Bitter Pills
Drug Makers See ‘Branded Generics’ Eating Into Profits

Altered Copies OutrunTênew Patent Laws in Battle, Boosting Market Pressures

Dr. Reddy’s Finds a Loophole

By Gavyn Harris and Emily T. Flincher, Special Correspondents of The Wall Street Journal

HYDERABAD, India—When the In- dia drug company Dr. Reddy’s Labo-
ratories Ltd. decided to introduce its first-ever branded drug, the company’s
top executives were confident that it would
be a good test for a patent system that makes
it easier for makers of innovator drugs, or
branded drugs, to defend themselves against
clones that are similar, but cheaper.

But Dr. Reddy’s victory shows how the
rapidly growing market for generics—drugs
that come in the same form as branded drugs—is
developing a novel strategy to attack the pric-
ing advantage that innovator drugs enjoy.

Dr. Reddy’s won a court case in Feb-
uary against Teva Pharmaceuticals, the Is-
raeli innovator drug company, in an Indian
court over the sale of Teva’s branded drug
for abdominal pain.

In the court case, Teva’s lawyers argu-
ed that Teva’s branded product has the same
active ingredients as the drug that Dr. Reddy’s
is selling as a generic.

A Federal Bench court in Hyderabad, In-
dia, ruled in favor of Dr. Reddy’s and granted
an injunction against the sale of Teva’s branded
drug, Hydromorphone HCl.

Dr. Reddy’s lawyers say the decision gives
the company a leading role in India’s drug market,
where growing numbers of consumers are look-
ing for cheaper medicines.

India’s $13 billion market for branded drugs
grew by about 30% last year, according to a study
by Credit Suisse First Boston.

But the decision could have more far-reaching
implications. It shows that Dr. Reddy’s and
other companies that make generics can challenge
innovator drug companies in court, capitaliz-
ing on India’s patent law reforms last year.

The victory is a blow to Teva, one of the
world’s largest generic drugmakers, which
was trying to block the sale of Dr. Reddy’s
generic version of the drug.

‘We are confident in our case and so are
dr. Reddy’s,’ said Teva’s lawyer, C. Jay Sesh
Ill, in New York. ‘We are determined to move
this case forward.’

The court case in India is just the latest
in a string of legal battles between innovator
drugmakers and generics makers.

In the United States, several generics makers
have won court cases against innovator drug-
makers, including Johnson & Johnson and the
Italian company Novartis.

The Indian court’s decision could make it
more difficult for innovator drugmakers to
block generics in other countries, said Inder-    
preet Kaur, chief executive of Dr. Reddy’s.

‘It’s an important step for the future of
generics in India and possibly worldwide,’
Kaur said.

Teva’s lawyers said they would appeal
the Indian court’s decision.

Teva said it had invested $220 million in
research and development to bring the drug
to market.

The drug, Hydromorphone HCl, is used
for pain management, and the generic version
is sold under the brand name Pantaril.
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U.S. Iraqis应该 Opposition Fighters in Iraq

Pledge to Target the Group

WASHINGTON—A move to permit U.S. military forces to launch attacks on Iraq’s opposition fighters is a landmark agreement with the group’s representatives, seeking to defuse the war.

The mission of the opposition forces is to undermine the legitimacy of the government and to prevent its collapse. The Iraqis were informed that the group would be supported by British and French forces in their efforts to achieve their goals.

Eliminating the Iraqis base of operation in Iran has been a priority for the United States, but the Iranians have been resistance to the proposed sanctions.

The document, obtained by The Wall Street Journal, outlines a protocol for cooperation between the two countries. The United States would provide intelligence and logistical support to the Iraqis, while the Iranians would seize the opportunity to reduce the threat.

The Iraqi opposition groups are composed of former members of the Barzani family, who have been fighting against the government for decades. The groups have been supported by various Western countries, including the United States.

The U.S. has designated the Barzani as a terrorist organization, which is an exception to the protocol.

The Iraqis said they would use the support to launch hit-and-run operations along the border with Iran, but they are also concerned about the possibility of a military operation.

A spokesman for the Barzani group, a leader of the movement, said, “We are ready to fight, but we need the support of the United States.”

The U.S. has been seeking to reduce its dependence on the Barzani group, which has been accused of links to al-Qaeda and other extremist groups.

The Barzani group is believed to have around 2,000 fighters, but it is unclear how many are active in the border region.

The U.S. has been providing weapons and training to the Barzani group, but it has been reluctant to commit its own forces to the battle.

The Iraqis have been requesting increased support, but the U.S. has been cautious.

The Barzani group has been fighting against the Iranian government for decades, but the Iranian government has been successful in reducing its influence.

The U.S. has been struggling to find a diplomatic solution to the conflict in Iraq, but the Barzani group has been a key ally in reducing the threat.

The U.S. has been providing assistance to the Barzani group for decades, but the Iranian government has been successful in reducing its influence.
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