Plaza, Suite 1520
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5426
(973) 286-6700
clizza@saul.com
wbaton@saul.com
dmoses@saul.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Indivior Inc.,
Indivior UK Limited, and
Aquestive Therapeutics, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

INDIVIOR INC., INDIVIOR UK LIMITED,
and AQUESTIVE THERAPEUTICS, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 17-7111 (KM)(CLW)
Civil Action No. 18-1775 (KM)(CLW)
Civil Action No. 18-5288 (KM)(CLW)
(Consolidated)

(Filed Electronically)

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –
OUTSIDE COUNSEL'S EYES ONLY –
FILED UNDER SEAL**

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS vi

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 2

 A. Suboxone Film 2

 B. The '305 Patent 3

 C. DRL's Generic Version of Suboxone Film 4

 D. DRL's Admissions Concerning Its ANDA Product and the Prior Validity Findings on the Parent '514 Patent 5

 1. Comparison of Claim 26 of the '305 Patent to Claim 62 of the '514 Patent 5

 2. The District Court's Decision on Claim 62 of the '514 Patent 6

 3. Claim 26 of the '305 Patent Requires a Continuously Cast Film Produced on a Manufacturing Line 7

III. LEGAL STANDARD 8

IV. ARGUMENT 9

 A. Plaintiffs Are Likely To Succeed on the Merits 9

 1. DRL Cannot Raise a Substantial Question of Noninfringement 9

 a) DRL's Proposed ANDA Product Meets Every Limitation of Claim 26 of the '305 Patent 10

 b) DRL Attempts to Add Another Limitation to Claim 26 to Concoct a Noninfringement Defense 13

 2. DRL Cannot Raise a Substantial Question of Invalidity 16

 B. Plaintiffs Will Suffer Irreparable Harm Unless DRL's Launch Is Enjoined 21

 1. Indivior Could Lose Most of Its Market Share and Revenue 21

 2. Suboxone Film Could Irretrievably Lose Favorable Formulary Status 23

 3. Indivior Could Suffer from Research and Development Delays and [REDACTED] 25

 4. Indivior Would Suffer Reputational Harm and Loss of Goodwill 26

 5. Aquestive Would Also Suffer Irreparable Harm 27

 C. The Balance of Harms Strongly Supports a Preliminary Injunction 27

 D. The Public Interest Favors an Injunction Here, Where Indivior Would Have to Scale Back its Role in Expanding Access to Opioid Addiction Treatment 28

V. THE RELIEF AWARDED SHOULD ADDRESS ANY ANDA PRODUCT THAT DRL HAS ALREADY SHIPPED 30

VI. PLAINTIFFS ARE PREPARED TO POST A REASONABLE BOND 31
VII. CONCLUSION..... 31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Antares Pharma, Inc. v. Medac Pharma, Inc.</i> , 55 F. Supp. 3d 526 (D. Del. 2014).....	23
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 809 F.3d 633 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	27
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	20
<i>AstraZeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 623 F. Supp. 2d 579 (D.N.J. 2009).....	24, 25
<i>AstraZeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 633 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	9
<i>Bio-Tech. Gen. Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 80 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	25
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 106 F. Supp. 2d 696 (D.N.J. 2000), <i>abrogated on other grounds by Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.</i> , 659 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	29, 30
<i>In re BRCA1-, BRCA2-Based Hereditary Cancer Test Patent Litig.</i> , 3 F. Supp. 3d 1213 (D. Utah 2014).....	23
<i>Butamax™ Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , No. 11-54-SLR, 2012 WL 2675232 (D. Del. July 6, 2012).....	30
<i>Canon Computer Sys., Inc. v. Nu-Kote Int’l, Inc.</i> , 134 F.3d 1085 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	16
<i>Chrysler Motors Corp. v. Auto Body Panels of Ohio, Inc.</i> , 908 F.2d 951 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	8
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , No. 09-MD-2118-SLR, 2011 WL 1980610 (D. Del. May 20, 2011).....	26
<i>eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.</i> , 547 U.S. 388 (2006).....	9
<i>Eisai Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , Nos. 05-5727, 07-5489 (HAA)(ES), 2008 WL 1722098 (D.N.J. Mar. 28, 2008).....	26, 27

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.