

Nos. 23-235, 23-236

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

ALLIANCE FOR HIPPOCRATIC MEDICINE, ET AL.,
Cross-Petitioners,

v.

U.S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, ET AL.,
Cross-Respondents.

and

ALLIANCE FOR HIPPOCRATIC MEDICINE, ET AL.,
Cross-Petitioners,

v.

DANCO LABORATORIES, L.L.C.,
Cross-Respondent.

*On Petitions for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit*

**CONDITIONAL CROSS-PETITION FOR A
WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

JAMES A. CAMPBELL
CODY S. BARNETT
ALLIANCE DEFENDING
FREEDOM
44180 Riverside Pkwy
Lansdowne, VA 20176
(571) 707-4655

ERIN M. HAWLEY
Counsel of Record
JOHN J. BURSCH
MATTHEW S. BOWMAN
ERIK C. BAPTIST
ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM
440 First Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 393-8690
ehawley@adflegal.org

Counsel for Cross-Petitioners/Respondents

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

In 2000, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the drug mifepristone to cause abortions. Central to FDA’s controversial approval was its conclusion that in-person doctor visits and dispensing requirements, gestational limits, and adverse event reporting were crucial to protect women. Beginning in 2016, FDA stripped away those safety measures in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).

The Fifth Circuit rightly held that FDA acted unlawfully in removing those safety measures, and Cross-Petitioners—pro-life healthcare organizations and doctors harmed by FDA’s actions—oppose FDA’s and Danco Laboratories’ interlocutory petitions in Case Nos. 23-235 and 23-236. As set forth in the Brief in Opposition, the Court should deny those petitions.

But if the Court grants review, it should also grant this conditional cross-petition and review FDA’s approval of mifepristone. As Judge Ho explained in dissent, the “challenge to the 2000 approval is timely,” FDA.Pet.App.84a, and “the 2000 approval [is] unlawful,” FDA.Pet.App.89a. The questions presented in this conditional cross-petition are:

1. Whether Cross-Petitioners’ challenge to FDA’s 2000 mifepristone approval is timely.
2. Whether FDA’s 2000 approval of mifepristone under Subpart H, which applies only to drugs that “treat[] serious or life-threatening illnesses,” 21 C.F.R. 314.500, and FDA’s subsequent approval of generic mifepristone were unlawful.

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Cross-Petitioners were plaintiffs-appellees below. They are Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine; American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians & Gynecologists; American College of Pediatricians; Christian Medical & Dental Associations; Shaun Jester, D.O.; Regina Frost-Clark, M.D.; Tyler Johnson, D.O.; and George Delgado, M.D.

Cross-Respondents were defendants-appellants and an intervenor-appellant below. The defendants-appellants are the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA); Robert M. Califf, M.D., in his official capacity as FDA's Commissioner of Food and Drugs; Janet Woodcock, M.D., in her official capacity as Principal Deputy Commissioner of FDA; Patrizia Cavazzoni, M.D., in her official capacity as Director of FDA's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research; the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and Xavier Becerra, in his official capacity as Secretary of HHS. The intervenor-appellant is Danco Laboratories, L.L.C.

Pursuant to Rule 29.6, Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine, American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians & Gynecologists, American College of Pediatricians, and Christian Medical & Dental Associations have no parent corporations, and no publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of the stock of any of them.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Supreme Court of the United States (U.S.):

- *Danco Laboratories, LLC v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine, et al.*, No. 22A901 (Apr. 21, 2023) (granting application for stay)
- *U.S. Food & Drug Administration, et al. v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine, et al.*, No. 22A902 (Apr. 21, 2023) (granting application for stay)

United States Court of Appeals (5th Cir.):

- *Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine, et al. v. U.S. Food & Drug Administration, et al.*, No. 23-10362 (Aug. 16, 2023) (partially affirming and partially reversing district court order)
- *Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine, et al. v. U.S. Food & Drug Administration, et al.*, No. 23-10362 (Apr. 12, 2023) (partially granting and partially denying stay pending appeal)

United States District Court (N.D. Tex.):

- *Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine, et al. v. U.S. Food & Drug Administration, et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-223 (Apr. 7, 2023) (staying the challenged agency actions)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	ii
RELATED PROCEEDINGS	iii
APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vii
DECISIONS BELOW	1
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
PERTINENT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES	1
INTRODUCTION	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
A. FDA’s approval of mifepristone	4
B. FDA’s removal of critical safeguards	7
C. Proceedings below	9
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE CONDITIONAL WRIT	11
I. The Court should review the entire Fifth Circuit decision if it grants FDA’s or Danco’s petitions	11
A. FDA disregarded law, science, and safety in pursuit of a political end.	11
B. The questions presented in this cross- petition are part and parcel of those presented in FDA’s and Danco’s petitions....	15

II. The Fifth Circuit erred in rejecting the challenges to FDA’s approvals of chemical abortion drugs.....	16
A. FDA reopened its 2000 Approval when it overhauled the mifepristone regimen in 2016 and authorized mail-order abortion in 2021.....	16
1. FDA expressly reopened the 2000 Approval.	18
2. FDA constructively reopened the 2000 Approval.	21
B. FDA violated its own regulations and federal laws when it approved mifepristone in 2000.	24
1. FDA impermissibly invoked Subpart H by classifying pregnancy as an “illness.”	24
a. Pregnancy is not a serious or life-threatening illness.	25
b. Chemical abortion does not provide a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing options.	26
2. The 2000 Approval also violated the APA and FDCA.	28
C. Because FDA’s 2000 Approval and 2016 Major Changes were unlawful, FDA’s 2019 Generic Approval was also unlawful.	31
CONCLUSION.....	36

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

18 U.S.C. 1461.....	1a
18 U.S.C. 1462.....	3a
21 U.S.C. 355.....	5a
21 U.S.C. 355-1.....	117a
21 C.F.R. 10.30.....	147a
21 C.F.R. 10.45.....	156a
21 C.F.R. 312.300(a).....	162a
21 C.F.R. 314.50.....	163a
21 C.F.R. 314.94.....	194a
21 C.F.R. 314.105(c).....	214a
21 C.F.R. 314.151.....	215a
21 C.F.R. 314.430(b).....	218a
21 C.F.R. 314.500.....	219a
21 C.F.R. 314.520.....	219a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alaska v. United States Department of Agriculture,</i> 772 F.3d 899 (D.C. Cir. 2014).....	17
<i>Baltimore Contractors, Inc. v. Bodinger,</i> 348 U.S. 176 (1955).....	16
<i>Baltimore Gas & Electric Company v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.,</i> 462 U.S. 87 (1983).....	29
<i>City of Waukesha v. EPA,</i> 320 F.3d 228 (D.C. Cir. 2003).....	34
<i>Cuomo v. Clearing House Association,</i> 557 U.S. 519 (2009).....	26
<i>Department of Commerce v. New York,</i> 139 S. Ct. 2551 (2019).....	33
<i>Duke Power Company v. Carolina Environmental Study Group, Inc.,</i> 438 U.S. 59 (1978).....	34
<i>Environmental Defense v. EPA,</i> 467 F.3d 1329 (D.C. Cir. 2006).....	21, 23
<i>FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.,</i> 556 U.S. 502 (2009).....	21
<i>Fort Stewart Schools v. Federal Labor Relations Authority,</i> 495 U.S. 641 (1990).....	24

<i>Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Gaston Copper Recycling Corp.</i> , 204 F.3d 149 (4th Cir. 2000)	34
<i>Growth Energy v. EPA</i> , 5 F.4th 1 (D.C. Cir. 2021)	20
<i>Hammoud v. Equifax Information Services, LLC</i> , 52 F.4th 669 (6th Cir. 2022)	35
<i>Kennecott Utah Copper Corp. v. United States Department of Interior</i> , 88 F.3d 1191 (D.C. Cir. 1996).....	3, 17–18, 23
<i>Kisor v. Wilkie</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2400 (2019).....	26
<i>Lamie v. United States Trustee</i> , 540 U.S. 526 (2004).....	26
<i>Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of United States, Inc. v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company</i> , 463 U.S. 29 (1983).....	2, 29, 31
<i>National Biodiesel Board v. EPA</i> , 843 F.3d 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2016).....	17, 21
<i>National Family Farm Coalition v. EPA</i> , 966 F.3d 893 (9th Cir. 2020)	34
<i>National Mining Association v. United States Department of Interior</i> , 70 F.3d 1345 (D.C. Cir. 1995).....	19

<i>Natural Resources Defense Council v. EPA</i> , 571 F.3d 1245 (D.C. Cir. 2009).....	3, 15, 21
<i>Natural Resources Defense Council v. Watkins</i> , 954 F.2d 974 (4th Cir. 1992)	34
<i>Ohio v. EPA</i> , 838 F.2d 1325 (D.C. Cir. 1988).....	17, 21
<i>Public Citizen v. Nuclear Regulatory Commission</i> , 901 F.2d 147 (D.C. Cir. 1990).....	20–21
<i>Public Interest Research Group of New Jersey, Inc. v. Powell Duffryn Terminals Inc.</i> , 913 F.2d 64 (3d Cir. 1990)	33–34
<i>Sierra Club v. EPA</i> , 551 F.3d 1019 (D.C. Cir. 2008).....	3, 10, 17–18, 22–23
<i>Switzerland Cheese Association v. E. Horne’s Market, Inc.</i> , 385 U.S. 23 (1966).....	16
<i>Washington Alliance of Technology Workers v. DHS</i> , 892 F.3d 332 (D.C. Cir. 2018).....	21
<u>Statutes</u>	
18 U.S.C. 1461.....	vi, 8, 13
18 U.S.C. 1462.....	vi, 8, 13
21 U.S.C. 321.....	4

21 U.S.C. 355.....	vi, 4, 8, 13, 29–32
21 U.S.C. 355-1.....	vi, 7, 19–20
5 U.S.C. 706.....	29
Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-85, tit. IX § 909(b)(1), 121 Stat. 823.....	6–7, 18

Other Authorities

Allysia Finley, <i>DayQuil, Covid Vaccine Boosters and FDA Science</i> , Wall St. J. (Sept. 17, 2023, 2:44 P.M.).....	14
Andrew Kolodny, <i>How FDA Failures Contributed to the Opioid Crisis</i> , 22 AMA J. of Ethics 743 (2020)	14
Caroline Chen, <i>FDA Increasingly Approves Drugs Without Conclusive Proof They Work</i> , PBS News Hour (June 26, 2018, 2:31 P.M.)	14–15
Celine Castronuovo, <i>OxyContin Decision Involved FDA ‘Miscalculation,’ Woodcock Says</i> , Bloomberg Law (June 15, 2022, 11:31 A.M.).....	14
FDA Approval Mem. to Population Council (Sept. 28, 2000)	6

Irving M. Spitz, et al., <i>Early Pregnancy Termination with Mifepristone and Misoprostol in the United States</i> , New England J. of Med. (Apr. 30, 1998)	31
Population Council Letter to FDA (Sep. 6, 2000)	5
<i>Therapeutic</i> , Merriam Webster	27
<u>Regulations</u>	
21 C.F.R. 10.30	vi, 7, 13
21 C.F.R. 312.300	vi, 26
21 C.F.R. 314 subpt. H	5
21 C.F.R. 314.105	vi, 4
21 C.F.R. 314.151	vi, 32
21 C.F.R. 314.430	vi, 23
21 C.F.R. 314.50	vi, 4
21 C.F.R. 314.500	i, vi, 2, 5, 11–12, 25, 28
21 C.F.R. 314.520	vi, 12, 18, 24
21 C.F.R. 314.94	vi, 32
57 Fed. Reg. 58,942 (Dec. 11, 1992)	5

DECISIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals is reported at 78 F.4th 210 and reprinted at FDA.Pet.App.1a. The opinion and order of the district court is not reported but is available at 2023 WL 2825871 and reprinted at FDA.Pet.App.111a. This Court's order granting a stay is reported at 143 S. Ct. 1075 and reprinted at FDA.Pet.App.245a. The court of appeals order granting a stay in part is not reported but is available at 2023 WL 2913725 and reprinted at FDA.Pet.App.196a.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The court of appeals' interlocutory opinion was entered on August 16, 2023. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

PERTINENT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES

Pertinent statutory and regulatory provisions are reproduced in FDA's petition appendix, FDA.Pet.App.249a–54a, Danco's petition appendix, Danco.Pet.App.250a–51a, and the appendix to this cross-petition, Cross.Pet.App.1a–219a.

INTRODUCTION

As set forth in Cross-Petitioners' Brief in Opposition in Case Nos. 23-235 and 23-236, there is no compelling reason for this Court to grant interlocutory review of the Fifth Circuit's decision. That opinion merely reinstated safety standards that governed the use of mifepristone for 16 years. Applying straightforward administrative law principles, the unanimous court of appeals held that FDA failed to adequately explain its decisions to remove these safeguards. Far from "unprecedented," FDA.Pet.3, the Fifth Circuit applied the well-established principle that an agency violates the APA when it "fail[s] to consider an important aspect of the problem" before it. *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of U.S., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983).

Nor is this Court's immediate review necessary. Reinstating safety conditions under which millions of women have previously taken mifepristone will not make that drug inaccessible. Ensuring that women see a doctor before receiving dangerous drugs is good medicine and common practice—not cause for this Court to intervene mid-litigation. And Danco has had *months* to reproduce its pre-2016 labels to continue its ongoing sale of the abortion drug.

That said, if the Court grants interlocutory review now, it should also grant this cross-petition and review the Fifth Circuit's entire decision. FDA approved mifepristone in 2000 under Subpart H, which authorizes the agency to approve only drugs that "treat[] serious or life-threatening illnesses." 21 C.F.R. 314.500. But as Judge Ho explained in his dissent below, "pregnancy is plainly not an illness." FDA.Pet.App.92a (cleaned up).

This challenge to FDA’s 2000 Approval is timely under the reopening doctrine. *Nat. Res. Def. Council v. EPA*, 571 F.3d 1245, 1266 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (*NRDC*) (per curiam). That rule restarts the clock for an APA claim where an agency revises a prior action so that it “significantly alters the stakes of judicial review.” *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 551 F.3d 1019, 1025 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Kennecott Utah Copper Corp. v. U.S. Dep’t of Interior*, 88 F.3d 1191, 1227 (D.C. Cir. 1996)).

“That standard is easily met here,” as Judge Ho concluded. FDA.Pet.App.84a. “It seems obvious that the 2016 and 2021 revisions”—the subject of FDA’s and Danco’s petitions—“significantly altered the regulatory landscape.” *Ibid.* “Indeed, the FDA recently told [this] Court that setting aside those revisions would ‘upend the regulatory regime for mifepristone.’” *Ibid.* (quoting App. to Stay, 2023 WL 3127519, at *2–3, *FDA v. All. for Hippocratic Med.*, 143 S. Ct. 1075 (2023)). “If switching from the 2016/2021 regime to the 2000-era regime significantly alters the ‘basic regulatory scheme,’ *NRDC*, 571 F.3d at 1266, then surely the reverse does, too.” *Ibid.*

Simply put, the issues presented by Petitioners and those presented in this cross-petition should be considered together. If the Court believes review is warranted now, it should also grant this cross-petition.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. FDA's approval of mifepristone

Congress delegated to FDA the responsibility to make sure that “new drug[s]” are both “safe and effective.” 21 U.S.C. 321(p), 355. FDA’s approval determinations evaluate whether a new drug application (NDA) includes scientific evidence demonstrating that the drug is safe and effective for its intended uses. *Id.* 355(d); 21 C.F.R. 314.50, 314.105(c).

In 2000, FDA approved a chemical abortion regimen that requires two drugs: mifepristone—also known as “RU-486” and “Mifeprex”—and misoprostol. C.A.Add.90. Mifepristone is a synthetic steroid that blocks nutrition to the unborn baby. *Ibid.* Misoprostol induces contractions to expel the unborn child from the mother’s womb. C.A.Add.90–91. This approval was politically charged from the beginning.

During the early 1990s, the Clinton Administration asked Roussel Uclaf, the French firm that manufactured RU-486, to make its drug available in the U.S. C.A.Add.106. Roussel initially declined but continued to face intense pressure from the administration. *Ibid.* Political appointees, including the HHS secretary and the FDA commissioner, lobbied Roussel to donate its U.S. patent rights for mifepristone. C.A.Add.107.

Roussel ultimately agreed, donating those patent rights to the Population Council—a nonprofit that John Rockefeller III founded to address supposed world “overpopulation.” *Ibid.* The Clinton Administration then boasted about bringing mifepristone stateside. *Ibid.*

In 1996, the Population Council applied to FDA for mifepristone's approval but needed Danco—a Cayman Islands-based company with no other pharmaceutical product—to distribute the drugs in the U.S. market. C.A.Add.115. So the Population Council granted to Danco an exclusive license to manufacture, market, and distribute mifepristone in the U.S. *Ibid.* Six months later, FDA approved the drug under an accelerated approval process known as “Subpart H.” 21 C.F.R. 314 subpt. H.

Subpart H was primarily “designed to expedite investigational HIV medications during the AIDS epidemic.” FDA.Pet.App.113a–14a & n.3. It applies only to drugs that “treat[] serious or life-threatening illnesses.” 21 C.F.R. 314.500. FDA must “determine[] that [the] drug, effective [to] the treatment of a *disease*, can be used safely only if distribution or use is modified or restricted.” FDA.Pet.App.5a (quoting 57 Fed. Reg. 58,942, 58,942 (Dec. 11, 1992) (emphasis added)). Before 2000, FDA had approved fewer than 40 drugs under Subpart H—including 20 “for the treatment of HIV and HIV-related diseases,” nine “for the treatment of various cancers,” four “for severe bacterial infections,” one for hypertension, and one for leprosy. FDA.Pet.App.163a.

Recognizing mifepristone's dangers to women, FDA resorted to Subpart H because the drug “could not be administered safely without imposing certain use restrictions.” FDA.Pet.App.7a. But Subpart H was not a good fit. As the Population Council explained in 2000, “[n]either pregnancy nor unwanted pregnancy is an illness, and subpart H is therefore inapplicable for that reason alone.” FDA.Pet.App.77a (quoting Population Council Ltr. to FDA at 1–2 (Sep. 6, 2000)).

Ignoring that warning, FDA charged ahead, declaring that mifepristone treated a “serious or life-threatening illness.” FDA.Pet.App.91a (citing FDA Approval Mem. to Population Council at 6 (Sept. 28, 2000)). The agency did this even though pregnancy is a “natural process” that many women experience. FDA.Pet.App.161a.

To mitigate mifepristone’s acknowledged risks, FDA’s 2000 Approval included numerous safety requirements, such as a seven-week gestational limit, confining prescribing authority to physicians, and mandating three in-person office visits: (1) the Day 1 in-person administration of mifepristone; (2) the Day 3 in-person administration of misoprostol; and (3) the Day 14 office visit to confirm no fetal parts or tissue remain in the uterus. C.A.Add.591–98. FDA also required abortion providers to report all adverse events. C.A.Add.596.

Cross-Petitioners American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians & Gynecologists (AAPLOG) and Christian Medical & Dental Associations (CMDA) timely filed a citizen petition with FDA challenging that approval (2002 Citizen Petition). C.A.Add.353–448.

While that petition was pending before FDA, Congress amended the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA) by codifying Subpart H through the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act (FDAAA). Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-85, tit. IX § 909(b)(1), 121 Stat. 823, 950. These changes require FDA to obtain a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy (REMS) whenever the agency determines that a REMS is “necessary to assure safe use of the drug, because of its inherent

toxicity or potential harmfulness” and its association “with a serious adverse drug experience.” 21 U.S.C. 355-1(f)(1).

The FDAAA further specified that a previously approved drug is “deemed to have in effect an approved [REMS] ... if there are in effect on the effective date of this Act elements to assure safe use [pursuant to Subpart H].” §909(b)(1), 121 Stat. at 950. This stop-gap measure said nothing about any specific drug approval or post-marketing restrictions. The FDAAA required drug sponsors to submit proposed REMS to FDA. *Ibid.* Danco’s supplemental new drug application implementing the REMS was approved in 2011. C.A.Add.672.

Though FDA had “180 days” to respond to the 2002 Citizen Petition, 21 C.F.R. 10.30(e)(2), approximately 14 *years* elapsed before FDA rejected it in 2016 (2016 Petition Denial). C.A.Add.123.

B. FDA’s removal of critical safeguards

The same day FDA denied the 2002 Citizen Petition in 2016, the agency approved “major changes” to the regimen that eviscerated many crucial safeguards (2016 Major Changes). FDA.Pet.App.10a, 200a. Among other things, the agency (1) eliminated the requirement for an in-person follow-up examination, (2) allowed non-doctors to prescribe and administer the drug, (3) increased the maximum gestational age from seven to ten weeks, (4) removed the in-person administration requirement for misoprostol, and (5) eliminated non-fatal adverse event reporting. C.A.Add.697–725.

In 2019, Cross-Petitioners AAPLOG and American College of Pediatricians (ACPeds) timely

filed a citizen petition challenging the 2016 Major Changes (2019 Citizen Petition). C.A.Add.740–66.

One month later, FDA approved GenBioPro, Inc.’s abbreviated new drug application (ANDA) for a generic version of mifepristone (2019 Generic Approval). C.A.Add.767–73. Relying on the safety data for Danco’s name-brand version, FDA determined the generic version “to be bioequivalent and, therefore, therapeutically equivalent” to Danco’s version. C.A.Add.768; see 21 U.S.C. 355(j)(2) (requiring generic version to have the same active ingredients, route of administration, dosage form, strength, bioequivalence, and labeling as the brand version).

In April 2021, FDA stated that it would “exercise enforcement discretion” and allow “dispensing of mifepristone through the mail ... or through a mail-order pharmacy” during the COVID pandemic (2021 Non-Enforcement Decision). FDA.Pet.App.11a. FDA took this action even though the Comstock Act expressly prohibits distribution of chemical abortion drugs by mail, express company, or common carrier. 18 U.S.C. 1461–62.

Then, in December 2021—nearly three years after the filing of the 2019 Citizen Petition—FDA denied almost all of that petition (2021 Petition Denial). C.A.Add.141–42. FDA simultaneously announced that the agency had decided it would permanently allow chemical abortion by mail—requiring only that the sponsors of mifepristone submit updated REMS. C.A.Add.140–41. This effectively federalized abortion by allowing abortion drugs to be mailed into states where the citizens have determined to prohibit such drugs.

C. Proceedings below

In November 2022, Cross-Petitioners filed this lawsuit alleging that the 2000 Approval, 2016 Petition Denial, 2016 Major Changes, 2019 Generic Approval, 2021 Non-Enforcement Decision, and 2021 Petition Denial all violated the APA. Danco intervened. C.A.Add.74–186.

Cross-Petitioners filed a motion for a preliminary injunction that the district court granted in part. FDA.Pet.App.111a. Rather than issue an injunction, the court used its power under 5 U.S.C. 705 to stay the effective date for each of FDA’s challenged actions. FDA.Pet.App.193a–95a. The district court noted that it would have imposed a preliminary injunction in the alternative. FDA.Pet.App.195a.

FDA and Danco appealed and moved to stay the district court’s order pending appeal. A Fifth Circuit motions panel stayed the district court’s ruling as it applied to the 2000 Approval but did not disturb the rest of the order. FDA.Pet.App.196a. After FDA and Danco appealed, this Court stayed the order through the ruling on any petition for certiorari. FDA.Pet.App.245a.

After full briefing and argument, the Fifth Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part the district court’s stay. FDA.Pet.App.3a. Exercising well-established principles of judicial review over agency actions, the court of appeals held that the 2016 Major Changes, the 2021 Non-Enforcement Decision, and 2021 Petition Denial violated the APA. FDA.Pet.App.51a–56a, 56a–63a. The court explained that, contrary to congressional command, FDA did not adequately explain its 2016 and 2021 decisions.

Ibid. FDA’s and Danco’s petitions for certiorari challenge that portion of the ruling.

In contrast, the court of appeals reversed the district court’s ruling on the 2000 Approval—the subject of this cross-petition. FDA.Pet.App.46a–51a. It held that Cross-Petitioners’ challenge to the 2000 Approval was not timely filed. *Ibid.*

Judge Ho dissented. He concluded that Cross-Petitioners timely challenged the 2000 Approval and that FDA acted unlawfully when it approved mifepristone under Subpart H. FDA.Pet.App.84a, 89a–90a.

Judge Ho observed that the reopening doctrine restarts the timeline for challenging agency actions in two instances: “(1) if the agency opened the issue up anew, and then reexamined and reaffirmed its prior decision, or (2) if the revision of accompanying regulations significantly alters the stakes of judicial review as the result of a change that could not have been reasonably anticipated.” FDA.Pet.App.85a (cleaned up). He then concluded that the second type of reopening—“constructive reopening”—applies here. FDA.Pet.App.85a. As he put it, “the FDA initially authorized mifepristone under certain safeguards to minimize harm. Remove these safeguards, and you’ve significantly altered the stakes of judicial review. The original scheme is now much more ‘worth challenging.’” FDA.Pet.App.86a. (quoting *Sierra Club*, 551 F.3d at 1026).

Turning to the merits of the 2000 Approval, Judge Ho found it unlawful. FDA.Pet.App.89a. “It’s a long-standing principle that agencies must follow their own regulations.” *Ibid.* (cleaned up). And the “FDA violated that principle when it approved mifepristone

under Subpart H—as even the drug’s sponsor, the Population Council, admitted in 2000.” FDA.Pet.App. 90a. That’s because “[p]regnancy is not an illness” and “Subpart H authorizes the FDA to approve only those drugs that treat ‘serious or life-threatening illnesses.” *Ibid.* (quoting 21 C.F.R. 314.500).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE CONDITIONAL WRIT

I. The Court should review the entire Fifth Circuit decision if it grants FDA’s or Danco’s petitions.

A. FDA disregarded law, science, and safety in pursuit of a political end.

FDA’s actions concerning mifepristone—spanning from the 2000 Approval to its most recent removal of safeguards—have consistently elevated politics above law, science, and safety. If this Court grants FDA’s and Danco’s interlocutory petitions, it should grant this cross-petition, review the Fifth Circuit’s entire decision, and assess the full range of FDA’s misdeeds. FDA’s early actions in approving mifepristone are inextricably intertwined with its more recent decisions to remove critical safeguards surrounding its use. To review one without the other is like reading a novel starting in the middle.

From the beginning, political actors have orchestrated mifepristone’s approval and deregulation. In 1993 and 1994, the Clinton Administration negotiated for the Population Council—a nonprofit that John Rockefeller III founded to address supposed world “overpopulation”—to obtain the U.S. patent rights to mifepristone from its French manufacturer. C.A.Add.106–07.

Subpart H is tailored to dangerous drugs that “can be safely used only if distribution or use is restricted.” 21 C.F.R. 314.520(a). Given the dangers of mifepristone, Subpart H was the *only* regulatory pathway for FDA to approve mifepristone. C.A.Add.587, 605–06. But Subpart H applies only to drugs that “treat[] serious or life-threatening illnesses.” 21 C.F.R. 314.500. Despite the Population Council warning FDA that the agency lacked authority to approve mifepristone under Subpart H, FDA did so anyway, violating its own regulations. C.A.Add.600.

Worse yet, FDA greenlit mifepristone despite the agency’s reservations about the drug’s safety. FDA.Pet.App.181a. In February 2000, FDA determined that it lacked “adequate information” to demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of mifepristone. C.A.Add.108. And in June 2000, FDA told Danco that prescribing physicians would be required to assess gestational age via ultrasound and that other requirements would be necessary to treat post-abortion complications. C.A.Add.405. But when that information was leaked to the public, FDA faced significant political backlash from Capitol Hill and pro-abortion groups. C.A.Add.406–407. Caving to this pressure, FDA approved mifepristone only three months later without *any* ultrasound requirement or *any* of its recommended safeguards against post-abortion complications. C.A.Add.406–08. As the district court concluded here, “FDA acquiesced on its legitimate safety concerns—in violation of its statutory duty.” FDA.Pet.App.182a.

As if that wasn’t enough, FDA’s 2000 Approval relied on one U.S. trial and two French studies that all included safeguards *not* incorporated into the

approved labeling. C.A.Add.591. FDA failed to offer any evidence, testing, or information—each required by the law governing new drug approvals, 21 U.S.C. 355(d)—to show the safety and effectiveness of mifepristone without these safeguards. This violated the APA’s most basic tenets. 21 U.S.C. 355(d); C.A.Add.4356, 4362.

And the political gamesmanship did not stop with that approval. Following the filing of the 2002 Citizen Petition challenging the 2000 Approval, FDA took *14 years*—until 2016—to reject it, simultaneously issuing “major changes” to the regimen that eviscerated crucial safeguards for women and girls. C.A.Add.634–67, 688–96. FDA’s own regulations require tentative or final responses to citizen petitions within 180 days. 21 C.F.R. 10.30(e)(2). By delaying, FDA was able to forestall a lawsuit until it was ready to implement its major changes, forcing Cross-Petitioners to play a game of whack-a-mole.

Then, on April 12, 2021, in the early days of the Biden Administration, FDA stated that it would “exercise enforcement discretion” and allow “dispensing of mifepristone through the mail ... or through a mail-order pharmacy” during the COVID pandemic. C.A.Add.788. FDA did so even though the Comstock Act expressly bans the sending of abortion drugs by mail, express company, or common carrier. 18 U.S.C. 1461–62 (prohibiting the mailing or delivery of “[e]very article or thing designed, adapted, or intended for producing abortion.”). In rejecting the 2019 Citizen Petition in December 2021, FDA announced that it would permanently allow abortion by mail, C.A.Add.808, an ongoing violation of federal law.

It is these unlawful and arbitrary actions that FDA deems its “scientific judgment,” FDA.Pet.30, expressing indignation that a federal court of appeals would dare question that judgment in a legal proceeding. But as Judge Ho explained, it is hardly “unprecedented” for FDA’s judgment to be wrong. FDA.Pet.App.104a–09a.

Consider the opioid crisis. This epidemic comes in part because FDA “failed to adequately predict the harms associated with” opioids. Celine Castronuovo, *OxyContin Decision Involved FDA ‘Miscalculation,’ Woodcock Says*, Bloomberg Law (June 15, 2022, 2:31 P.M.), <https://perma.cc/WJY3-7LVE>. Even today, ignoring criticism from the National Academy of Sciences, senators, and former commissioners, FDA has not changed its opioid policies but instead has “adopted a defensive posture and sought to shift blame.” Andrew Kolodny, *How FDA Failures Contributed to the Opioid Crisis*, 22 AMA J. of Ethics 743, 747 (2020); accord Allysia Finley, *DayQuil, Covid Vaccine Boosters and FDA Science*, Wall St. J. (Sept. 17, 2023, 2:44 P.M.), <https://perma.cc/QNU6-2VLN>.

FDA’s accelerated approvals are also emblematic of the agency’s penchant to subordinate patient safety to politics. Starting in 1992, advocacy groups started “contribut[ing] to the salaries of the agency’s drug reviewers in exchange for time limits on reviews.” Caroline Chen, *FDA Increasingly Approves Drugs Without Conclusive Proof They Work*, PBS News Hour (June 26, 2018, 11:31 A.M.), <https://perma.cc/3V3X-AK3V>. This, despite FDA’s own admission that “accelerated approval has greater uncertainty.” *Ibid.* As a result, “[t]he FDA is increasingly green-lighting expensive drugs despite dangerous or little-known side effects and inconclusive evidence that they curb

or cure disease.” *Ibid.* The lower courts’ opinions recognize that’s what FDA did here, too.

B. The questions presented in this cross-petition are part and parcel of those presented in FDA’s and Danco’s petitions.

FDA’s and Danco’s petitions ask the Court to examine the 2016 Major Changes, 2021 Non-Enforcement Decision, and 2021 Petition Denial. But the Court will have an incomplete view of those issues unless it also considers the FDA’s approval of mifepristone. Indeed, FDA’s decisions to remove safety restrictions that the agency found indispensable in granting mifepristone’s approval are central to issues raised in this cross petition.

A clear overlap exists between FDA’s defense of its decisions to eliminate mifepristone’s safety measures and Cross-Petitioners’ arguments that their challenge to the 2000 Approval is timely. If FDA’s actions to remove those safety requirements in 2016 and 2021 changed “the basic regulatory scheme,” *NRDC*, 571 F.3d at 1266, the Fifth Circuit was wrong to reject Cross-Petitioners’ reopening argument. Yet FDA previously “told [this] Court that setting aside those revisions would ‘upend the regulatory regime for mifepristone’ and ‘unleash[] regulatory chaos.’” FDA.Pet.App.84a (Ho, J., concurring and dissenting in part (quoting App. to Stay, 2023 WL 3127519, at *2–3, *FDA v. All. for Hippocratic Med.*, 143 S. Ct. 1075 (2023))). Meanwhile, FDA insists that the reopening doctrine does not apply because the 2016 and 2021 changes did not alter the basic regulatory scheme. C.A.Add.2114. FDA can’t have it both ways. Accordingly, it would not only be inefficient but unjust to Cross-Petitioners if

the Court were to review FDA's arguments without also considering those arguments' impact on Cross-Petitioners' challenge to the 2000 Approval.

Unlike some state courts, "federal law expresses the policy against piecemeal appeals." *Switzerland Cheese Ass'n v. E. Horne's Market, Inc.*, 385 U.S. 23, 24 (1966) (citing *Baltimore Contractors, Inc. v. Bodinger*, 348 U.S. 176 (1955)). And this case shows why that is so. It makes no sense that this Court would grant the petitions and resolve only part of the case, especially where the 2000 Approval involves interrelated questions and provides the background for the 2016 Major Changes, the 2021 Non-Enforcement Decision, and 2021 Petition Denial. Thus, if the Court believes interlocutory review is warranted, it should consider all those issues at once.

II. The Fifth Circuit erred in rejecting the challenges to FDA's approvals of chemical abortion drugs.

A. FDA reopened its 2000 Approval when it overhauled the mifepristone regimen in 2016 and authorized mail-order abortion in 2021.

Cross-Petitioners' challenge to FDA's 2000 Approval is timely. The Fifth Circuit erred in concluding otherwise. The reopening doctrine "allows an otherwise untimely challenge to proceed where an agency has—either explicitly or implicitly—undertaken to reexamine its former choice." *Nat'l Biodiesel Bd. v. EPA*, 843 F.3d 1010, 1017 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (cleaned up); cf. *Alaska v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 772 F.3d 899, 900 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (Kavanaugh, J.) ("[R]eopening ... giv[es] rise to a new right of action

even though the regulation challenged is no different.”) (cleaned up). As Judge Sentelle explained, “without weakening [the] general and appropriate rule” that a jurisdictional statute of limitations “may not be enlarged or altered by the courts,” the “period for seeking judicial review may be made to run anew when the agency in question by some new promulgation” reopens an agency action. *Ohio v. EPA*, 838 F.2d 1325, 1328 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

Express reopening occurs where an agency “reexamine[s] its former choice.” *Nat’l Biodiesel Bd.*, 843 F.3d at 1017 (cleaned up). Constructive reopening exists where the agency alters the “basic regulatory scheme” by, among other things, removing necessary safeguards. *Ibid.* Both express and constructive reopening occurred here because FDA re-examined its approval of mifepristone and altered the basic regulatory scheme by removing safeguards it previously found indispensable to the drug’s safe use.

The reopening doctrine is a necessary backstop to agency gamesmanship. As the D.C. Circuit recognizes, the doctrine prevents an agency from evading review by “creat[ing] a different regulatory construct.” *Sierra Club*, 551 F.3d at 1025. Reopening applies when “the revision of [] underlying regulations significantly alters the stakes of judicial review” because the underlying regulations “may not have been worth challenging” initially, but the subsequent “[r]egulations gave them new significance.” *Kennecott*, 88 F.3d at 1226–27. In other words, reopening arises from the regulatory bait-and-switch that occurs when an agency fundamentally alters the “package deal that [it] devised and sold to the public as adequate protection.” *Sierra Club*, 551 F.3d at 1026. Just as “new and potentially more onerous”

regulations can change the stakes for judicial review, *Kennecott*, 88 F.3d at 1227, so can a new and more dangerous drug regimen.

The application of the reopening doctrine here takes on greater importance in light of the Court's grant of certiorari in *Corner Post, Inc. v. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System*, No. 22-1008. Federal agencies should not be able to avoid judicial review by pulling a regulatory bait-and-switch. But whether they can also avoid accountability when their actions injure parties who could not have filed a challenge within the six-year limitations period impacts this case, too. At least one Cross-Petitioner was first harmed by mifepristone just last year. C.A.Add.959. This Cross-Petitioner could not have sued until now.

1. FDA expressly reopened the 2000 Approval.

Under Subpart H, FDA approved mifepristone contingent on certain safeguards. Indeed, the 2000 Approval relied on Subpart H because it was the only way FDA could require post-marketing restrictions "needed to assure safe use" of mifepristone. 21 C.F.R. 314.520(a).

The 2007 FDAAA then codified Subpart H's post-marketing restrictions, renaming them REMS. §909(b)(1), 121 Stat. at 950. In a section entitled "initial approval," the FDAAA (like Subpart H) requires FDA to impose a REMS when it "determines that a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy *is necessary to ensure* that the benefits of the drug outweigh the risks of the drug." 21 U.S.C. 355-1(a)(1) (emphasis added). Echoing Subpart H, REMS that

contain “elements [] necessary to assure safe use” “[p]rovid[e] safe access for patients to drugs with known serious risks *that would otherwise be unavailable.*” *Id.* 355-1(f) (emphasis added). Because FDA found mifepristone to be “associated with a serious adverse drug experience,” the agency concluded that mifepristone could “be approved only if, or would be withdrawn unless, such elements are required” as part of a REMS. See *id.* 355-1(f)(1)(A).

The 2000 Approval’s safeguards—initially under Subpart H and subsequently pursuant to a REMS—were necessary to allow mifepristone into the market. Without these safeguards, FDA would not have issued its 2000 Approval. Neither FDA nor Danco has ever disputed this. But the 2016 Major Changes and the 2021 Petition Denial removed the very safeguards indispensable to the 2000 Approval. In fact, FDA issued the 2016 Major Changes in response to Danco’s request to reopen, reconsider, and remove crucial elements assuring safe use required for the 2000 Approval. C.A.Add.700–01. This literal reopening was “a serious, substantive reconsideration” of the 2000 Approval. *Nat’l Mining Ass’n v. U.S. Dep’t of Interior*, 70 F.3d 1345, 1352 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

Simply put, FDA’s 2016 and 2021 actions necessarily reconsidered and revised the 2000 Approval by re-evaluating and changing the safeguards essential to that original approval. Those express re-examinations reopened that initial decision and restarted the clock to challenge it.

Two members of the panel below believed that FDA had taken the 2000 Approval “as a given, and considered only whether the REMS amendments were safe.” FDA.Pet.App.47a. But this view overlooks

that the removed safety requirements *were preconditions to FDA’s approval of chemical abortion*. Erasing them necessarily reopened the question whether mifepristone was safe without them—the very question FDA considered in 2000.

The context of the 2016 Major Changes confirms that FDA reopened its 2000 Approval. *Pub. Citizen v. Nuclear Regul. Comm’n*, 901 F.2d 147, 150 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (reviewing court “must look to the entire context ... to determine whether an issue was in fact reopened”). FDA denied the 2002 Citizen Petition’s request for reconsideration of the 2000 Approval—a petition it had “carefully considered” for 14 years—*on the same day* it issued the 2016 Major Changes. C.A.Add.635. Those same-day decisions reinforce that the 2016 Major Changes reconsidered the 2000 Approval. See *Growth Energy v. EPA*, 5 F.4th 1, 21 (D.C. Cir. 2021).

The context of the 2021 Petition Denial is also probative. There, FDA explicitly stated that it “undertook a *full review* of the Mifepristone REMS Program.” C.A.Add.808 (emphasis added). A “full review” of a REMS for a drug that requires safeguards to obtain and retain approval necessarily reconsiders whether the initial approval was inappropriate and thus the drug should “otherwise be unavailable.” 21 U.S.C. 355-1(f).

In these unique circumstances, reopening simply reflects the commonsense proposition that the entirety of a final agency action is reviewable under the APA. The 2016 and 2021 removal of safeguards that FDA determined to be essential for mifepristone’s initial approval necessarily considered whether mifepristone meets the statutory

requirements for approval without those safeguards. Just as “an official interpretation of a regulation may trigger a reopening,” *Env’t Def. v. EPA*, 467 F.3d 1329, 1334 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (citing *Pub. Citizen*, 901 F.2d at 151), so too does FDA’s removal of statutorily required preconditions to approval. See *FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.*, 556 U.S. 502, 515–16 (2009) (agencies must provide courts with “a reasoned explanation ... for disregarding facts and circumstances that underlay or were engendered by [a] prior policy”); *Wash. All. of Tech. Workers v. DHS*, 892 F.3d 332, 345–46 (D.C. Cir. 2018); *Ohio*, 838 F.2d at 1328 (applying reopening doctrine and allowing challenge to entire regulatory regime to proceed).

2. FDA constructively reopened the 2000 Approval.

The 2016 Major Changes, 2021 Non-Enforcement Decision, and 2021 Petition Denial also constructively reopened the 2000 Approval. Removing in-person doctor visits and dispensing requirements and expanding the gestational age of the unborn infants enacted a “sea change” in the chemical abortion regimen, *NRDC*, 571 F.3d at 1266, dramatically altering the “basic regulatory scheme” by removing necessary safeguards, *Nat’l Biodiesel Bd.*, 843 F.3d at 1017.

FDA effectively admits this. It says that reinstating mifepristone’s pre-2016 safeguards would be “destabilizing,” FDA.Pet.29, “upend[ing] the regulatory regime for mifepristone” and “unleashing regulatory chaos,” FDA.Stay.App.2–3. FDA also asserts that “the substantially more restrictive pre-2016 conditions of use” differ from the post-2016 conditions so much that to return to them would “unnecessarily

impair or even eliminate access to mifepristone.” FDA.Pet.28. As Judge Ho explained below, “[i]f switching from the 2016/2021 regime to the 2000-era regime significantly alters the basic regulatory scheme, then surely the reverse does, too.” FDA.Pet.App.84a (cleaned up). Constructive reopening thus applies here.

This case is on all fours with *Sierra Club*. There, EPA adopted a 1994 rule that exempted major sources from the Clean Air Act’s emission standards during startups, shutdowns, and malfunctions (the SSM exemption). *Sierra Club*, 551 F.3d at 1022. The rule required these sources to develop a publicly available SSM plan detailing efforts “to maintain compliance with the standards, even during SSMs.” *Ibid.* (cleaned up). In a series of rulemakings, EPA: (1) stopped making plans publicly available; (2) removed the requirement that a permit incorporate the SSM plan; and (3) took away the requirement that major sources implement the SSM plans during SSM periods. *Id.* at 1023.

The Sierra Club filed suit in 2007, challenging the legality of the 1994 SSM exemption. *Id.* at 1024. The D.C. Circuit correctly held the challenge timely. The Court recognized that EPA had constructively reopened that decision “by stripping out virtually all of the SSM plan requirements that it created to contain that exemption.” *Id.* at 1025 (quotation omitted). By abandoning “necessary safeguards,” EPA had “changed the calculus for petitioners in seeking judicial review and thereby constructively reopened consideration of the [initial] exemption.” *Id.* at 1025–26 (cleaned up).

So too here. By stripping out virtually all the restrictions accompanying the 2000 Approval, and by abandoning necessary safeguards, FDA constructively reopened the 2000 Approval. In fact, every panel member below acknowledged that the 2016 and 2021 changes “meaningfully altered” the drug regimen. FDA.Pet.App.47a.

Despite this, two judges below believed the reopening doctrine did not apply because the 2016 and 2021 changes could “have been reasonably anticipated.” FDA.Pet.App.48a (quoting *Env’t Def.*, 467 F.3d at 1334). Not so. Danco’s supplemental petition requesting that nine safeguards be removed was confidential. 21 C.F.R. 314.430(b) (stating that “FDA will not publicly disclose the existence of an application or abbreviated application before an approval letter is sent to the applicant”). Nor did FDA disclose before December 2021 its self-initiated decision to permanently remove the in-person dispensing requirement. It is simply untrue that Cross-Petitioners “had adequate notice of a forthcoming change that might alter their incentive to seek judicial review.” *Kennecott*, 88 F.3d at 1214.

Further, the in-person dispensing requirement served as “the cornerstone” for pre-2021 REMS, alleviating “concerns about provider qualifications, improper use, illicit distribution, and the detection of adverse events.” FDA.Pet.App.229a. Eliminating that cornerstone requirement worked a sea change in the basic regulatory structure. Cross-Petitioners could not reasonably anticipate the removal of safeguards that FDA had said were necessary preconditions to mifepristone’s approval.

B. FDA violated its own regulations and federal laws when it approved mifepristone in 2000.

Once it is clear that Cross-Petitioners timely filed their challenge to the 2000 Approval, the merits analysis of that claim is straightforward. The 2000 Approval violated the APA because it conflicted with FDA's own regulations and federal law.

1. FDA impermissibly invoked Subpart H by classifying pregnancy as an "illness."

"It is a familiar rule of administrative law that an agency must abide by its own regulations." *Fort Stewart Schs. v. Fed. Labor Rels. Auth.*, 495 U.S. 641, 654 (1990) (citations omitted). FDA violated this rule when it used Subpart H to approve mifepristone in 2000.

Subpart H was the *only* source of authority that would have allowed FDA to approve chemical abortion drugs in 2000. C.A.Add.596. FDA determined that chemical abortion drugs could not be safely approved without post-marketing restrictions. C.A.Add.111. Restrictions were "needed to assure safe use of this product." C.A.Add.587. And Subpart H was the only approval mechanism that provided for such restrictions. 21 C.F.R. 314.520(a).

Yet Subpart H was never a good fit for mifepristone. That provision provides for the accelerated approval of certain high-need drugs. It applies to new drugs "that have been studied for their safety and effectiveness in treating *serious or life-threatening illnesses* and that provide *meaningful therapeutic benefit* to patients over existing treatments (e.g., the

ability to treat patients unresponsive to, or intolerant of, available therapy, or improved patient response over available therapy.” 21 C.F.R 314.500 (emphasis added). Like a square peg in the proverbial round hole, chemical abortion meets none of Subpart H’s requirements. Pregnancy is not an illness, much less a serious or life-threatening one. Nor does chemical abortion provide a therapeutic benefit over existing treatments. Indeed, FDA put forward no evidence on the administrative record produced to date that it found any such benefit.

a. Pregnancy is not a serious or life-threatening illness.

FDA has repeatedly conceded that pregnancy is not an illness. C.A.Add.638, 4217. Defined as when a woman is “with child,” FDA.Pet.App.90a (Ho, J., concurring and dissenting), pregnancy is a normal physiological state that many females experience one or more times during their lifetimes, C.A.Add.88. An “illness,” by contrast, is “a disease, ailment, sickness, [or] malady.” FDA.Pet.App.90a (Ho, J., concurring and dissenting) (quoting Oxford English Dictionary (2nd ed. 1989)) (cleaned up). The only “‘reasonable construction’ of the word ‘illness’ ... doesn’t include pregnancy.” FDA.Pet.App.91a (cleaned up).

Even mifepristone’s champion—the Population Council—agreed with this analysis. Just three weeks before the 2000 Approval, the Population Council wrote to FDA stating that “[n]either pregnancy nor unwanted pregnancy is an illness, and Subpart H is therefore inapplicable for that reason alone.” C.A.Add.109. Well said.

Seeking to avoid that obvious conclusion, FDA invokes the preamble to the final rule for Subpart H. The agency says that the preamble somehow expands the text of Subpart H to encompass “serious or life-threatening *conditions*, as well as ... illnesses or diseases.” C.A.Add.638 (emphasis added). But preamble language that contradicts the operative regulatory text is entitled to no weight. See *Cuomo v. Clearing House Ass’n*, 557 U.S. 519, 533 (2009) (invalidating an agency’s interpretation of a regulation inconsistent with the regulation’s text and the statute).

FDA’s expansive interpretation of Subpart H is unreasonable. If FDA wanted to include “conditions” in Subpart H, the agency knew how to draft such language. *E.g.*, 21 C.F.R. 312.300(a) (including “disease or condition” within the scope of FDA’s “Subpart I” regulations for certain investigational drugs). To read “condition” into Subpart H would violate the well-established omitted-case canon of construction. See *Lamie v. U.S. Tr.*, 540 U.S. 526, 538 (2004) (refusing to “read an absent word into the statute”). Because FDA’s interpretation defies the plain text of Subpart H, it is entitled to no deference. See *Kisor v. Wilkie*, 139 S. Ct. 2400, 2415 (2019) (“If uncertainty does not exist, there is no plausible reason for deference.”).

b. Chemical abortion does not provide a meaningful therapeutic benefit over existing options.

FDA’s 2000 Approval violates Subpart H twice-over because chemical abortion drugs do not provide a “meaningful therapeutic benefit” over existing options, including surgical abortion. FDA’s politically

motivated approval of chemical abortion glossed over two glaring flaws: (1) chemical abortion is not “therapeutic”; and (2) chemical abortion does not provide a meaningful benefit over surgical abortion. C.A.Add.377.

1. Mifepristone is not “therapeutic” for at least three reasons. *First*, the term “therapeutic” relates to the treatment or curing of a disease or disorder. *Therapeutic*, Merriam Webster, <https://perma.cc/6KL5-NFKP>. But as explained above, pregnancy is not an illness requiring therapeutic treatment. *Second*, FDA approved these drugs for use in healthy pregnant women who lack a serious or life-threatening illness to treat. C.A.Add.373. *Third*, these drugs *do not treat* pregnancy-related complications, such as life-threatening ectopic pregnancies. C.A.Add.413. In fact, “if a woman who has an ectopic pregnancy undergoes a [chemical] abortion, she is at risk for tubal rupture and subsequent hemorrhage due to delay in diagnosis and delay in treatment.” *Ibid*. That’s because the symptoms of an ectopic pregnancy—vaginal bleeding, pelvic pain, and cramping—are confusingly similar to certain side effects of chemical abortion drugs. *Ibid*. FDA acknowledges this danger. C.A.Add.2366 (warning that “some of the expected symptoms experienced with a medical abortion (abdominal pain, uterine bleeding) may be similar to those of a ruptured ectopic pregnancy”).

2. Chemical abortion does not provide a “meaningful” benefit over existing options. These drugs are not an alternative “therapy” for patients “unresponsive to, or intolerant of,” surgical abortion—indeed, surgical intervention is often required after an

incomplete or failed chemical abortion. See 21 C.F.R. 314.500. Nor do these drugs provide an “improved patient response” over surgical abortions. See *ibid.* In fact, chemical abortion drugs pose a higher risk of serious and life-threatening adverse effects on women and girls. For example, “[c]hemical abortions are over fifty percent (50%) more likely than surgical abortions to result in an emergency department visit within thirty days.” C.A.Add.92 (citation omitted). And “[t]he number of chemical abortion-related emergency room visits increased by over five hundred percent (500%) between 2002 and 2015. *Ibid.* (citation omitted). Tellingly, FDA’s cited clinical trials did not compare chemical abortion with surgical abortion to assess whether a benefit existed. C.A.Add.377.

FDA offered only one “meaningful therapeutic benefit” of chemical abortion: “the avoidance of a surgical procedure.” C.A.Add.596. But “[b]y defining the ‘therapeutic benefit’ solely as the avoidance of the current standard of care’s delivery mechanism, FDA effectively guarantees that a drug will satisfy this second prong of Subpart H.” C.A.Add.374. Such circularity cannot itself be the requisite “benefit.”

FDA’s 2000 Approval thus failed to satisfy the requirements of Subpart H.

2. The 2000 Approval also violated the APA and FDCA.

FDA’s 2000 Approval also failed to satisfy the requirements of the APA and the FDCA.

The APA forbids “arbitrary” and “capricious” agency actions. 5 U.S.C. 706(2)(A). Regulatory action is arbitrary and capricious when the agency ignores “the relevant data” and fails to “articulate a

satisfactory explanation for its action[s].” *State Farm*, 463 U.S. at 43. A court must “consider whether the decision was based on a consideration of the relevant factors and whether there has been a clear error of judgment.” *Ibid.* (cleaned up). The agency misses the mark if it “entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise.” *Ibid.*

The APA also requires courts “to determine whether the agency [action] conformed with controlling statutes.” *Balt. Gas & Elec. Co. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 87, 97 (1983). The FDCA requires companies seeking to market any new drug in the U.S. to obtain FDA’s approval by filing an NDA. 21 U.S.C. 355(a), (b). The NDA must contain scientific data showing the safety and effectiveness of the drug under real-world conditions. *Id.* 355(d).

The FDCA requires FDA to reject the NDA if the clinical investigations “do not include adequate tests ... to show whether or not such drug is safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof.” *Ibid.* FDA must also reject the NDA if “the results of such tests ... do not show that such drug is safe for use under such conditions.” *Ibid.* Similarly, FDA must deny the NDA if the agency “has insufficient information to determine whether such drug is safe for use under such conditions.” *Ibid.* Finally, FDA must deny the NDA if “there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the

proposed labeling thereof.” *Ibid.* In short, numerous provisions require that FDA evaluate a new drug under the conditions for use.

Yet none of the studies cited by FDA evaluated mifepristone under the prescribed conditions for use in 2000. After obtaining the U.S. patent rights to mifepristone, the Population Council conducted a U.S. clinical trial of the drug. C.A.Add.107. But this clinical trial failed to evaluate the conditions of use *under the proposed labeling*. For example, the trial included two safeguards: (1) each woman received an ultrasound to confirm gestational age and to exclude an ectopic pregnancy; and (2) the women needed to be monitored over the course of four hours to check for adverse events after taking misoprostol. C.A.Add.428–29. And the two previous French clinical trials included two similar safeguards: (1) each woman received an ultrasound, if available; and (2) the women remained under observation for three to five hours after taking misoprostol. C.A.Add.378–79.

But FDA included *none* of these requirements in the 2000 Approval. FDA.Pet.App.173a. Though the trials included ultrasounds to diagnose life-threatening ectopic pregnancies, FDA was silent—in evidence and explanation—on how a doctor could do that without an ultrasound. C.A.Add.595. And while FDA asserted that a doctor could use “other clinical methods” to diagnose gestational age, *ibid.*, those other clinical methods are not *equal* to ultrasounds in their accuracy and reliability. Indeed, an ultrasound is the most accurate method to determine gestational age. C.A.Add.410–414. FDA has never denied this fact. And accuracy in gestational age is crucial because there is a “significant increase in failures and

complications” as the pregnancy progresses. C.A.Add.411.

FDA also excluded the clinical trials’ safeguard that women remain under the doctor’s observation for at least three to five hours after ingesting misoprostol. In doing so, it ignored the U.S. trial’s finding that “many adverse events, including those rated as severe, occurred during this period, as did almost half the expulsions, and some women may prefer to be in the clinic during these events.” Irving M. Spitz, et al., *Early Pregnancy Termination with Mifepristone and Misoprostol in the United States*, *New England J. of Med.* (Apr. 30, 1998).

The 2000 Approval thus lacked the adequate testing, sufficient information, and substantial evidence required to show the safety and effectiveness of chemical abortion drugs under the approved conditions. See 21 U.S.C. 355(d). What’s more, FDA entirely disregarded important aspects of the identified problems, ignored the relevant data, and failed to articulate satisfactory explanations for its action. *State Farm*, 463 U.S. at 43. These failures violate the basic tenets of the APA and the FDCA.

C. Because FDA’s 2000 Approval and 2016 Major Changes were unlawful, FDA’s 2019 Generic Approval was also unlawful.

FDA also violated the FDCA and the APA when approving a generic version of mifepristone in 2019. The FDCA allows a generic drug manufacturer to submit an ANDA for premarket review and approval. 21 U.S.C. 355(j); 21 C.F.R. 314.94. The generic company must show that (1) the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the

labeling proposed for the new drug have been previously approved for a drug listed, and (2) the drug product is chemically the same as the already approved drug, allowing it to rely on FDA's previous finding of safety and effectiveness for the approved drug. *Ibid.* The route of administration, dosage form, and strength must also be the same. *Ibid.* Based on GenBioPro's application for its generic version, FDA determined that the 2019 ANDA "demonstrate[d] that the drug is safe and effective ... in the submitted labeling" because it is "bioequivalent and, therefore, therapeutically equivalent" to Danco's version. C.A.Add.768.

If the listed drug—on which the ANDA-approved generic drug is based—is withdrawn, the FDCA and FDA's implementing regulations generally require FDA to withdraw the generic drug as well. 21 U.S.C. 355(j)(6); 21 C.F.R. 314.151.

The 2019 Generic Approval violated the FDCA because FDA relied on the unlawful 2000 Approval and 2016 Major Changes to approve GenBioPro's generic chemical abortion drug. C.A.Add.179–80, 1061–62. Because the 2000 Approval must be withdrawn and the Fifth Circuit has already upheld the stay of the 2016 Major Changes, the 2019 Generic Approval must meet the same fate. Unable to rely on the unlawful 2000 Approval and 2016 Major Changes, the 2019 Generic Approval violated the FDCA because it lacked its own clinical investigations, adequate testing, sufficient information, and

substantial evidence to show the generic drug’s safety and effectiveness under the proposed labeling.¹

The Fifth Circuit faulted Cross-Petitioners for failing to show traceability—i.e., that the 2019 Generic Approval caused them the same harms as name-brand mifepristone. FDA.Pet.App.47a. But “Article III requires no more than *de facto* causality.” *Dep’t of Com. v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 2551, 2566 (2019) (cleaned up). Traceability is satisfied where plaintiffs show that an action “causes or contributes to the kinds of injuries alleged by the plaintiffs.” *Pub. Int. Rsch. Grp. of N.J., Inc. v. Powell Duffryn Terminals Inc.*, 913 F.2d 64, 72 (3d Cir. 1990). That is undeniably true here.

As GenBioPro admits, its sales of generic mifepristone represent roughly two-thirds of chemical abortions annually. GenBioPro.Stay.Amicus.Br.2. And since the 2019 Generic Approval, chemical abortions have skyrocketed. C.A.Add.2435 (showing dramatic increase—39% in 2017 to 53% in 2020—in chemical abortions among all abortions). The availability of generic chemical abortion drugs through the mail and without a single in-person doctor’s visit harms Cross-Petitioners. See *City of Waukesha v. EPA*, 320 F.3d 228, 235 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (per curiam) (reviewing courts must assume claims are meritorious for Article III inquiry). Under these circumstances, traceability is easily satisfied.

¹ Cross-Respondents did not respond to the merits of Cross-Petitioners’ challenge to the 2019 Generic Approval in the district court proceedings and thus waived any objection. C.A.Add.3354–55, 2026.

It is no answer to say that name-brand mifepristone also causes harm to Cross-Petitioners. The “fairly traceable” standard is “not equivalent to a requirement of tort causation.” *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Gaston Copper Recycling Corp.*, 204 F.3d 149, 161–62 (4th Cir. 2000) (cleaned up). It is satisfied by a “substantial likelihood” that the challenged action caused the alleged injury. *Duke Power Co. v. Carolina Env’t Study Grp., Inc.*, 438 U.S. 59, 75 n.20 (1978). Plaintiffs need not “show to a scientific certainty” that a particular product alone caused their harm. *Powell Duffryn Terminals*, 913 F.2d at 72. Rather than “pinpointing the origins of particular molecules,” as with environmental challenges—or a particular drug manufacturer, as here—a plaintiff “must merely show” that the defendant’s actions “causes or contributes to the kinds of injuries alleged.” *Gaston Copper*, 204 F.3d at 161 (citing *Nat. Res. Def. Council v. Watkins*, 954 F.2d 974, 980 (4th Cir. 1992)).

That’s why an environmental plaintiff “need not sue every discharger in one action.” *Powell Duffryn Terminals*, 913 F.2d at 72 n.8. (“the pollution of any one may be shown to cause some part of the injury suffered”) (emphasis omitted). It’s why an organization can challenge EPA’s approval of a particular pesticide registration when other versions exist in the market. *Nat’l Fam. Farm Coal. v. EPA*, 966 F.3d 893, 910 (9th Cir. 2020) (cleaned up) (“[t]he causation requirement is satisfied by showing a reasonable probability of the challenged action’s threat to [petitioner’s] concrete interest”). And it’s why a consumer can sue only one of the credit-reporting agencies. *Hammoud v. Equifax Info. Servs., LLC*, 52 F.4th 669, 679 (6th Cir. 2022) (Nalbandian, J., concurring) (traceability satisfied where plaintiff

showed a “substantial likelihood” that “Experian, as opposed to Equifax, provided the faulty credit information”).

Here, there is no dispute that the 2019 generic has the same chemical makeup as name-brand mifepristone and will cause the same harms. Indeed, Cross-Petitioners will continue to be harmed by *both* the generic and name-brand drug. Moreover, it’s substantially likely that approving a generic version—which increases the amount of the drug available on the market, and at a lower price—will increase the incidents of those harms. This is confirmed by data demonstrating that chemical abortions have surged since the 2019 General Approval. C.A.Add.2435 (FDA’s expert showing that the percentage of chemical rather than surgical abortions “has grown especially rapidly in recent years”). These facts satisfy Article III.

CONCLUSION

The petitions for a writ of certiorari in Case Nos. 23-236 and 23-236 should be denied. But if those petitions are granted, this conditional cross-petition for a writ of certiorari should also be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. CAMPBELL
CODY S. BARNETT
ALLIANCE DEFENDING
FREEDOM
44180 Riverside Pkwy
Lansdowne, VA 20176
(571) 707-4655

ERIN M. HAWLEY
Counsel of Record
JOHN J. BURSCH
MATTHEW S. BOWMAN
ERIK C. BAPTIST
ALLIANCE DEFENDING
FREEDOM
440 First Street NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 393-8690
ehawley@ADFLegal.org

OCTOBER 2023

APPENDIX

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

18 U.S.C. 1461.....	1a
18 U.S.C. 1462.....	3a
21 U.S.C. 355.....	5a
21 U.S.C. 355-1.....	117a
21 C.F.R. 10.30.....	147a
21 C.F.R. 10.45.....	156a
21 C.F.R. 312.300(a).....	162a
21 C.F.R. 314.50.....	163a
21 C.F.R. 314.94.....	194a
21 C.F.R. 314.105(c).....	214a
21 C.F.R. 314.151.....	215a
21 C.F.R. 314.430(b).....	218a
21 C.F.R. 314.500.....	219a
21 C.F.R. 314.520.....	219a

18 U.S.C. 1461

Mailing obscene or crime-inciting matter

Every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance; and--

Every article or thing designed, adapted, or intended for producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral use; and

Every article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing which is advertised or described in a manner calculated to lead another to use or apply it for producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral purpose; and

Every written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where, or how, or from whom, or by what means any of such mentioned matters, articles, or things may be obtained or made, or where or by whom any act or operation of any kind for the procuring or producing of abortion will be done or performed, or how or by what means abortion may be produced, whether sealed or unsealed; and

Every paper, writing, advertisement, or representation that any article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing may, or can, be used or applied for producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral purpose; and

Every description calculated to induce or incite a person to so use or apply any such article, instrument, substance, drug, medicine, or thing--

Is declared to be nonmailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier.

Whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of anything declared by this section or section 3001(e) of title 39 to be nonmailable, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, or knowingly takes any such thing from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or disposition thereof, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, for each such offense thereafter.

The term “indecent”, as used in this section includes matter of a character tending to incite arson, murder, or assassination.

18 U.S.C. 1462
Importation or transportation of obscene matters

Whoever brings into the United States, or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or knowingly uses any express company or other common carrier or interactive computer service (as defined in section 230(e)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934), for carriage in interstate or foreign commerce--

(a) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, motion-picture film, paper, letter, writing, print, or other matter of indecent character; or

(b) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy phonograph recording, electrical transcription, or other article or thing capable of producing sound; or

(c) any drug, medicine, article, or thing designed, adapted, or intended for producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral use; or any written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where, how, or of whom, or by what means any of such mentioned articles, matters, or things may be obtained or made; or

Whoever knowingly takes or receives, from such express company or other common carrier or interactive computer service (as defined in section 230(e)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934) any matter or thing the carriage or importation of which is herein made unlawful--

4a

Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, for each such offense thereafter.

21 U.S.C. 355
New drugs

(a) Necessity of effective approval of application

No person shall introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce any new drug, unless an approval of an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) or (j) is effective with respect to such drug.

(b) Filing application; contents

(1)(A) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any drug subject to the provisions of subsection (a). Such persons shall submit to the Secretary as part of the application--

- (i)** full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether such drug is safe for use and whether such drug is effective in use;
- (ii)** a full list of the articles used as components of such drug;
- (iii)** a full statement of the composition of such drug;
- (iv)** a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug;
- (v)** such samples of such drug and of the articles used as components thereof as the Secretary may require;
- (vi)** specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such drug;

(vii) any assessments required under section 355c of this title; and

(viii) the patent number and expiration date of each patent for which a claim of patent infringement could reasonably be asserted if a person not licensed by the owner of the patent engaged in the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug, and that--

(I) claims the drug for which the applicant submitted the application and is a drug substance (active ingredient) patent or a drug product (formulation or composition) patent; or

(II) claims a method of using such drug for which approval is sought or has been granted in the application.

(B) If an application is filed under this subsection for a drug, and a patent of the type described in subparagraph (A)(viii) is issued after the filing date but before approval of the application, the applicant shall amend the application to include the patent number and expiration date.

(2) An application submitted under paragraph (1) for a drug for which the investigations described in clause (A) of such paragraph and relied upon by the applicant for approval of the application were not conducted by or for the applicant and for which the applicant has not obtained a right of reference or use from the person by or for whom the investigations were conducted shall also include--

(A) a certification, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of his knowledge, with respect to each patent which claims the drug for which such

investigations were conducted or which claims a use for such drug for which the applicant is seeking approval under this subsection and for which information is required to be filed under paragraph (1) or subsection (c)--

- (i) that such patent information has not been filed,
- (ii) that such patent has expired,
- (iii) of the date on which such patent will expire, or
- (iv) that such patent is invalid or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of the new drug for which the application is submitted; and

(B) if with respect to the drug for which investigations described in paragraph (1)(A) were conducted information was filed under paragraph (1) or subsection (c) for a method of use patent which does not claim a use for which the applicant is seeking approval under this subsection, a statement that the method of use patent does not claim such a use.

(3) Notice of opinion that patent is invalid or will not be infringed

(A) Agreement to give notice

An applicant that makes a certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(iv) shall include in the application a statement that the applicant will give notice as required by this paragraph.

(B) Timing of notice

An applicant that makes a certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(iv) shall give notice as required under this paragraph--

(i) if the certification is in the application, not later than 20 days after the date of the postmark on the notice with which the Secretary informs the applicant that the application has been filed; or

(ii) if the certification is in an amendment or supplement to the application, at the time at which the applicant submits the amendment or supplement, regardless of whether the applicant has already given notice with respect to another such certification contained in the application or in an amendment or supplement to the application.

(C) Recipients of notice

An applicant required under this paragraph to give notice shall give notice to--

(i) each owner of the patent that is the subject of the certification (or a representative of the owner designated to receive such a notice); and

(ii) the holder of the approved application under this subsection for the drug that is claimed by the patent or a use of which is claimed by the patent (or a representative of the holder designated to receive such a notice).

(D) Contents of notice

A notice required under this paragraph shall--

(i) state that an application that contains data from bioavailability or bioequivalence studies has been submitted under this subsection for the drug with respect to which the certification is made to

obtain approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, or sale of the drug before the expiration of the patent referred to in the certification; and

(ii) include a detailed statement of the factual and legal basis of the opinion of the applicant that the patent is invalid or will not be infringed.

(4)(A) An applicant may not amend or supplement an application referred to in paragraph (2) to seek approval of a drug that is a different drug than the drug identified in the application as submitted to the Secretary.

(B) With respect to the drug for which such an application is submitted, nothing in this subsection or subsection (c)(3) prohibits an applicant from amending or supplementing the application to seek approval of a different strength.

(5)(A) The Secretary shall issue guidance for the individuals who review applications submitted under paragraph (1) or under section 262 of Title 42, which shall relate to promptness in conducting the review, technical excellence, lack of bias and conflict of interest, and knowledge of regulatory and scientific standards, and which shall apply equally to all individuals who review such applications.

(B) The Secretary shall meet with a sponsor of an investigation or an applicant for approval for a drug under this subsection or section 262 of Title 42 if the sponsor or applicant makes a reasonable written request for a meeting for the purpose of reaching agreement on the design and size--

(i)(I) of clinical trials intended to form the primary basis of an effectiveness claim; or

(II) in the case where human efficacy studies are not ethical or feasible, of animal and any associated clinical trials which, in combination, are intended to form the primary basis of an effectiveness claim; or

(ii) with respect to an application for approval of a biological product under section 262(k) of Title 42, of any necessary clinical study or studies.

The sponsor or applicant shall provide information necessary for discussion and agreement on the design and size of the clinical trials. Minutes of any such meeting shall be prepared by the Secretary and made available to the sponsor or applicant upon request.

(C) Any agreement regarding the parameters of the design and size of clinical trials of a new drug under this paragraph that is reached between the Secretary and a sponsor or applicant shall be reduced to writing and made part of the administrative record by the Secretary. Such agreement shall not be changed after the testing begins, except--

(i) with the written agreement of the sponsor or applicant; or

(ii) pursuant to a decision, made in accordance with subparagraph (D) by the director of the reviewing division, that a substantial scientific issue essential to determining the safety or effectiveness of the drug has been identified after the testing has begun.

(D) A decision under subparagraph (C)(ii) by the director shall be in writing and the Secretary shall provide to the sponsor or applicant an opportunity for a meeting at which the director and the sponsor or applicant will be present and at which the director will document the scientific issue involved.

(E) The written decisions of the reviewing division shall be binding upon, and may not directly or indirectly be changed by, the field or compliance division personnel unless such field or compliance division personnel demonstrate to the reviewing division why such decision should be modified.

(F) No action by the reviewing division may be delayed because of the unavailability of information from or action by field personnel unless the reviewing division determines that a delay is necessary to assure the marketing of a safe and effective drug.

(G) For purposes of this paragraph, the reviewing division is the division responsible for the review of an application for approval of a drug under this subsection or section 262 of Title 42 (including all scientific and medical matters, chemistry, manufacturing, and controls).

(6) An application submitted under this subsection shall be accompanied by the certification required under section 282(j)(5)(B) of Title 42. Such certification shall not be considered an element of such application.

(c) Period for approval of application; period for, notice, and expedition of hearing; period for issuance of order

(1) Within one hundred and eighty days after the filing of an application under subsection (b), or such additional period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the applicant, the Secretary shall either--

(A) approve the application if he then finds that none of the grounds for denying approval specified in subsection (d) applies, or

(B) give the applicant notice of an opportunity for a hearing before the Secretary under subsection (d) on the question whether such application is approvable. If the applicant elects to accept the opportunity for hearing by written request within thirty days after such notice, such hearing shall commence not more than ninety days after the expiration of such thirty days unless the Secretary and the applicant otherwise agree. Any such hearing shall thereafter be conducted on an expedited basis and the Secretary's order thereon shall be issued within ninety days after the date fixed by the Secretary for filing final briefs.

(2) Not later than 30 days after the date of approval of an application submitted under subsection (b), the holder of the approved application shall file with the Secretary the patent number and the expiration date of any patent described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(viii), except that a patent that is identified as claiming a method of using such drug shall be filed only if the patent claims a method of use approved in the application. If a patent described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(viii) is issued after the date of approval of an application submitted under subsection (b), the holder of the approved application shall, not later

than 30 days after the date of issuance of the patent, file the patent number and the expiration date of the patent, except that a patent that claims a method of using such drug shall be filed only if approval for such use has been granted in the application. If the patent information described in subsection (b) could not be filed with the submission of an application under subsection (b) because the application was filed before the patent information was required under subsection (b) or a patent was issued after the application was approved under such subsection, the holder of an approved application shall file with the Secretary the patent number and the expiration date of any patent described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(viii). If the holder of an approved application could not file patent information under subsection (b) because it was not required at the time the application was approved, the holder shall file such information under this subsection not later than thirty days after September 24, 1984, and if the holder of an approved application could not file patent information under subsection (b) because no patent of the type for which information is required to be submitted in subsection (b)(1)(A)(viii) had been issued when an application was filed or approved, the holder shall file such information under this subsection not later than thirty days after the date the patent involved is issued. Upon the submission of patent information under this subsection, the Secretary shall publish it. Patent information that is not the type of patent information required by subsection (b)(1)(A)(viii) shall not be submitted under this paragraph.

(3) The approval of an application filed under subsection (b) which contains a certification required

by paragraph (2) of such subsection shall be made effective on the last applicable date determined by applying the following to each certification made under subsection (b)(2)(A):

(A) If the applicant only made a certification described in clause (i) or (ii) of subsection (b)(2)(A) or in both such clauses, the approval may be made effective immediately.

(B) If the applicant made a certification described in clause (iii) of subsection (b)(2)(A), the approval may be made effective on the date certified under clause (iii).

(C) If the applicant made a certification described in clause (iv) of subsection (b)(2)(A), the approval shall be made effective immediately unless, before the expiration of 45 days after the date on which the notice described in subsection (b)(3) is received, an action is brought for infringement of the patent that is the subject of the certification and for which information was submitted to the Secretary under paragraph (2) or subsection (b)(1) before the date on which the application (excluding an amendment or supplement to the application) was submitted. If such an action is brought before the expiration of such days, the approval may be made effective upon the expiration of the thirty-month period beginning on the date of the receipt of the notice provided under subsection (b)(3) or such shorter or longer period as the court may order because either party to the action failed to reasonably cooperate in expediting the action, except that--

(i) if before the expiration of such period the district court decides that the patent is invalid

or not infringed (including any substantive determination that there is no cause of action for patent infringement or invalidity), the approval shall be made effective on--

(I) the date on which the court enters judgment reflecting the decision; or

(II) the date of a settlement order or consent decree signed and entered by the court stating that the patent that is the subject of the certification is invalid or not infringed;

(ii) if before the expiration of such period the district court decides that the patent has been infringed--

(I) if the judgment of the district court is appealed, the approval shall be made effective on--

(aa) the date on which the court of appeals decides that the patent is invalid or not infringed (including any substantive determination that there is no cause of action for patent infringement or invalidity); or

(bb) the date of a settlement order or consent decree signed and entered by the court of appeals stating that the patent that is the subject of the certification is invalid or not infringed; or

(II) if the judgment of the district court is not appealed or is affirmed, the approval shall be made effective on the date specified by the district court in a court order under section 271(e)(4)(A) of Title 35;

(iii) if before the expiration of such period the court grants a preliminary injunction prohibiting the applicant from engaging in the commercial manufacture or sale of the drug until the court decides the issues of patent validity and infringement and if the court decides that such patent is invalid or not infringed, the approval shall be made effective as provided in clause (i); or

(iv) if before the expiration of such period the court grants a preliminary injunction prohibiting the applicant from engaging in the commercial manufacture or sale of the drug until the court decides the issues of patent validity and infringement and if the court decides that such patent has been infringed, the approval shall be made effective as provided in clause (ii).

In such an action, each of the parties shall reasonably cooperate in expediting the action.

(D) Civil action to obtain patent certainty

(i) Declaratory judgment absent infringement action

(I) In general

No action may be brought under section 2201 of Title 28 by an applicant referred to in subsection (b)(2) for a declaratory judgment with respect to a patent which is the subject of the certification referred to in subparagraph (C) unless--

(aa) the 45-day period referred to in such subparagraph has expired;

(bb) neither the owner of such patent nor the holder of the approved application under subsection (b) for the drug that is claimed by the patent or a use of which is claimed by the patent brought a civil action against the applicant for infringement of the patent before the expiration of such period; and

(cc) in any case in which the notice provided under paragraph (2)(B) relates to noninfringement, the notice was accompanied by a document described in subclause (III).

(II) Filing of civil action

If the conditions described in items (aa), (bb), and as applicable, (cc) of subclause (I) have been met, the applicant referred to in such subclause may, in accordance with section 2201 of Title 28, bring a civil action under such section against the owner or holder referred to in such subclause (but not against any owner or holder that has brought such a civil action against the applicant, unless that civil action was dismissed without prejudice) for a declaratory judgment that the patent is invalid or will not be infringed by the drug for which the applicant seeks approval, except that such civil action may be brought for a declaratory judgment that the patent will not be infringed only in a case in which the condition described in subclause (I)(cc) is applicable. A civil action referred to in this subclause shall be brought in the judicial district where the defendant has its principal place of business or a regular and established place of business.

(III) Offer of confidential access to application

For purposes of subclause (I)(cc), the document described in this subclause is a document providing an offer of confidential access to the application that is in the custody of the applicant referred to in subsection (b)(2) for the purpose of determining whether an action referred to in subparagraph (C) should be brought. The document providing the offer of confidential access shall contain such restrictions as to persons entitled to access, and on the use and disposition of any information accessed, as would apply had a protective order been entered for the purpose of protecting trade secrets and other confidential business information. A request for access to an application under an offer of confidential access shall be considered acceptance of the offer of confidential access with the restrictions as to persons entitled to access, and on the use and disposition of any information accessed, contained in the offer of confidential access, and those restrictions and other terms of the offer of confidential access shall be considered terms of an enforceable contract. Any person provided an offer of confidential access shall review the application for the sole and limited purpose of evaluating possible infringement of the patent that is the subject of the certification under subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv) and for no other purpose, and may not disclose information of no relevance to any issue of patent infringement to any person other than a person provided an offer of confidential access. Further, the application may be redacted by the applicant to remove any information of no relevance to any issue of patent infringement.

(ii) Counterclaim to infringement action

(I) In general

If an owner of the patent or the holder of the approved application under subsection (b) for the drug that is claimed by the patent or a use of which is claimed by the patent brings a patent infringement action against the applicant, the applicant may assert a counterclaim seeking an order requiring the holder to correct or delete the patent information submitted by the holder under subsection (b) or this subsection on the ground that the patent does not claim either--

(aa) the drug for which the application was approved; or

(bb) an approved method of using the drug.

(II) No independent cause of action

Subclause (I) does not authorize the assertion of a claim described in subclause (I) in any civil action or proceeding other than a counterclaim described in subclause (I).

(iii) No damages

An applicant shall not be entitled to damages in a civil action under clause (i) or a counterclaim under clause (ii).

(E)(i) Repealed. Pub.L. 117-9, § 1(b)(1)(A), Apr. 23, 2021, 135 Stat. 258

(ii) If an application submitted under subsection (b) for a drug, no active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) of which has been approved in any other application under subsection (b), is approved after September 24, 1984, no application which refers to the drug for which the subsection (b) application was submitted and for

which the investigations described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) and relied upon by the applicant for approval of the application were not conducted by or for the applicant and for which the applicant has not obtained a right of reference or use from the person by or for whom the investigations were conducted may be submitted under subsection (b) before the expiration of five years from the date of the approval of the application under subsection (b), except that such an application may be submitted under subsection (b) after the expiration of four years from the date of the approval of the subsection (b) application if it contains a certification of patent invalidity or noninfringement described in clause (iv) of subsection (b)(2)(A). The approval of such an application shall be made effective in accordance with this paragraph except that, if an action for patent infringement is commenced during the one-year period beginning forty-eight months after the date of the approval of the subsection (b) application, the thirty-month period referred to in subparagraph (C) shall be extended by such amount of time (if any) which is required for seven and one-half years to have elapsed from the date of approval of the subsection (b) application.

(iii) If an application submitted under subsection (b) for a drug, which includes an active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) that has been approved in another application approved under subsection (b), is approved after September 24, 1984, and if such application contains reports of new clinical investigations (other than bioavailability studies) essential to the approval of

the application and conducted or sponsored by the applicant, the Secretary may not make the approval of an application submitted under subsection (b) for the conditions of approval of such drug in the approved subsection (b) application effective before the expiration of three years from the date of the approval of the application under subsection (b) if the investigations described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) and relied upon by the applicant for approval of the application were not conducted by or for the applicant and if the applicant has not obtained a right of reference or use from the person by or for whom the investigations were conducted.

(iv) If a supplement to an application approved under subsection (b) is approved after September 24, 1984, and the supplement contains reports of new clinical investigations (other than bioavailability¹ studies) essential to the approval of the supplement and conducted or sponsored by the person submitting the supplement, the Secretary may not make the approval of an application submitted under subsection (b) for a change approved in the supplement effective before the expiration of three years from the date of the approval of the supplement under subsection (b) if the investigations described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) and relied upon by the applicant for approval of the application were not conducted by or for the applicant and if the applicant has not obtained a right of reference or use from the person by or for whom the investigations were conducted.

¹ So in original. Probably should be “bioavailability”.

(v) If an application (or supplement to an application) submitted under subsection (b) for a drug, which includes an active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) that has been approved in another application under subsection (b), was approved during the period beginning January 1, 1982, and ending on September 24, 1984, the Secretary may not make the approval of an application submitted under this subsection and for which the investigations described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) and relied upon by the applicant for approval of the application were not conducted by or for the applicant and for which the applicant has not obtained a right of reference or use from the person by or for whom the investigations were conducted and which refers to the drug for which the subsection (b) application was submitted effective before the expiration of two years from September 24, 1984.

(4) A drug manufactured in a pilot or other small facility may be used to demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of the drug and to obtain approval for the drug prior to manufacture of the drug in a larger facility, unless the Secretary makes a determination that a full scale production facility is necessary to ensure the safety or effectiveness of the drug.

(5)(A) The Secretary may rely upon qualified data summaries to support the approval of a supplemental application, with respect to a qualified indication for a drug, submitted under subsection (b), if such supplemental application complies with subparagraph (B).

(B) A supplemental application is eligible for review as described in subparagraph (A) only if--

(i) there is existing data available and acceptable to the Secretary demonstrating the safety of the drug; and

(ii) all data used to develop the qualified data summaries are submitted to the Secretary as part of the supplemental application.

(C) The Secretary shall post on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration and update annually--

(i) the number of applications reviewed solely under subparagraph (A) or section 262(a)(2)(E) of Title 42;

(ii) the average time for completion of review under subparagraph (A) or section 262(a)(2)(E) of Title 42;

(iii) the average time for review of supplemental applications where the Secretary did not use review flexibility under subparagraph (A) or section 262(a)(2)(E) of Title 42; and

(iv) the number of applications reviewed under subparagraph (A) or section 262(a)(2)(E) of Title 42 for which the Secretary made use of full data sets in addition to the qualified data summary.

(D) In this paragraph--

(i) the term “qualified indication” means an indication for a drug that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for summary level review under this paragraph; and

(ii) the term “qualified data summary” means a summary of clinical data that demonstrates the

safety and effectiveness of a drug with respect to a qualified indication.

(d) Grounds for refusing application; approval of application; “substantial evidence” defined

If the Secretary finds, after due notice to the applicant in accordance with subsection (c) and giving him an opportunity for a hearing, in accordance with said subsection, that (1) the investigations, reports of which are required to be submitted to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b), do not include adequate tests by all methods reasonably applicable to show whether or not such drug is safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof; (2) the results of such tests show that such drug is unsafe for use under such conditions or do not show that such drug is safe for use under such conditions; (3) the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug are inadequate to preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity; (4) upon the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application, or upon the basis of any other information before him with respect to such drug, he has insufficient information to determine whether such drug is safe for use under such conditions; or (5) evaluated on the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application and any other information before him with respect to such drug, there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof; or (6) the application failed to contain the

patent information prescribed by subsection (b); or (7) based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, such labeling is false or misleading in any particular; he shall issue an order refusing to approve the application. If, after such notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary finds that clauses (1) through (6) do not apply, he shall issue an order approving the application. As used in this subsection and subsection (e), the term “substantial evidence” means evidence consisting of adequate and well-controlled investigations, including clinical investigations, by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the effectiveness of the drug involved, on the basis of which it could fairly and responsibly be concluded by such experts that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling or proposed labeling thereof. If the Secretary determines, based on relevant science, that data from one adequate and well-controlled clinical investigation and confirmatory evidence (obtained prior to or after such investigation) are sufficient to establish effectiveness, the Secretary may consider such data and evidence to constitute substantial evidence for purposes of the preceding sentence. The Secretary shall implement a structured risk-benefit assessment framework in the new drug approval process to facilitate the balanced consideration of benefits and risks, a consistent and systematic approach to the discussion and regulatory decisionmaking, and the communication of the benefits and risks of new drugs. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall alter the criteria for

evaluating an application for marketing approval of a drug.

(e) Withdrawal of approval; grounds; immediate suspension upon finding imminent hazard to public health

The Secretary shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, withdraw approval of an application with respect to any drug under this section if the Secretary finds (1) that clinical or other experience, tests, or other scientific data show that such drug is unsafe for use under the conditions of use upon the basis of which the application was approved; (2) that new evidence of clinical experience, not contained in such application or not available to the Secretary until after such application was approved, or tests by new methods, or tests by methods not deemed reasonably applicable when such application was approved, evaluated together with the evidence available to the Secretary when the application was approved, shows that such drug is not shown to be safe for use under the conditions of use upon the basis of which the application was approved; or (3) on the basis of new information before him with respect to such drug, evaluated together with the evidence available to him when the application was approved, that there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof; or (4) the patent information prescribed by subsection (c) was not filed within thirty days after the receipt of written notice from the Secretary specifying the failure to file such information; or (5) that the application contains any untrue statement of a

material fact: *Provided*, That if the Secretary (or in his absence the officer acting as Secretary) finds that there is an imminent hazard to the public health, he may suspend the approval of such application immediately, and give the applicant prompt notice of his action and afford the applicant the opportunity for an expedited hearing under this subsection; but the authority conferred by this proviso to suspend the approval of an application shall not be delegated. The Secretary may also, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, withdraw the approval of an application submitted under subsection (b) or (j) with respect to any drug under this section if the Secretary finds (1) that the applicant has failed to establish a system for maintaining required records, or has repeatedly or deliberately failed to maintain such records or to make required reports, in accordance with a regulation or order under subsection (k) or to comply with the notice requirements of section 360(k)(2) of this title, or the applicant has refused to permit access to, or copying or verification of, such records as required by paragraph (2) of such subsection; or (2) that on the basis of new information before him, evaluated together with the evidence before him when the application was approved, the methods used in, or the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug are inadequate to assure and preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity and were not made adequate within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Secretary specifying the matter complained of; or (3) that on the basis of new information before him, evaluated together with the evidence before him when the application was

approved, the labeling of such drug, based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, is false or misleading in any particular and was not corrected within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Secretary specifying the matter complained of. Any order under this subsection shall state the findings upon which it is based. The Secretary may withdraw the approval of an application submitted under this section, or suspend the approval of such an application, as provided under this subsection, without first ordering the applicant to submit an assessment of the approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for the drug under section 355-1(g)(2)(D) of this title.

(f) Revocation of order refusing, withdrawing or suspending approval of application

Whenever the Secretary finds that the facts so require, he shall revoke any previous order under subsection (d) or (e) refusing, withdrawing, or suspending approval of an application and shall approve such application or reinstate such approval, as may be appropriate.

(g) Service of orders

Orders of the Secretary issued under this section shall be served (1) in person by any officer or employee of the department designated by the Secretary or (2) by mailing the order by registered mail or by certified mail addressed to the applicant or respondent at his last-known address in the records of the Secretary.

(h) Appeal from order

An appeal may be taken by the applicant from an order of the Secretary refusing or withdrawing

approval of an application under this section. Such appeal shall be taken by filing in the United States court of appeals for the circuit wherein such applicant resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within sixty days after the entry of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, or any officer designated by him for that purpose, and thereupon the Secretary shall certify and file in the court the record upon which the order complained of was entered, as provided in section 2112 of Title 28. Upon the filing of such petition such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside such order, except that until the filing of the record the Secretary may modify or set aside his order. No objection to the order of the Secretary shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the Secretary or unless there were reasonable grounds for failure so to do. The finding of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. If any person shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Secretary, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts by reason of the additional

evidence so taken, and he shall file with the court such modified findings which, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, and his recommendation, if any, for the setting aside of the original order. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside any such order of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of Title 28. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of the Secretary's order.

(i) Exemptions of drugs for research; discretionary and mandatory conditions; direct reports to Secretary

(1) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations for exempting from the operation of the foregoing subsections of this section drugs intended solely for investigational use by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety and effectiveness of drugs. Such regulations may, within the discretion of the Secretary, among other conditions relating to the protection of the public health, provide for conditioning such exemption upon--

(A) the submission to the Secretary, before any clinical testing of a new drug is undertaken, of reports, by the manufacturer or the sponsor of the investigation of such drug, of nonclinical tests of such drug adequate to justify the proposed clinical testing;

(B) the manufacturer or the sponsor of the investigation of a new drug proposed to be distributed to investigators for clinical testing

obtaining a signed agreement from each of such investigators that patients to whom the drug is administered will be under his personal supervision, or under the supervision of investigators responsible to him, and that he will not supply such drug to any other investigator, or to clinics, for administration to human beings;

(C) the establishment and maintenance of such records, and the making of such reports to the Secretary, by the manufacturer or the sponsor of the investigation of such drug, of data (including but not limited to analytical reports by investigators) obtained as the result of such investigational use of such drug, as the Secretary finds will enable him to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of such drug in the event of the filing of an application pursuant to subsection (b); and

(D) the submission to the Secretary by the manufacturer or the sponsor of the investigation of a new drug of a statement of intent regarding whether the manufacturer or sponsor has plans for assessing pediatric safety and efficacy.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), a clinical investigation of a new drug may begin 30 days after the Secretary has received from the manufacturer or sponsor of the investigation a submission containing such information about the drug and the clinical investigation, including--

(A) information on design of the investigation and adequate reports of basic information, certified by the applicant to be accurate reports, necessary to assess the safety of the drug for use in clinical investigation; and

(B) adequate information on the chemistry and manufacturing of the drug, controls available for the drug, and primary data tabulations from nonclinical tests or human studies.

(3)(A) At any time, the Secretary may prohibit the sponsor of an investigation from conducting the investigation (referred to in this paragraph as a “clinical hold”) if the Secretary makes a determination described in subparagraph (B). The Secretary shall specify the basis for the clinical hold, including the specific information available to the Secretary which served as the basis for such clinical hold, and confirm such determination in writing.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), a determination described in this subparagraph with respect to a clinical hold is that--

(i) the drug involved represents an unreasonable risk to the safety of the persons who are the subjects of the clinical investigation, taking into account the qualifications of the clinical investigators, information about the drug, the design of the clinical investigation, the condition for which the drug is to be investigated, and the health status of the subjects involved; or

(ii) the clinical hold should be issued for such other reasons as the Secretary may by regulation establish (including reasons established by regulation before November 21, 1997).

(C) Any written request to the Secretary from the sponsor of an investigation that a clinical hold be removed shall receive a decision, in writing and specifying the reasons therefor, within 30 days after

receipt of such request. Any such request shall include sufficient information to support the removal of such clinical hold.

(4) Regulations under paragraph (1) shall provide that such exemption shall be conditioned upon the manufacturer, or the sponsor of the investigation, requiring that experts using such drugs for investigational purposes certify to such manufacturer or sponsor that they will inform any human beings to whom such drugs, or any controls used in connection therewith, are being administered, or their representatives, that such drugs are being used for investigational purposes and will obtain the consent of such human beings or their representatives, except where it is not feasible, it is contrary to the best interests of such human beings, or the proposed clinical testing poses no more than minimal risk to such human beings and includes appropriate safeguards as prescribed to protect the rights, safety, and welfare of such human beings. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require any clinical investigator to submit directly to the Secretary reports on the investigational use of drugs. The Secretary shall update such regulations to require inclusion in the informed consent documents and process a statement that clinical trial information for such clinical investigation has been or will be submitted for inclusion in the registry data bank pursuant to subsection (j) of section 282 of Title 42.

(j) Abbreviated new drug applications

(1) Any person may file with the Secretary an abbreviated application for the approval of a new drug.

(2)(A) An abbreviated application for a new drug shall contain--

(i) information to show that the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling proposed for the new drug have been previously approved for a drug listed under paragraph (7) (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as a “listed drug”);

(ii)(I) if the listed drug referred to in clause (i) has only one active ingredient, information to show that the active ingredient of the new drug is the same as that of the listed drug;

(II) if the listed drug referred to in clause (i) has more than one active ingredient, information to show that the active ingredients of the new drug are the same as those of the listed drug, or

(III) if the listed drug referred to in clause (i) has more than one active ingredient and if one of the active ingredients of the new drug is different and the application is filed pursuant to the approval of a petition filed under subparagraph (C), information to show that the other active ingredients of the new drug are the same as the active ingredients of the listed drug, information to show that the different active ingredient is an active ingredient of a listed drug or of a drug which does not meet the requirements of section 321(p) of this title, and such other information respecting the different active ingredient with respect to which the petition was filed as the Secretary may require;

(iii) information to show that the route of administration, the dosage form, and the strength

of the new drug are the same as those of the listed drug referred to in clause (i) or, if the route of administration, the dosage form, or the strength of the new drug is different and the application is filed pursuant to the approval of a petition filed under subparagraph (C), such information respecting the route of administration, dosage form, or strength with respect to which the petition was filed as the Secretary may require;

(iv) information to show that the new drug is bioequivalent to the listed drug referred to in clause (i), except that if the application is filed pursuant to the approval of a petition filed under subparagraph (C), information to show that the active ingredients of the new drug are of the same pharmacological or therapeutic class as those of the listed drug referred to in clause (i) and the new drug can be expected to have the same therapeutic effect as the listed drug when administered to patients for a condition of use referred to in clause (i);

(v) information to show that the labeling proposed for the new drug is the same as the labeling approved for the listed drug referred to in clause (i) except for changes required because of differences approved under a petition filed under subparagraph (C) or because the new drug and the listed drug are produced or distributed by different manufacturers;

(vi) the items specified in clauses (ii) through (vi) of subsection (b)(1)(A);

(vii) a certification, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of his knowledge, with respect to

each patent which claims the listed drug referred to in clause (i) or which claims a use for such listed drug for which the applicant is seeking approval under this subsection and for which information is required to be filed under subsection (b) or (c)--

- (I) that such patent information has not been filed,
 - (II) that such patent has expired,
 - (III) of the date on which such patent will expire, or
 - (IV) that such patent is invalid or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of the new drug for which the application is submitted; and
- (viii) if with respect to the listed drug referred to in clause (i) information was filed under subsection (b) or (c) for a method of use patent which does not claim a use for which the applicant is seeking approval under this subsection, a statement that the method of use patent does not claim such a use.

The Secretary may not require that an abbreviated application contain information in addition to that required by clauses (i) through (viii).

(B) Notice of opinion that patent is invalid or will not be infringed

(i) Agreement to give notice

An applicant that makes a certification described in subparagraph (A)(vii)(IV) shall include in the application a statement that the applicant will give notice as required by this subparagraph.

(ii) Timing of notice

An applicant that makes a certification described in subparagraph (A)(vii)(IV) shall give notice as required under this subparagraph--

(I) if the certification is in the application, not later than 20 days after the date of the postmark on the notice with which the Secretary informs the applicant that the application has been filed; or

(II) if the certification is in an amendment or supplement to the application, at the time at which the applicant submits the amendment or supplement, regardless of whether the applicant has already given notice with respect to another such certification contained in the application or in an amendment or supplement to the application.

(iii) Recipients of notice

An applicant required under this subparagraph to give notice shall give notice to--

(I) each owner of the patent that is the subject of the certification (or a representative of the owner designated to receive such a notice); and

(II) the holder of the approved application under subsection (b) for the drug that is claimed by the patent or a use of which is claimed by the patent (or a representative of the holder designated to receive such a notice).

(iv) Contents of notice

A notice required under this subparagraph shall--

(I) state that an application that contains data from bioavailability or bioequivalence studies has

been submitted under this subsection for the drug with respect to which the certification is made to obtain approval to engage in the commercial manufacture, use, or sale of the drug before the expiration of the patent referred to in the certification; and

(II) include a detailed statement of the factual and legal basis of the opinion of the applicant that the patent is invalid or will not be infringed.

(C) If a person wants to submit an abbreviated application for a new drug which has a different active ingredient or whose route of administration, dosage form, or strength differ from that of a listed drug, such person shall submit a petition to the Secretary seeking permission to file such an application. The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a petition submitted under this subparagraph within ninety days of the date the petition is submitted. The Secretary shall approve such a petition unless the Secretary finds--

(i) that investigations must be conducted to show the safety and effectiveness of the drug or of any of its active ingredients, the route of administration, the dosage form, or strength which differ from the listed drug; or

(ii) that any drug with a different active ingredient may not be adequately evaluated for approval as safe and effective on the basis of the information required to be submitted in an abbreviated application.

(D)(i) An applicant may not amend or supplement an application to seek approval of a drug referring to a

different listed drug from the listed drug identified in the application as submitted to the Secretary.

(ii) With respect to the drug for which an application is submitted, nothing in this subsection prohibits an applicant from amending or supplementing the application to seek approval of a different strength.

(iii) Within 60 days after December 8, 2003, the Secretary shall issue guidance defining the term “listed drug” for purposes of this subparagraph.

(3)(A) The Secretary shall issue guidance for the individuals who review applications submitted under paragraph (1), which shall relate to promptness in conducting the review, technical excellence, lack of bias and conflict of interest, and knowledge of regulatory and scientific standards, and which shall apply equally to all individuals who review such applications.

(B) The Secretary shall meet with a sponsor of an investigation or an applicant for approval for a drug under this subsection if the sponsor or applicant makes a reasonable written request for a meeting for the purpose of reaching agreement on the design and size of bioavailability and bioequivalence studies needed for approval of such application. The sponsor or applicant shall provide information necessary for discussion and agreement on the design and size of such studies. Minutes of any such meeting shall be prepared by the Secretary and made available to the sponsor or applicant.

(C) Any agreement regarding the parameters of design and size of bioavailability and bioequivalence studies of a drug under this paragraph that is reached

between the Secretary and a sponsor or applicant shall be reduced to writing and made part of the administrative record by the Secretary. Such agreement shall not be changed after the testing begins, except--

(i) with the written agreement of the sponsor or applicant; or

(ii) pursuant to a decision, made in accordance with subparagraph (D) by the director of the reviewing division, that a substantial scientific issue essential to determining the safety or effectiveness of the drug has been identified after the testing has begun.

(D) A decision under subparagraph (C)(ii) by the director shall be in writing and the Secretary shall provide to the sponsor or applicant an opportunity for a meeting at which the director and the sponsor or applicant will be present and at which the director will document the scientific issue involved.

(E) The written decisions of the reviewing division shall be binding upon, and may not directly or indirectly be changed by, the field or compliance office personnel unless such field or compliance office personnel demonstrate to the reviewing division why such decision should be modified.

(F) No action by the reviewing division may be delayed because of the unavailability of information from or action by field personnel unless the reviewing division determines that a delay is necessary to assure the marketing of a safe and effective drug.

(G) For purposes of this paragraph, the reviewing division is the division responsible for the review of

41a

an application for approval of a drug under this subsection (including scientific matters, chemistry, manufacturing, and controls).

(4) Subject to paragraph (5), the Secretary shall approve an application for a drug unless the Secretary finds--

(A) the methods used in, or the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of the drug are inadequate to assure and preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity;

(B) information submitted with the application is insufficient to show that each of the proposed conditions of use have been previously approved for the listed drug referred to in the application;

(C)(i) if the listed drug has only one active ingredient, information submitted with the application is insufficient to show that the active ingredient is the same as that of the listed drug;

(ii) if the listed drug has more than one active ingredient, information submitted with the application is insufficient to show that the active ingredients are the same as the active ingredients of the listed drug, or

(iii) if the listed drug has more than one active ingredient and if the application is for a drug which has an active ingredient different from the listed drug, information submitted with the application is insufficient to show--

(I) that the other active ingredients are the same as the active ingredients of the listed drug, or

(II) that the different active ingredient is an active ingredient of a listed drug or a drug which does not meet the requirements of section 321(p) of this title, or no petition to file an application for the drug with the different ingredient was approved under paragraph (2)(C);

(D)(i) if the application is for a drug whose route of administration, dosage form, or strength of the drug is the same as the route of administration, dosage form, or strength of the listed drug referred to in the application, information submitted in the application is insufficient to show that the route of administration, dosage form, or strength is the same as that of the listed drug, or

(ii) if the application is for a drug whose route of administration, dosage form, or strength of the drug is different from that of the listed drug referred to in the application, no petition to file an application for the drug with the different route of administration, dosage form, or strength was approved under paragraph (2)(C);

(E) if the application was filed pursuant to the approval of a petition under paragraph (2)(C), the application did not contain the information required by the Secretary respecting the active ingredient, route of administration, dosage form, or strength which is not the same;

(F) information submitted in the application is insufficient to show that the drug is bioequivalent to the listed drug referred to in the application or, if the application was filed pursuant to a petition approved under paragraph (2)(C), information submitted in the application is insufficient to show that the active

ingredients of the new drug are of the same pharmacological or therapeutic class as those of the listed drug referred to in paragraph (2)(A)(i) and that the new drug can be expected to have the same therapeutic effect as the listed drug when administered to patients for a condition of use referred to in such paragraph;

(G) information submitted in the application is insufficient to show that the labeling proposed for the drug is the same as the labeling approved for the listed drug referred to in the application except for changes required because of differences approved under a petition filed under paragraph (2)(C) or because the drug and the listed drug are produced or distributed by different manufacturers;

(H) information submitted in the application or any other information available to the Secretary shows that (i) the inactive ingredients of the drug are unsafe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling proposed for the drug, or (ii) the composition of the drug is unsafe under such conditions because of the type or quantity of inactive ingredients included or the manner in which the inactive ingredients are included;

(I) the approval under subsection (c) of the listed drug referred to in the application under this subsection has been withdrawn or suspended for grounds described in the first sentence of subsection (e), the Secretary has published a notice of opportunity for hearing to withdraw approval of the listed drug under subsection (c) for grounds described in the first sentence of subsection (e), the approval under this

subsection of the listed drug referred to in the application under this subsection has been withdrawn or suspended under paragraph (6), or the Secretary has determined that the listed drug has been withdrawn from sale for safety or effectiveness reasons;

(J) the application does not meet any other requirement of paragraph (2)(A); or

(K) the application contains an untrue statement of material fact.

(5)(A) Within one hundred and eighty days of the initial receipt of an application under paragraph (2) or within such additional period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the applicant, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the application.

(B) The approval of an application submitted under paragraph (2) shall be made effective on the last applicable date determined by applying the following to each certification made under paragraph (2)(A)(vii):

(i) If the applicant only made a certification described in subclause (I) or (II) of paragraph (2)(A)(vii) or in both such subclauses, the approval may be made effective immediately.

(ii) If the applicant made a certification described in subclause (III) of paragraph (2)(A)(vii), the approval may be made effective on the date certified under subclause (III).

(iii) If the applicant made a certification described in subclause (IV) of paragraph (2)(A)(vii), the approval shall be made effective immediately

unless, before the expiration of 45 days after the date on which the notice described in paragraph (2)(B) is received, an action is brought for infringement of the patent that is the subject of the certification and for which information was submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b)(1) or (c)(2) before the date on which the application (excluding an amendment or supplement to the application), which the Secretary later determines to be substantially complete, was submitted. If such an action is brought before the expiration of such days, the approval shall be made effective upon the expiration of the thirty-month period beginning on the date of the receipt of the notice provided under paragraph (2)(B)(i) or such shorter or longer period as the court may order because either party to the action failed to reasonably cooperate in expediting the action, except that--

(I) if before the expiration of such period the district court decides that the patent is invalid or not infringed (including any substantive determination that there is no cause of action for patent infringement or invalidity), the approval shall be made effective on--

(aa) the date on which the court enters judgment reflecting the decision; or

(bb) the date of a settlement order or consent decree signed and entered by the court stating that the patent that is the subject of the certification is invalid or not infringed;

(II) if before the expiration of such period the district court decides that the patent has been infringed--

(aa) if the judgment of the district court is appealed, the approval shall be made effective on--

(AA) the date on which the court of appeals decides that the patent is invalid or not infringed (including any substantive determination that there is no cause of action for patent infringement or invalidity); or

(BB) the date of a settlement order or consent decree signed and entered by the court of appeals stating that the patent that is the subject of the certification is invalid or not infringed; or

(bb) if the judgment of the district court is not appealed or is affirmed, the approval shall be made effective on the date specified by the district court in a court order under section 271(e)(4)(A) of Title 35;

(III) if before the expiration of such period the court grants a preliminary injunction prohibiting the applicant from engaging in the commercial manufacture or sale of the drug until the court decides the issues of patent validity and infringement and if the court decides that such patent is invalid or not infringed, the approval shall be made effective as provided in subclause (I); or

(IV) if before the expiration of such period the court grants a preliminary injunction prohibiting the applicant from engaging in the commercial manufacture or sale of the drug until the court decides the issues of patent

validity and infringement and if the court decides that such patent has been infringed, the approval shall be made effective as provided in subclause (II).

In such an action, each of the parties shall reasonably cooperate in expediting the action.

(iv) 180-day exclusivity period

(I) Effectiveness of application

Subject to subparagraph (D), if the application contains a certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV) and is for a drug for which a first applicant has submitted an application containing such a certification, the application shall be made effective on the date that is 180 days after the date of the first commercial marketing of the drug (including the commercial marketing of the listed drug) by any first applicant.

(II) Definitions

In this paragraph:

(aa) 180-day exclusivity period

The term “180-day exclusivity period” means the 180-day period ending on the day before the date on which an application submitted by an applicant other than a first applicant could become effective under this clause.

(bb) First applicant

As used in this subsection, the term “first applicant” means an applicant that, on the first day on which a substantially complete application containing a certification described in paragraph

(2)(A)(vii)(IV) is submitted for approval of a drug, submits a substantially complete application that contains and lawfully maintains a certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV) for the drug.

(cc) Substantially complete application

As used in this subsection, the term “substantially complete application” means an application under this subsection that on its face is sufficiently complete to permit a substantive review and contains all the information required by paragraph (2)(A).

(dd) Tentative approval

(AA) In general

The term “tentative approval” means notification to an applicant by the Secretary that an application under this subsection meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(A), but cannot receive effective approval because the application does not meet the requirements of this subparagraph, there is a period of exclusivity for the listed drug under subparagraph (F) or section 355a of this title, or there is a 7-year period of exclusivity for the listed drug under section 360cc of this title.

(BB) Limitation

A drug that is granted tentative approval by the Secretary is not an approved drug and shall not have an effective approval until the Secretary issues an approval after any necessary additional review of the application.

(v) 180-day exclusivity period for competitive generic therapies

(I) Effectiveness of application

Subject to subparagraph (D)(iv), if the application is for a drug that is the same as a competitive generic therapy for which any first approved applicant has commenced commercial marketing, the application shall be made effective on the date that is 180 days after the date of the first commercial marketing of the competitive generic therapy (including the commercial marketing of the listed drug) by any first approved applicant.

(II) Limitation

The exclusivity period under subclause (I) shall not apply with respect to a competitive generic therapy that has previously received an exclusivity period under subclause (I).

(III) Definitions

In this clause and subparagraph (D)(iv):

(aa) The term “competitive generic therapy” means a drug--

(AA) that is designated as a competitive generic therapy under section 356h of this title; and

(BB) for which there are no unexpired patents or exclusivities on the list of products described in section 355(j)(7)(A) of this title at the time of submission.

(bb) The term “first approved applicant” means any applicant that has submitted an application that--

(AA) is for a competitive generic therapy that is approved on the first day on which any application for such competitive generic therapy is approved;

(BB) is not eligible for a 180-day exclusivity period under clause (iv) for the drug that is the subject of the application for the competitive generic therapy; and

(CC) is not for a drug for which all drug versions have forfeited eligibility for a 180-day exclusivity period under clause (iv) pursuant to subparagraph (D).

(C) Civil action to obtain patent certainty

(i) Declaratory judgment absent infringement action

(I) In general

No action may be brought under section 2201 of Title 28 by an applicant under paragraph (2) for a declaratory judgment with respect to a patent which is the subject of the certification referred to in subparagraph (B)(iii) unless--

(aa) the 45-day period referred to in such subparagraph has expired;

(bb) neither the owner of such patent nor the holder of the approved application under subsection (b) for the drug that is claimed by the patent or a use of which is claimed by the patent brought a civil action against the applicant for infringement of the patent before the expiration of such period; and

(cc) in any case in which the notice provided under paragraph (2)(B) relates to noninfringement, the notice was accompanied by a document described in subclause (III).

(II) Filing of civil action

If the conditions described in items (aa), (bb), and as applicable, (cc) of subclause (I) have been met, the applicant referred to in such subclause may, in accordance with section 2201 of Title 28, bring a civil action under such section against the owner or holder referred to in such subclause (but not against any owner or holder that has brought such a civil action against the applicant, unless that civil action was dismissed without prejudice) for a declaratory judgment that the patent is invalid or will not be infringed by the drug for which the applicant seeks approval, except that such civil action may be brought for a declaratory judgment that the patent will not be infringed only in a case in which the condition described in subclause (I)(cc) is applicable. A civil action referred to in this subclause shall be brought in the judicial district where the defendant has its principal place of business or a regular and established place of business.

(III) Offer of confidential access to application

For purposes of subclause (I)(cc), the document described in this subclause is a document providing an offer of confidential access to the application that is in the custody of the applicant under paragraph (2) for the purpose of determining whether an action referred to in subparagraph (B)(iii) should be brought. The document providing the offer of confidential access shall contain such restrictions as to persons

entitled to access, and on the use and disposition of any information accessed, as would apply had a protective order been entered for the purpose of protecting trade secrets and other confidential business information. A request for access to an application under an offer of confidential access shall be considered acceptance of the offer of confidential access with the restrictions as to persons entitled to access, and on the use and disposition of any information accessed, contained in the offer of confidential access, and those restrictions and other terms of the offer of confidential access shall be considered terms of an enforceable contract. Any person provided an offer of confidential access shall review the application for the sole and limited purpose of evaluating possible infringement of the patent that is the subject of the certification under paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV) and for no other purpose, and may not disclose information of no relevance to any issue of patent infringement to any person other than a person provided an offer of confidential access. Further, the application may be redacted by the applicant to remove any information of no relevance to any issue of patent infringement.

(ii) Counterclaim to infringement action

(I) In general

If an owner of the patent or the holder of the approved application under subsection (b) for the drug that is claimed by the patent or a use of which is claimed by the patent brings a patent infringement action against the applicant, the applicant may assert a counterclaim seeking an order requiring the holder to correct or delete the patent information submitted by

the holder under subsection (b) or (c) on the ground that the patent does not claim either--

(aa) the drug for which the application was approved; or

(bb) an approved method of using the drug.

(II) No independent cause of action

Subclause (I) does not authorize the assertion of a claim described in subclause (I) in any civil action or proceeding other than a counterclaim described in subclause (I).

(iii) No damages

An applicant shall not be entitled to damages in a civil action under clause (i) or a counterclaim under clause (ii).

(D) Forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity period

(i) Definition of forfeiture event

In this subparagraph, the term “forfeiture event”, with respect to an application under this subsection, means the occurrence of any of the following:

(I) Failure to market

The first applicant fails to market the drug by the later of--

(aa) the earlier of the date that is--

(AA) 75 days after the date on which the approval of the application of the first applicant is made effective under subparagraph (B)(iii); or

(BB) 30 months after the date of submission of the application of the first applicant; or

(bb) with respect to the first applicant or any other applicant (which other applicant has received tentative approval), the date that is 75 days after the date as of which, as to each of the patents with respect to which the first applicant submitted and lawfully maintained a certification qualifying the first applicant for the 180-day exclusivity period under subparagraph (B)(iv), at least 1 of the following has occurred:

(AA) In an infringement action brought against that applicant with respect to the patent or in a declaratory judgment action brought by that applicant with respect to the patent, a court enters a final decision from which no appeal (other than a petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari) has been or can be taken that the patent is invalid or not infringed.

(BB) In an infringement action or a declaratory judgment action described in subitem (AA), a court signs a settlement order or consent decree that enters a final judgment that includes a finding that the patent is invalid or not infringed.

(CC) The patent information submitted under subsection (b) or (c) is withdrawn by the holder of the application approved under subsection (b).

(II) Withdrawal of application

The first applicant withdraws the application or the Secretary considers the application to have been withdrawn as a result of a determination by the

Secretary that the application does not meet the requirements for approval under paragraph (4).

(III) Amendment of certification

The first applicant amends or withdraws the certification for all of the patents with respect to which that applicant submitted a certification qualifying the applicant for the 180-day exclusivity period.

(IV) Failure to obtain tentative approval

The first applicant fails to obtain tentative approval of the application within 30 months after the date on which the application is filed, unless the failure is caused by a change in or a review of the requirements for approval of the application imposed after the date on which the application is filed.

(V) Agreement with another applicant, the listed drug application holder, or a patent owner

The first applicant enters into an agreement with another applicant under this subsection for the drug, the holder of the application for the listed drug, or an owner of the patent that is the subject of the certification under paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV), the Federal Trade Commission or the Attorney General files a complaint, and there is a final decision of the Federal Trade Commission or the court with regard to the complaint from which no appeal (other than a petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari) has been or can be taken that the agreement has violated the antitrust laws (as defined in section 12 of Title 15, except that the term includes section 45 of

Title 15 to the extent that that section applies to unfair methods of competition).

(VI) Expiration of all patents

All of the patents as to which the applicant submitted a certification qualifying it for the 180-day exclusivity period have expired.

(ii) Forfeiture

The 180-day exclusivity period described in subparagraph (B)(iv) shall be forfeited by a first applicant if a forfeiture event occurs with respect to that first applicant.

(iii) Subsequent applicant

If all first applicants forfeit the 180-day exclusivity period under clause (ii)--

(I) approval of any application containing a certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV) shall be made effective in accordance with subparagraph (B)(iii); and

(II) no applicant shall be eligible for a 180-day exclusivity period.

(iv) Special forfeiture rule for competitive generic therapy

The 180-day exclusivity period described in subparagraph (B)(v) shall be forfeited by a first approved applicant if the applicant fails to market the competitive generic therapy within 75 days after the date on which the approval of the first approved applicant's application for the competitive generic therapy is made effective.

(E) If the Secretary decides to disapprove an application, the Secretary shall give the applicant notice of an opportunity for a hearing before the Secretary on the question of whether such application is approvable. If the applicant elects to accept the opportunity for hearing by written request within thirty days after such notice, such hearing shall commence not more than ninety days after the expiration of such thirty days unless the Secretary and the applicant otherwise agree. Any such hearing shall thereafter be conducted on an expedited basis and the Secretary's order thereon shall be issued within ninety days after the date fixed by the Secretary for filing final briefs.

(F)(i) Repealed. Pub.L. 117-9, § 1(b)(1)(B), Apr. 23, 2021, 135 Stat. 258

(ii) If an application submitted under subsection (b) for a drug, no active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) of which has been approved in any other application under subsection (b), is approved after September 24, 1984, no application may be submitted under this subsection which refers to the drug for which the subsection (b) application was submitted before the expiration of five years from the date of the approval of the application under subsection (b), except that such an application may be submitted under this subsection after the expiration of four years from the date of the approval of the subsection (b) application if it contains a certification of patent invalidity or noninfringement described in subclause (IV) of paragraph (2)(A)(vii). The approval of such an application shall be made effective in accordance with

subparagraph (B) except that, if an action for patent infringement is commenced during the one-year period beginning forty-eight months after the date of the approval of the subsection (b) application, the thirty-month period referred to in subparagraph (B)(iii) shall be extended by such amount of time (if any) which is required for seven and one-half years to have elapsed from the date of approval of the subsection (b) application.

(iii) If an application submitted under subsection (b) for a drug, which includes an active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) that has been approved in another application approved under subsection (b), is approved after September 24, 1984, and if such application contains reports of new clinical investigations (other than bioavailability studies) essential to the approval of the application and conducted or sponsored by the applicant, the Secretary may not make the approval of an application submitted under this subsection for the conditions of approval of such drug in the subsection (b) application effective before the expiration of three years from the date of the approval of the application under subsection (b) for such drug.

(iv) If a supplement to an application approved under subsection (b) is approved after September 24, 1984, and the supplement contains reports of new clinical investigations (other than bioavailability studies) essential to the approval of the supplement and conducted or sponsored by the person submitting the supplement, the Secretary may not make the approval of an application submitted under this subsection for a change approved in the supplement

effective before the expiration of three years from the date of the approval of the supplement under subsection (b).

(v) If an application (or supplement to an application) submitted under subsection (b) for a drug, which includes an active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) that has been approved in another application under subsection (b), was approved during the period beginning January 1, 1982, and ending on September 24, 1984, the Secretary may not make the approval of an application submitted under this subsection which refers to the drug for which the subsection (b) application was submitted or which refers to a change approved in a supplement to the subsection (b) application effective before the expiration of two years from September 24, 1984.

(6) If a drug approved under this subsection refers in its approved application to a drug the approval of which was withdrawn or suspended for grounds described in the first sentence of subsection (e) or was withdrawn or suspended under this paragraph or which, as determined by the Secretary, has been withdrawn from sale for safety or effectiveness reasons, the approval of the drug under this subsection shall be withdrawn or suspended--

(A) for the same period as the withdrawal or suspension under subsection (e) or this paragraph, or

(B) if the listed drug has been withdrawn from sale, for the period of withdrawal from sale or, if earlier, the period ending on the date the Secretary

determines that the withdrawal from sale is not for safety or effectiveness reasons.

(7)(A)(i) Within sixty days of September 24, 1984, the Secretary shall publish and make available to the public--

(I) a list in alphabetical order of the official and proprietary name of each drug which has been approved for safety and effectiveness under subsection (c) before September 24, 1984;

(II) the date of approval if the drug is approved after 1981 and the number of the application which was approved; and

(III) whether in vitro or in vivo bioequivalence studies, or both such studies, are required for applications filed under this subsection which will refer to the drug published.

(ii) Every thirty days after the publication of the first list under clause (i) the Secretary shall revise the list to include each drug which has been approved for safety and effectiveness under subsection (c) or approved under this subsection during the thirty-day period.

(iii) When patent information submitted under subsection (c) respecting a drug included on the list is to be published by the Secretary, the Secretary shall, in revisions made under clause (ii), include such information for such drug.

(iv) For each drug included on the list, the Secretary shall specify any exclusivity period that is applicable, for which the Secretary has determined the

expiration date, and for which such period has not yet expired, under--

- (I) clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of subsection (c)(3)(E);
- (II) clause (iv) or (v) of paragraph (5)(B);
- (III) clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (5)(F);
- (IV) section 355a of this title;
- (V) section 355f of this title;
- (VI) section 360cc(a) of this title; or
- (VII) subsection (u).

(v)(I) With respect to an application submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(2) for a drug that is subject to section 353(b) of this title for which the sole difference from a listed drug relied upon in the application is a difference in inactive ingredients not permitted under clause (iii) or (iv) of section 314.94(a)(9) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), the Secretary shall make an evaluation with respect to whether such drug is a therapeutic equivalent (as defined in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) to another approved drug product in the prescription drug product section of the list under this paragraph as follows:

- (aa) With respect to such an application submitted after December 29, 2022, the evaluation shall be made with respect to a listed drug relied upon in the application pursuant to subsection (b)(2) that is a pharmaceutical equivalent (as defined in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) to the drug in the

application pursuant to subsection (b)(2) at the time of approval of such application or not later than 180 days after the date of such approval, provided that the request for such an evaluation is made in the original application (or in a resubmission to a complete response letter), and all necessary data and information are submitted in the original application (or in a resubmission in response to a complete response letter) for the therapeutic equivalence evaluation, including information to demonstrate bioequivalence, in a form and manner prescribed by the Secretary.

(bb) With respect to such an application approved prior to or on December 29, 2022, the evaluation shall be made not later than 180 days after receipt of a request for a therapeutic equivalence evaluation submitted as part of a supplement to such application; or with respect to an application that was submitted prior to December 29, 2022, but not approved as of December 29, 2022, the evaluation shall be made not later than 180 days after the date of approval of such application if a request for such evaluation is submitted as an amendment to the application, provided that--

(AA) such request for a therapeutic equivalence evaluation is being sought with respect to a listed drug relied upon in the application, and the relied upon listed drug is in the prescription drug product section of the list under this paragraph and is a pharmaceutical equivalent (as defined in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) to the drug for which a therapeutic equivalence evaluation is sought; and

(BB) the amendment or supplement, as applicable, containing such request, or the relevant application, includes all necessary data and information for the therapeutic equivalence evaluation, including information to demonstrate bioequivalence, in a form and manner prescribed by the Secretary.

(II) When the Secretary makes an evaluation under subclause (I), the Secretary shall, in revisions made to the list pursuant to clause (ii), include such information for such drug.

(B) A drug approved for safety and effectiveness under subsection (c) or approved under this subsection shall, for purposes of this subsection, be considered to have been published under subparagraph (A) on the date of its approval or September 24, 1984, whichever is later.

(C) If the approval of a drug was withdrawn or suspended for grounds described in the first sentence of subsection (e) or was withdrawn or suspended under paragraph (6) or if the Secretary determines that a drug has been withdrawn from sale for safety or effectiveness reasons, it may not be published in the list under subparagraph (A) or, if the withdrawal or suspension occurred after its publication in such list, it shall be immediately removed from such list--

(i) for the same period as the withdrawal or suspension under subsection (e) or paragraph (6),
or

(ii) if the listed drug has been withdrawn from sale, for the period of withdrawal from sale or, if earlier, the period ending on the date the Secretary

determines that the withdrawal from sale is not for safety or effectiveness reasons.

A notice of the removal shall be published in the Federal Register.

(D) In the case of a listed drug for which the list under subparagraph (A)(i) includes a patent for such drug, and any claim of the patent has been cancelled or invalidated pursuant to a final decision issued by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office or by a court, from which no appeal has been, or can be, taken, if the holder of the applicable application approved under subsection (c) determines that a patent for such drug, or any patent information for such drug, no longer meets the listing requirements under this section--

(i) the holder of such approved application shall notify the Secretary, in writing, within 14 days of such decision of such cancellation or invalidation and request that such patent or patent information, as applicable, be amended or withdrawn in accordance with the decision issued by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board or a court;

(ii) the holder of such approved application shall include in any notification under clause (i) information related to such patent cancellation or invalidation decision and submit such information, including a copy of such decision, to the Secretary; and

(iii) the Secretary shall, in response to a notification under clause (i), amend or remove patent or patent information in accordance with the relevant decision from the Patent Trial and

Appeals Board or court, as applicable, except that the Secretary shall not remove from the list any patent or patent information before the expiration of any 180-day exclusivity period under paragraph (5)(B)(iv) that relies on a certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(vii)(IV).

(8) For purposes of this subsection:

(A)(i) The term “bioavailability” means the rate and extent to which the active ingredient or therapeutic ingredient is absorbed from a drug and becomes available at the site of drug action.

(ii) For a drug that is not intended to be absorbed into the bloodstream, the Secretary may assess bioavailability by scientifically valid measurements intended to reflect the rate and extent to which the active ingredient or therapeutic ingredient becomes available at the site of drug action.

(B) A drug shall be considered to be bioequivalent to a listed drug if--

(i) the rate and extent of absorption of the drug do not show a significant difference from the rate and extent of absorption of the listed drug when administered at the same molar dose of the therapeutic ingredient under similar experimental conditions in either a single dose or multiple doses; or

(ii) the extent of absorption of the drug does not show a significant difference from the extent of absorption of the listed drug when administered at the same molar dose of the therapeutic ingredient under similar experimental conditions in either a single dose or multiple doses and the difference

from the listed drug in the rate of absorption of the drug is intentional, is reflected in its proposed labeling, is not essential to the attainment of effective body drug concentrations on chronic use, and is considered medically insignificant for the drug.

(C) For a drug that is not intended to be absorbed into the bloodstream, the Secretary may establish alternative, scientifically valid methods to show bioequivalence if the alternative methods are expected to detect a significant difference between the drug and the listed drug in safety and therapeutic effect.

(9) The Secretary shall, with respect to each application submitted under this subsection, maintain a record of--

(A) the name of the applicant,

(B) the name of the drug covered by the application,

(C) the name of each person to whom the review of the chemistry of the application was assigned and the date of such assignment, and

(D) the name of each person to whom the bioequivalence review for such application was assigned and the date of such assignment.

The information the Secretary is required to maintain under this paragraph with respect to an application submitted under this subsection shall be made available to the public after the approval of such application.

(10)(A) If the proposed labeling of a drug that is the subject of an application under this subsection differs from the listed drug due to a labeling revision described under clause (i), the drug that is the subject of such application shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, be eligible for approval and shall not be considered misbranded under section 352 of this title if--

(i) a revision to the labeling of the listed drug has been approved by the Secretary within 90 days of when the application is otherwise eligible for approval under this subsection;

(ii) the sponsor of the application agrees to submit revised labeling for the drug that is the subject of the application not later than 60 days after approval under this subsection of the application;

(iii) the labeling revision described under clause (i) does not include a change to the “Warnings” section of the labeling; and

(iv) such application otherwise meets the applicable requirements for approval under this subsection.

(B) If, after a labeling revision described in subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary determines that the continued presence in interstate commerce of the labeling of the listed drug (as in effect before the revision described in subparagraph (A)(i)) adversely impacts the safe use of the drug, no application under this subsection shall be eligible for approval with such labeling.

(11)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall prioritize the review of, and act within 8 months

of the date of the submission of, an original abbreviated new drug application submitted for review under this subsection that is for a drug--

(i) for which there are not more than 3 approved drug products listed under paragraph (7) and for which there are no blocking patents and exclusivities; or

(ii) that has been included on the list under section 356e of this title.

(B) To qualify for priority review under this paragraph, not later than 60 days prior to the submission of an application described in subparagraph (A) or that the Secretary may prioritize pursuant to subparagraph (D), the applicant shall provide complete, accurate information regarding facilities involved in manufacturing processes and testing of the drug that is the subject of the application, including facilities in corresponding Type II active pharmaceutical ingredients drug master files referenced in an application and sites or organizations involved in bioequivalence and clinical studies used to support the application, to enable the Secretary to make a determination regarding whether an inspection of a facility is necessary. Such information shall include the relevant (as determined by the Secretary) sections of such application, which shall be unchanged relative to the date of the submission of such application, except to the extent that a change is made to such information to exclude a facility that was not used to generate data to meet any application requirements for such submission and that is not the only facility intended to conduct one or more unit operations in commercial production.

Information provided by an applicant under this subparagraph shall not be considered the submission of an application under this subsection.

(C) The Secretary may expedite an inspection or reinspection under section 374 of this title of an establishment that proposes to manufacture a drug described in subparagraph (A).

(D) Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent the Secretary from prioritizing the review of other applications as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(12) The Secretary shall publish on the internet website of the Food and Drug Administration, and update at least once every 6 months, a list of all drugs approved under subsection (c) for which all patents and periods of exclusivity under this chapter have expired and for which no application has been approved under this subsection.

(13) Upon the request of an applicant regarding one or more specified pending applications under this subsection, the Secretary shall, as appropriate, provide review status updates indicating the categorical status of the applications by each relevant review discipline.

(k) Records and reports; required information; regulations and orders; access to records

(1) In the case of any drug for which an approval of an application filed under subsection (b) or (j) is in effect, the applicant shall establish and maintain such records, and make such reports to the Secretary, of data relating to clinical experience and other data or information, received or otherwise obtained by such applicant with respect to such drug, as the

Secretary may by general regulation, or by order with respect to such application, prescribe on the basis of a finding that such records and reports are necessary in order to enable the Secretary to determine, or facilitate a determination, whether there is or may be ground for invoking subsection (e). Regulations and orders issued under this subsection and under subsection (i) shall have due regard for the professional ethics of the medical profession and the interests of patients and shall provide, where the Secretary deems it to be appropriate, for the examination, upon request, by the persons to whom such regulations or orders are applicable, of similar information received or otherwise obtained by the Secretary.

(2) Every person required under this section to maintain records, and every person in charge or custody thereof, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at all reasonable times to have access to and copy and verify such records.

(3) Active postmarket risk identification

(A) Definition

In this paragraph, the term “data” refers to information with respect to a drug approved under this section or under section 262 of Title 42, including claims data, patient survey data, standardized analytic files that allow for the pooling and analysis of data from disparate data environments, and any other data deemed appropriate by the Secretary.

(B) Development of postmarket risk identification and analysis methods

The Secretary shall, not later than 2 years after September 27, 2007, in collaboration with public, academic, and private entities--

(i) develop methods to obtain access to disparate data sources including the data sources specified in subparagraph (C);

(ii) develop validated methods for the establishment of a postmarket risk identification and analysis system to link and analyze safety data from multiple sources, with the goals of including, in aggregate--

(I) at least 25,000,000 patients by July 1, 2010; and

(II) at least 100,000,000 patients by July 1, 2012; and

(iii) convene a committee of experts, including individuals who are recognized in the field of protecting data privacy and security, to make recommendations to the Secretary on the development of tools and methods for the ethical and scientific uses for, and communication of, post-marketing data specified under subparagraph (C), including recommendations on the development of effective research methods for the study of drug safety questions.

(C) Establishment of the postmarket risk identification and analysis system

(i) In general

The Secretary shall, not later than 1 year after the development of the risk identification and analysis

methods under subparagraph (B), establish and maintain procedures--

(I) for risk identification and analysis based on electronic health data, in compliance with the regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and in a manner that does not disclose individually identifiable health information in violation of paragraph (4)(B);

(II) for the reporting (in a standardized form) of data on all serious adverse drug experiences (as defined in section 355-1(b) of this title) submitted to the Secretary under paragraph (1), and those adverse events submitted by patients, providers, and drug sponsors, when appropriate;

(III) to provide for active adverse event surveillance using the following data sources, as available:

(aa) Federal health-related electronic data (such as data from the Medicare program and the health systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs);

(bb) private sector health-related electronic data (such as pharmaceutical purchase data and health insurance claims data); and

(cc) other data as the Secretary deems necessary to create a robust system to identify adverse events and potential drug safety signals;

(IV) to identify certain trends and patterns with respect to data accessed by the system;

(V) to provide regular reports to the Secretary concerning adverse event trends, adverse event patterns, incidence and prevalence of adverse events, and other information the Secretary determines appropriate, which may include data on comparative national adverse event trends; and

(VI) to enable the program to export data in a form appropriate for further aggregation, statistical analysis, and reporting.

(ii) Timeliness of reporting

The procedures established under clause (i) shall ensure that such data are accessed, analyzed, and reported in a timely, routine, and systematic manner, taking into consideration the need for data completeness, coding, cleansing, and standardized analysis and transmission.

(iii) Private sector resources

To ensure the establishment of the active postmarket risk identification and analysis system under this subsection not later than 1 year after the development of the risk identification and analysis methods under subparagraph (B), as required under clause (i), the Secretary may, on a temporary or permanent basis, implement systems or products developed by private entities.

(iv) Complementary approaches

To the extent the active postmarket risk identification and analysis system under this subsection is not sufficient to gather data and information relevant to a priority drug safety question, the Secretary shall develop, support, and participate in complementary

approaches to gather and analyze such data and information, including--

(I) approaches that are complementary with respect to assessing the safety of use of a drug in domestic populations not included, or under-represented, in the trials used to approve the drug (such as older people, people with comorbidities, pregnant women, or children); and

(II) existing approaches such as the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System and the Vaccine Safety Datalink or successor databases.

(v) Authority for contracts

The Secretary may enter into contracts with public and private entities to fulfill the requirements of this subparagraph.

(4) Advanced analysis of drug safety data

(A) Purpose

The Secretary shall establish collaborations with public, academic, and private entities, which may include the Centers for Education and Research on Therapeutics under section 299b-1 of Title 42, to provide for advanced analysis of drug safety data described in paragraph (3)(C) and other information that is publicly available or is provided by the Secretary, in order to--

(i) improve the quality and efficiency of postmarket drug safety risk-benefit analysis;

(ii) provide the Secretary with routine access to outside expertise to study advanced drug safety questions; and

(iii) enhance the ability of the Secretary to make timely assessments based on drug safety data.

(B) Privacy

Such analysis shall not disclose individually identifiable health information when presenting such drug safety signals and trends or when responding to inquiries regarding such drug safety signals and trends.

(C) Public process for priority questions

At least biannually, the Secretary shall seek recommendations from the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee (or any successor committee) and from other advisory committees, as appropriate, to the Food and Drug Administration on-

- (i) priority drug safety questions; and
- (ii) mechanisms for answering such questions, including through--
 - (I) active risk identification under paragraph (3); and
 - (II) when such risk identification is not sufficient, postapproval studies and clinical trials under subsection (o)(3).

(D) Procedures for the development of drug safety collaborations

(i) In general

Not later than 180 days after the date of the establishment of the active postmarket risk identification and analysis system under this subsection, the Secretary shall establish and implement procedures under

which the Secretary may routinely contract with one or more qualified entities to--

(I) classify, analyze, or aggregate data described in paragraph (3)(C) and information that is publicly available or is provided by the Secretary;

(II) allow for prompt investigation of priority drug safety questions, including--

(aa) unresolved safety questions for drugs or classes of drugs; and

(bb) for a newly-approved drugs,² safety signals from clinical trials used to approve the drug and other preapproval trials; rare, serious drug side effects; and the safety of use in domestic populations not included, or underrepresented, in the trials used to approve the drug (such as older people, people with comorbidities, pregnant women, or children);

(III) perform advanced research and analysis on identified drug safety risks;

(IV) focus postapproval studies and clinical trials under subsection (o)(3) more effectively on cases for which reports under paragraph (1) and other safety signal detection is not sufficient to resolve whether there is an elevated risk of a serious adverse event associated with the use of a drug; and

(V) carry out other activities as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this paragraph.

(ii) Request for specific methodology

² So in original. Probably should be “drug.”

The procedures described in clause (i) shall permit the Secretary to request that a specific methodology be used by the qualified entity. The qualified entity shall work with the Secretary to finalize the methodology to be used.

(E) Use of analyses

The Secretary shall provide the analyses described in this paragraph, including the methods and results of such analyses, about a drug to the sponsor or sponsors of such drug.

(F) Qualified entities

(i) In general

The Secretary shall enter into contracts with a sufficient number of qualified entities to develop and provide information to the Secretary in a timely manner.

(ii) Qualification

The Secretary shall enter into a contract with an entity under clause (i) only if the Secretary determines that the entity has a significant presence in the United States and has one or more of the following qualifications:

(I) The research, statistical, epidemiologic, or clinical capability and expertise to conduct and complete the activities under this paragraph, including the capability and expertise to provide the Secretary de-identified data consistent with the requirements of this subsection.

(II) An information technology infrastructure in place to support electronic data and operational standards to provide security for such data.

(III) Experience with, and expertise on, the development of drug safety and effectiveness research using electronic population data.

(IV) An understanding of drug development or risk/benefit balancing in a clinical setting.

(V) Other expertise which the Secretary deems necessary to fulfill the activities under this paragraph.

(G) Contract requirements

Each contract with a qualified entity under subparagraph (F)(i) shall contain the following requirements:

(i) Ensuring privacy

The qualified entity shall ensure that the entity will not use data under this subsection in a manner that-

-

(I) violates the regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996;

(II) violates sections 552 or 552a of Title 5 with regard to the privacy of individually-identifiable beneficiary health information; or

(III) discloses individually identifiable health information when presenting drug safety signals and trends or when responding to inquiries regarding drug safety signals and trends.

Nothing in this clause prohibits lawful disclosure for other purposes.

(ii) Component of another organization

If a qualified entity is a component of another organization--

(I) the qualified entity shall establish appropriate security measures to maintain the confidentiality and privacy of such data; and

(II) the entity shall not make an unauthorized disclosure of such data to the other components of the organization in breach of such confidentiality and privacy requirement.

(iii) Termination or nonrenewal

If a contract with a qualified entity under this subparagraph is terminated or not renewed, the following requirements shall apply:

(I) Confidentiality and privacy protections

The entity shall continue to comply with the confidentiality and privacy requirements under this paragraph with respect to all data disclosed to the entity.

(II) Disposition of data

The entity shall return any data disclosed to such entity under this subsection to which it would not otherwise have access or, if returning the data is not practicable, destroy the data.

(H) Competitive procedures

The Secretary shall use competitive procedures (as defined in section 132 of Title 41) to enter into contracts under subparagraph (G).

(I) Review of contract in the event of a merger or acquisition

The Secretary shall review the contract with a qualified entity under this paragraph in the event of a merger or acquisition of the entity in order to ensure that the requirements under this paragraph will continue to be met.

(J) Coordination

In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall provide for appropriate communications to the public, scientific, public health, and medical communities, and other key stakeholders, and to the extent practicable shall coordinate with the activities of private entities, professional associations, or other entities that may have sources of drug safety data.

(5) The Secretary shall--

(A) conduct regular screenings of the Adverse Event Reporting System database and post a quarterly report on the Adverse Event Reporting System Web site of any new safety information or potential signal of a serious risk identified by Adverse³ Event Reporting System within the last quarter; and⁴

(B) on an annual basis, review the entire backlog of postmarket safety commitments to determine which commitments require revision or should be eliminated, report to the Congress on these determinations, and assign start dates and estimated completion dates for such commitments; and

(C) make available on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration--

³ So in original. Probably should be preceded by “the”.

⁴ So in original. The word “and” probably should not appear.

- (i) guidelines, developed with input from experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs, that detail best practices for drug safety surveillance using the Adverse Event Reporting System; and
- (ii) criteria for public posting of adverse event signals.

(l) Public disclosure of safety and effectiveness data and action package

(1) Safety and effectiveness data and information which has been submitted in an application under subsection (b) for a drug and which has not previously been disclosed to the public shall be made available to the public, upon request, unless extraordinary circumstances are shown--

- (A) if no work is being or will be undertaken to have the application approved,
- (B) if the Secretary has determined that the application is not approvable and all legal appeals have been exhausted,
- (C) if approval of the application under subsection (c) is withdrawn and all legal appeals have been exhausted,
- (D) if the Secretary has determined that such drug is not a new drug, or
- (E) upon the effective date of the approval of the first application under subsection (j) which refers to such drug or upon the date upon which the approval of an application under subsection (j) which refers to such drug could be made effective if such an application had been submitted.

(2) Action package for approval

(A) Action package

The Secretary shall publish the action package for approval of an application under subsection (b) or section 262 of Title 42 on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration--

(i) not later than 30 days after the date of approval of such applications--

(I) for a drug, no active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) of which has been approved in any other application under this section; or

(II) for a biological product, no active ingredient of which has been approved in any other application under section 262 of Title 42; and

(ii) not later than 30 days after the third request for such action package for approval received under section 552 of Title 5 for any other drug or biological product.

(B) Immediate publication of summary review

Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall publish, on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration, the materials described in subparagraph (C)(iv) not later than 48 hours after the date of approval of the drug, except where such materials require redaction by the Secretary.

(C) Contents

An action package for approval of an application under subparagraph (A) shall be dated and shall include the following:

(i) Documents generated by the Food and Drug Administration related to review of the application.

(ii) Documents pertaining to the format and content of the application generated during drug development.

(iii) Labeling submitted by the applicant.

(iv) A summary review that documents conclusions from all reviewing disciplines about the drug, noting any critical issues and disagreements with the applicant and within the review team and how they were resolved, recommendations for action, and an explanation of any nonconcurrency with review conclusions.

(v) The Division Director and Office Director's decision document which includes--

(I) a brief statement of concurrence with the summary review;

(II) a separate review or addendum to the review if disagreeing with the summary review; and

(III) a separate review or addendum to the review to add further analysis.

(vi) Identification by name of each officer or employee of the Food and Drug Administration who--

(I) participated in the decision to approve the application; and

(II) consents to have his or her name included in the package.

(D) Review

A scientific review of an application is considered the work of the reviewer and shall not be altered by management or the reviewer once final.

(E) Confidential information

This paragraph does not authorize the disclosure of any trade secret, confidential commercial or financial information, or other matter listed in section 552(b) of Title 5.

(m) “Patent” defined

For purposes of this section, the term “patent” means a patent issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(n) Scientific advisory panels

(1) For the purpose of providing expert scientific advice and recommendations to the Secretary regarding a clinical investigation of a drug or the approval for marketing of a drug under this section or section 262 of Title 42, the Secretary shall establish panels of experts or use panels of experts established before November 21, 1997, or both.

(2) The Secretary may delegate the appointment and oversight authority granted under section 394 of this title to a director of a center or successor entity within the Food and Drug Administration.

(3) The Secretary shall make appointments to each panel established under paragraph (1) so that each panel shall consist of--

(A) members who are qualified by training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the drugs to be referred to the panel and who, to the extent feasible, possess skill and experience in the development, manufacture, or utilization of such drugs;

(B) members with diverse expertise in such fields as clinical and administrative medicine, pharmacy, pharmacology, pharmacoeconomics, biological and physical sciences, and other related professions;

(C) a representative of consumer interests, and a representative of interests of the drug manufacturing industry not directly affected by the matter to be brought before the panel; and

(D) two or more members who are specialists or have other expertise in the particular disease or condition for which the drug under review is proposed to be indicated.

Scientific, trade, and consumer organizations shall be afforded an opportunity to nominate individuals for appointment to the panels. No individual who is in the regular full-time employ of the United States and engaged in the administration of this chapter may be a voting member of any panel. The Secretary shall designate one of the members of each panel to serve as chairman thereof.

(4) The Secretary shall, as appropriate, provide education and training to each new panel member before such member participates in a panel's

activities, including education regarding requirements under this chapter and related regulations of the Secretary, and the administrative processes and procedures related to panel meetings.

(5) Panel members (other than officers or employees of the United States), while attending meetings or conferences of a panel or otherwise engaged in its business, shall be entitled to receive compensation for each day so engaged, including traveltime, at rates to be fixed by the Secretary, but not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate in effect for positions classified above grade GS-15 of the General Schedule. While serving away from their homes or regular places of business, panel members may be allowed travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of Title 5, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(6) The Secretary shall ensure that scientific advisory panels meet regularly and at appropriate intervals so that any matter to be reviewed by such a panel can be presented to the panel not more than 60 days after the matter is ready for such review. Meetings of the panel may be held using electronic communication to convene the meetings.

(7) Within 90 days after a scientific advisory panel makes recommendations on any matter under its review, the Food and Drug Administration official responsible for the matter shall review the conclusions and recommendations of the panel, and notify the affected persons of the final decision on the matter, or of the reasons that no such decision has been reached. Each such final decision shall be documented including the rationale for the decision.

(o) Postmarket studies and clinical trials; labeling

(1) In general

A responsible person may not introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce the new drug involved if the person is in violation of a requirement established under paragraph (3) or (4) with respect to the drug.

(2) Definitions

For purposes of this subsection:

(A) Responsible person

The term “responsible person” means a person who--

(i) has submitted to the Secretary a covered application that is pending; or

(ii) is the holder of an approved covered application.

(B) Covered application

The term “covered application” means--

(i) an application under subsection (b) for a drug that is subject to section 353(b) of this title; and

(ii) an application under section 262 of Title 42.

(C) New safety information; serious risk

The terms “new safety information”, “serious risk”, and “signal of a serious risk” have the meanings given such terms in section 355-1(b) of this title.

(3) Studies and clinical trials

(A) In general

For any or all of the purposes specified in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may, subject to subparagraph (D), require a responsible person for a drug to conduct a postapproval study or studies of the drug, or a postapproval clinical trial or trials of the drug, on the basis of scientific data deemed appropriate by the Secretary, including information regarding chemically-related or pharmacologically-related drugs.

(B) Purposes of study or clinical trial

The purposes referred to in this subparagraph with respect to a postapproval study or postapproval clinical trial are the following:

- (i) To assess a known serious risk related to the use of the drug involved.
- (ii) To assess signals of serious risk related to the use of the drug.
- (iii) To identify an unexpected serious risk when available data indicates the potential for a serious risk.

(C) Establishment of requirement after approval of covered application

The Secretary may require a postapproval study or studies or postapproval clinical trial or trials for a drug for which an approved covered application is in effect as of the date on which the Secretary seeks to establish such requirement only if the Secretary becomes aware of new safety information.

(D) Determination by Secretary

- (i) **Postapproval studies**

The Secretary may not require the responsible person to conduct a study under this paragraph, unless the Secretary makes a determination that the reports under subsection (k)(1) and the active postmarket risk identification and analysis system as available under subsection (k)(3) will not be sufficient to meet the purposes set forth in subparagraph (B).

(ii) Postapproval clinical trials

The Secretary may not require the responsible person to conduct a clinical trial under this paragraph, unless the Secretary makes a determination that a postapproval study or studies will not be sufficient to meet the purposes set forth in subparagraph (B).

(E) Notification; timetables; periodic reports

(i) Notification

The Secretary shall notify the responsible person regarding a requirement under this paragraph to conduct a postapproval study or clinical trial by the target dates for communication of feedback from the review team to the responsible person regarding proposed labeling and postmarketing study commitments as set forth in the letters described in section 101(c) of the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007.

(ii) Timetable; periodic reports

For each study or clinical trial required to be conducted under this paragraph, the Secretary shall require that the responsible person submit a timetable for completion of the study or clinical

trial. With respect to each study required to be conducted under this paragraph or otherwise undertaken by the responsible person to investigate a safety issue, the Secretary shall require the responsible person to periodically report to the Secretary on the status of such study including whether any difficulties in completing the study have been encountered. With respect to each clinical trial required to be conducted under this paragraph or otherwise undertaken by the responsible person to investigate a safety issue, the Secretary shall require the responsible person to periodically report to the Secretary on the status of such clinical trial including whether enrollment has begun, the number of participants enrolled, the expected completion date, whether any difficulties completing the clinical trial have been encountered, and registration information with respect to the requirements under section 282(j) of Title 42. If the responsible person fails to comply with such timetable or violates any other requirement of this subparagraph, the responsible person shall be considered in violation of this subsection, unless the responsible person demonstrates good cause for such noncompliance or such other violation. The Secretary shall determine what constitutes good cause under the preceding sentence.

(F) Dispute resolution

The responsible person may appeal a requirement to conduct a study or clinical trial under this paragraph using dispute resolution procedures established by the Secretary in regulation and guidance.

(4) Safety labeling changes requested by Secretary

(A) New safety or new effectiveness information

If the Secretary becomes aware of new information, including any new safety information or information related to reduced effectiveness, that the Secretary determines should be included in the labeling of the drug, the Secretary shall promptly notify the responsible person or, if the same drug approved under subsection (b) is not currently marketed, the holder of an approved application under subsection (j).

(B) Response to notification

Following notification pursuant to subparagraph (A), the responsible person or the holder of the approved application under subsection (j) shall within 30 days-

(i) submit a supplement proposing changes to the approved labeling to reflect the new safety information, including changes to boxed warnings, contraindications, warnings, precautions, or adverse reactions, or new effectiveness information; or

(ii) notify the Secretary that the responsible person or the holder of the approved application under subsection (j) does not believe a labeling change is warranted and submit a statement detailing the reasons why such a change is not warranted.

(C) Review

Upon receipt of such supplement, the Secretary shall promptly review and act upon such supplement. If the Secretary disagrees with the proposed changes in the supplement or with the statement setting forth the reasons why no labeling change is necessary, the Secretary shall initiate discussions to reach agreement on whether the labeling for the drug should be modified to reflect the new safety or new effectiveness information, and if so, the contents of such labeling changes.

(D) Discussions

Such discussions shall not extend for more than 30 days after the response to the notification under subparagraph (B), unless the Secretary determines an extension of such discussion period is warranted.

(E) Order

Within 15 days of the conclusion of the discussions under subparagraph (D), the Secretary may issue an order directing the responsible person or the holder of the approved application under subsection (j) to make such a labeling change as the Secretary deems appropriate to address the new safety or new effectiveness information. Within 15 days of such an order, the responsible person or the holder of the approved application under subsection (j) shall submit a supplement containing the labeling change.

(F) Dispute resolution

Within 5 days of receiving an order under subparagraph (E), the responsible person or the holder of the approved application under subsection (j) may appeal using dispute resolution procedures established by the Secretary in regulation and guidance.

(G) Violation

If the responsible person or the holder of the approved application under subsection (j) has not submitted a supplement within 15 days of the date of such order under subparagraph (E), and there is no appeal or dispute resolution proceeding pending, the responsible person or holder shall be considered to be in violation of this subsection. If at the conclusion of any dispute resolution procedures the Secretary determines that a supplement must be submitted and such a supplement is not submitted within 15 days of the date of that determination, the responsible person or holder shall be in violation of this subsection.

(H) Public health threat

Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), if the Secretary concludes that such a labeling change is necessary to protect the public health, the Secretary may accelerate the timelines in such subparagraphs.

(I) Rule of construction

This paragraph shall not be construed to affect the responsibility of the responsible person or the holder of the approved application under subsection (j) to maintain its label in accordance with existing requirements, including subpart B of part 201 and sections 314.70 and 601.12 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(5) Non-delegation

Determinations by the Secretary under this subsection for a drug shall be made by individuals at or above the level of individuals empowered to

approve a drug (such as division directors within the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research).

(p) Risk evaluation and mitigation strategy

(1) In general

A person may not introduce or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce a new drug if--

(A)(i) the application for such drug is approved under subsection (b) or (j) and is subject to section 353(b) of this title; or

(ii) the application for such drug is approved under section 262 of Title 42; and

(B) a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy is required under section 355-1 of this title with respect to the drug and the person fails to maintain compliance with the requirements of the approved strategy or with other requirements under section 355-1 of this title, including requirements regarding assessments of approved strategies.

(2) Certain postmarket studies

The failure to conduct a postmarket study under section 356 of this title, subpart H of part 314, or subpart E of part 601 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), is deemed to be a violation of paragraph (1).

(q) Petitions and civil actions regarding approval of certain applications

(1) In general

(A) Determination

The Secretary shall not delay approval of a pending application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of this section or section 262(k) of Title 42 because of any request to take any form of action relating to the application, either before or during consideration of the request, unless--

- (i) the request is in writing and is a petition submitted to the Secretary pursuant to section 10.30 or 10.35 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations); and
- (ii) the Secretary determines, upon reviewing the petition, that a delay is necessary to protect the public health.

Consideration of the petition shall be separate and apart from review and approval of any application.

(B) Notification

If the Secretary determines under subparagraph (A) that a delay is necessary with respect to an application, the Secretary shall provide to the applicant, not later than 30 days after making such determination, the following information:

- (i) Notification of the fact that a determination under subparagraph (A) has been made.
- (ii) If applicable, any clarification or additional data that the applicant should submit to the docket on the petition to allow the Secretary to review the petition promptly.
- (iii) A brief summary of the specific substantive issues raised in the petition which form the basis of the determination.

(C) Format

The information described in subparagraph (B) shall be conveyed via either, at the discretion of the Secretary--

- (i) a document; or
- (ii) a meeting with the applicant involved.

(D) Public disclosure

Any information conveyed by the Secretary under subparagraph (C) shall be considered part of the application and shall be subject to the disclosure requirements applicable to information in such application.

(E) Denial based on intent to delay

If the Secretary determines that a petition or a supplement to the petition was submitted with the primary purpose of delaying the approval of an application and the petition does not on its face raise valid scientific or regulatory issues, the Secretary may deny the petition at any point based on such determination. The Secretary may issue guidance to describe the factors that will be used to determine under this subparagraph whether a petition is submitted with the primary purpose of delaying the approval of an application.

(F) Final agency action

The Secretary shall take final agency action on a petition not later than 150 days after the date on which the petition is submitted. The Secretary shall not extend such period for any reason, including--

- (i) any determination made under subparagraph (A);

(ii) the submission of comments relating to the petition or supplemental information supplied by the petitioner; or

(iii) the consent of the petitioner.

(G) Extension of 30-month period

If the filing of an application resulted in first-applicant status under subsection (j)(5)(D)(i)(IV) and approval of the application was delayed because of a petition, the 30-month period under such subsection is deemed to be extended by a period of time equal to the period beginning on the date on which the Secretary received the petition and ending on the date of final agency action on the petition (inclusive of such beginning and ending dates), without regard to whether the Secretary grants, in whole or in part, or denies, in whole or in part, the petition.

(H) Certification

The Secretary shall not consider a petition for review unless the party submitting such petition does so in written form and the subject document is signed and contains the following certification: “I certify that, to my best knowledge and belief: (a) this petition includes all information and views upon which the petition relies; (b) this petition includes representative data and/or information known to the petitioner which are unfavorable to the petition; and (c) I have taken reasonable steps to ensure that any representative data and/or information which are unfavorable to the petition were disclosed to me. I further certify that the information upon which I have based the action

requested herein first became known to the party on whose behalf this petition is submitted on or about the following date: _____. If I received or expect to receive payments, including cash and other forms of consideration, to file this information or its contents, I received or expect to receive those payments from the following persons or organizations: _____. I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct as of the date of the submission of this petition.”, with the date on which such information first became known to such party and the names of such persons or organizations inserted in the first and second blank space, respectively.

(I) Verification

The Secretary shall not accept for review any supplemental information or comments on a petition unless the party submitting such information or comments does so in written form and the subject document is signed and contains the following verification: “I certify that, to my best knowledge and belief: (a) I have not intentionally delayed submission of this document or its contents; and (b) the information upon which I have based the action requested herein first became known to me on or about _____. If I received or expect to receive payments, including cash and other forms of consideration, to file this information or its contents, I received or expect to receive those payments from the following persons or organizations: _____. I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct as of the date of the submission of this petition.”, with the date on which such information first became

known to the party and the names of such persons or organizations inserted in the first and second blank space, respectively.

(2) Exhaustion of administrative remedies

(A) Final agency action within 150 days

The Secretary shall be considered to have taken final agency action on a petition if--

(i) during the 150-day period referred to in paragraph (1)(F), the Secretary makes a final decision within the meaning of section 10.45(d) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); or

(ii) such period expires without the Secretary having made such a final decision.

(B) Dismissal of certain civil actions

If a civil action is filed against the Secretary with respect to any issue raised in the petition before the Secretary has taken final agency action on the petition within the meaning of subparagraph (A), the court shall dismiss without prejudice the action for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

(C) Administrative record

For purposes of judicial review related to the approval of an application for which a petition under paragraph (1) was submitted, the administrative record regarding any issue raised by the petition shall include--

(i) the petition filed under paragraph (1) and any supplements and comments thereto;

(ii) the Secretary's response to such petition, if issued; and

(iii) other information, as designated by the Secretary, related to the Secretary's determinations regarding the issues raised in such petition, as long as the information was considered by the agency no later than the date of final agency action as defined under subparagraph (2)(A), and regardless of whether the Secretary responded to the petition at or before the approval of the application at issue in the petition.

(3) Annual report on delays in approvals per petitions

The Secretary shall annually submit to the Congress a report that specifies--

(A) the number of applications that were approved during the preceding 12-month period;

(B) the number of such applications whose effective dates were delayed by petitions referred to in paragraph (1) during such period;

(C) the number of days by which such applications were so delayed; and

(D) the number of such petitions that were submitted during such period.

(4) Exceptions

(A) This subsection does not apply to--

(i) a petition that relates solely to the timing of the approval of an application pursuant to subsection (j)(5)(B)(iv); or

(ii) a petition that is made by the sponsor of an application and that seeks only to have the Secretary take or refrain from taking any form of action with respect to that application.

(B) Paragraph (2) does not apply to a petition addressing issues concerning an application submitted pursuant to section 262(k) of Title 42.

(5) Definitions

(A) Application

For purposes of this subsection, the term “application” means an application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of this section or section 262(k) of Title 42.

(B) Petition

For purposes of this subsection, other than paragraph (1)(A)(i), the term “petition” means a request described in paragraph (1)(A)(i).

(r) Postmarket drug safety information for patients and providers

(1) Establishment

Not later than 1 year after September 27, 2007, the Secretary shall improve the transparency of information about drugs and allow patients and health care providers better access to information about drugs by developing and maintaining an Internet Web site that--

(A) provides links to drug safety information listed in paragraph (2) for prescription drugs that are approved under this section or licensed under section 262 of Title 42; and

(B) improves communication of drug safety information to patients and providers.

(2) Internet Web site

The Secretary shall carry out paragraph (1) by--

(A) developing and maintaining an accessible, consolidated Internet Web site with easily searchable drug safety information, including the information found on United States Government Internet Web sites, such as the United States National Library of Medicine's Daily Med and Medline Plus Web sites, in addition to other such Web sites maintained by the Secretary;

(B) ensuring that the information provided on the Internet Web site is comprehensive and includes, when available and appropriate--

(i) patient labeling and patient packaging inserts;

(ii) a link to a list of each drug, whether approved under this section or licensed under such section 262, for which a Medication Guide, as provided for under part 208 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), is required;

(iii) a link to the registry and results data bank provided for under subsections (i) and (j) of section 282 of Title 42;

(iv) the most recent safety information and alerts issued by the Food and Drug Administration for drugs approved by the Secretary under this section, such as product recalls, warning letters, and import alerts;

- (v) publicly available information about implemented RiskMAPs and risk evaluation and mitigation strategies under subsection (o);
 - (vi) guidance documents and regulations related to drug safety; and
 - (vii) other material determined appropriate by the Secretary;
- (C) providing access to summaries of the assessed and aggregated data collected from the active surveillance infrastructure under subsection (k)(3) to provide information of known and serious side-effects for drugs approved under this section or licensed under such section 262;
- (D) preparing and making publicly available on the Internet website established under paragraph (1) best practices for drug safety surveillance activities for drugs approved under this section or section 262 of Title 42;
- (E) enabling patients, providers, and drug sponsors to submit adverse event reports through the Internet Web site;
- (F) providing educational materials for patients and providers about the appropriate means of disposing of expired, damaged, or unusable medications; and
- (G) supporting initiatives that the Secretary determines to be useful to fulfill the purposes of the Internet Web site.

(3) Posting of drug labeling

The Secretary shall post on the Internet Web site established under paragraph (1) the approved

professional labeling and any required patient labeling of a drug approved under this section or licensed under such section 262 not later than 21 days after the date the drug is approved or licensed, including in a supplemental application with respect to a labeling change.

(4) Private sector resources

To ensure development of the Internet Web site by the date described in paragraph (1), the Secretary may, on a temporary or permanent basis, implement systems or products developed by private entities.

(5) Authority for contracts

The Secretary may enter into contracts with public and private entities to fulfill the requirements of this subsection.

(6) Review

The Advisory Committee on Risk Communication under section 360bbb-6 of this title shall, on a regular basis, perform a comprehensive review and evaluation of the types of risk communication information provided on the Internet Web site established under paragraph (1) and, through other means, shall identify, clarify, and define the purposes and types of information available to facilitate the efficient flow of information to patients and providers, and shall recommend ways for the Food and Drug Administration to work with outside entities to help facilitate the dispensing of risk communication information to patients and providers.

(s) Referral to advisory committee

The Secretary shall--

105a

(1) refer a drug or biological product to a Food and Drug Administration advisory committee for review at a meeting of such advisory committee prior to the approval of such drug or biological if it is--

(A) a drug, no active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) of which has been approved in any other application under this section; or

(B) a biological product, no active ingredient of which has been approved in any other application under section 262 of Title 42; or

(2) if the Secretary does not refer a drug or biological product described in paragraph (1) to a Food and Drug Administration advisory committee prior to such approval, provide in the action letter on the application for the drug or biological product a summary of the reasons why the Secretary did not refer the drug or biological product to an advisory committee prior to approval.

(t) Database for authorized generic drugs

(1) In general

(A) Publication

The Commissioner shall--

(i) not later than 9 months after September 27, 2007, publish a complete list on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration of all authorized generic drugs (including drug trade name, brand company manufacturer, and the date the authorized generic drug entered the market); and

(ii) update the list quarterly to include each authorized generic drug included in an annual report submitted to the Secretary by the sponsor of a listed drug during the preceding 3-month period.

(B) Notification

The Commissioner shall notify relevant Federal agencies, including the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the Federal Trade Commission, when the Commissioner first publishes the information described in subparagraph (A) that the information has been published and that the information will be updated quarterly.

(2) Inclusion

The Commissioner shall include in the list described in paragraph (1) each authorized generic drug included in an annual report submitted to the Secretary by the sponsor of a listed drug after January 1, 1999.

(3) Authorized generic drug

In this section, the term “authorized generic drug” means a listed drug (as that term is used in subsection (j)) that--

(A) has been approved under subsection (c); and

(B) is marketed, sold, or distributed directly or indirectly to retail class of trade under a different labeling, packaging (other than repackaging as the listed drug in blister packs, unit doses, or similar packaging for use in institutions), product code, labeler code, trade name, or trade mark than the listed drug.

(u) Certain drugs containing single enantiomers

(1) In general

For purposes of subsections (c)(3)(E)(ii) and (j)(5)(F)(ii), if an application is submitted under subsection (b) for a non-racemic drug containing as an active moiety (as defined by the Secretary in section 314.3 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) a single enantiomer that is contained in a racemic drug approved in another application under subsection (b), the applicant may, in the application for such non-racemic drug, elect to have the single enantiomer not be considered the same active moiety as that contained in the approved racemic drug, if--

(A)(i) the single enantiomer has not been previously approved except in the approved racemic drug; and

(ii) the application submitted under subsection (b) for such non-racemic drug--

(I) includes full reports of new clinical investigations (other than bioavailability studies)--

(aa) necessary for the approval of the application under subsections (c) and (d); and

(bb) conducted or sponsored by the applicant; and

(II) does not rely on any clinical investigations (other than bioavailability studies) that are part of an application submitted under subsection (b) for approval of the approved racemic drug; and

(B) the application submitted under subsection (b) for such non-racemic drug is not submitted for approval of a condition of use--

(i) in a therapeutic category in which the approved racemic drug has been approved; or

(ii) for which any other enantiomer of the racemic drug has been approved.

(2) Limitation

(A) No approval in certain therapeutic categories

Until the date that is 10 years after the date of approval of a non-racemic drug described in paragraph (1) and with respect to which the applicant has made the election provided for by such paragraph, the Secretary shall not approve such non-racemic drug for any condition of use in the therapeutic category in which the racemic drug has been approved.

(B) Labeling

If applicable, the labeling of a non-racemic drug described in paragraph (1) and with respect to which the applicant has made the election provided for by such paragraph shall include a statement that the non-racemic drug is not approved, and has not been shown to be safe and effective, for any condition of use of the racemic drug.

(3) Definition

(A) In general

For purposes of this subsection, the term “therapeutic category” means a therapeutic

category identified in the list developed by the United States Pharmacopeia pursuant to section 1395w-104(b)(3)(C)(ii) of Title 42 and as in effect on September 27, 2007.

(B) Publication by Secretary

The Secretary shall publish the list described in subparagraph (A) and may amend such list by regulation.

(4) Availability

The election referred to in paragraph (1) may be made only in an application that is submitted to the Secretary after September 27, 2007, and before October 1, 2027.

(v) Antibiotic drugs submitted before November 21, 1997

(1) Antibiotic drugs approved before November 21, 1997

(A) In general

Notwithstanding any provision of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 or any other provision of law, a sponsor of a drug that is the subject of an application described in subparagraph (B)(i) shall be eligible for, with respect to the drug, the 3-year exclusivity period referred to under clauses (iii) and (iv) of subsection (c)(3)(E) and under clauses (iii) and (iv) of subsection (j)(5)(F), subject to the requirements of such clauses, as applicable.

(B) Application; antibiotic drug described

(i) Application

An application described in this clause is an application for marketing submitted under this section after October 8, 2008, in which the drug that is the subject of the application contains an antibiotic drug described in clause (ii).

(ii) Antibiotic drug

An antibiotic drug described in this clause is an antibiotic drug that was the subject of an application approved by the Secretary under section 357 of this title (as in effect before November 21, 1997).

(2) Antibiotic drugs submitted before November 21, 1997, but not approved

(A) In general

Notwithstanding any provision of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 or any other provision of law, a sponsor of a drug that is the subject of an application described in subparagraph (B)(i) may elect to be eligible for, with respect to the drug--

(i)(I) the 3-year exclusivity period referred to under clauses (iii) and (iv) of subsection (c)(3)(E) and under clauses (iii) and (iv) of subsection (j)(5)(F), subject to the requirements of such clauses, as applicable; and

(II) the 5-year exclusivity period referred to under clause (ii) of subsection (c)(3)(E) and under clause (ii) of subsection (j)(5)(F), subject to the requirements of such clauses, as applicable; or

(ii) a patent term extension under section 156 of Title 35, subject to the requirements of such section.

(B) Application; antibiotic drug described

(i) Application

An application described in this clause is an application for marketing submitted under this section after October 8, 2008, in which the drug that is the subject of the application contains an antibiotic drug described in clause (ii).

(ii) Antibiotic drug

An antibiotic drug described in this clause is an antibiotic drug that was the subject of 1 or more applications received by the Secretary under section 357 of this title (as in effect before November 21, 1997), none of which was approved by the Secretary under such section.

(3) Limitations

(A) Exclusivities and extensions

Paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) shall not be construed to entitle a drug that is the subject of an approved application described in subparagraphs⁵ (1)(B)(i) or (2)(B)(i), as applicable, to any market exclusivities or patent extensions other than those exclusivities or extensions described in paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A).

(B) Conditions of use

⁵ So in original. Probably should be “subparagraph”.

Paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A)(i) shall not apply to any condition of use for which the drug referred to in subparagraph (1)(B)(i) or (2)(B)(i), as applicable, was approved before October 8, 2008.

(4) Application of certain provisions

Notwithstanding section 125, or any other provision, of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997, or any other provision of law, and subject to the limitations in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), the provisions of the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 shall apply to any drug subject to paragraph (1) or any drug with respect to which an election is made under paragraph (2)(A).

(w) Deadline for determination on certain petitions

The Secretary shall issue a final, substantive determination on a petition submitted pursuant to subsection (b) of section 314.161 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), no later than 270 days after the date the petition is submitted.

(x) Date of approval in the case of recommended controls under the CSA

(1) In general

In the case of an application under subsection (b) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to issue a scientific and medical evaluation and recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule

controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

(2) Date of approval

For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in paragraph (1), the term “date of approval” shall mean the later of--

(A) the date an application under subsection (b) is approved under subsection (c); or

(B) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug.

(y) Contrast agents intended for use with applicable medical imaging devices

(1) In general

The sponsor of a contrast agent for which an application has been approved under this section may submit a supplement to the application seeking approval for a new use following the authorization of a premarket submission for an applicable medical imaging device for that use with the contrast agent pursuant to section 360j(p)(1) of this title.

(2) Review of supplement

In reviewing a supplement submitted under this subsection, the agency center charged with the premarket review of drugs may--

(A) consult with the center charged with the premarket review of devices; and

(B) review information and data submitted to the Secretary by the sponsor of an applicable medical imaging device pursuant to section

360e, 360(k), or 360c(f)(2) of this title so long as the sponsor of such applicable medical imaging device has provided to the sponsor of the contrast agent a right of reference.

(3) Definitions

For purposes of this subsection--

(A) the term “new use” means a use of a contrast agent that is described in the approved labeling of an applicable medical imaging device described in section 360j(p) of this title, but that is not described in the approved labeling of the contrast agent; and

(B) the terms “applicable medical imaging device” and “contrast agent” have the meanings given such terms in section 360j(p) of this title.

(z)⁶ Nonclinical test defined

For purposes of this section, the term “nonclinical test” means a test conducted in vitro, in silico, or in chemico, or a nonhuman in vivo test, that occurs before or during the clinical trial phase of the investigation of the safety and effectiveness of a drug. Such test may include the following:

- (1)** Cell-based assays.
- (2)** Organ chips and microphysiological systems.
- (3)** Computer modeling.
- (4)** Other nonhuman or human biology-based test methods, such as bioprinting.
- (5)** Animal tests.

⁶ So in original. Two subsecs. (z) have been enacted.

(z) Diversity action plan for clinical studies

(1) With respect to a clinical investigation of a new drug that is a phase 3 study, as defined in section 312.21(c) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), or, as appropriate, another pivotal study of a new drug (other than bioavailability or bioequivalence studies), the sponsor of such drug shall submit to the Secretary a diversity action plan.

(2) Such diversity action plan shall include--

(A) the sponsor's goals for enrollment in such clinical study;

(B) the sponsor's rationale for such goals; and

(C) an explanation of how the sponsor intends to meet such goals.

(3) The sponsor shall submit to the Secretary such diversity action plan, in the form and manner specified by the Secretary in guidance, as soon as practicable but not later than the date on which the sponsor submits the protocol to the Secretary for such a phase 3 study or other pivotal study of the drug. The sponsor may submit modifications to the diversity action plan. Any such modifications shall be in the form and manner specified by the Secretary in guidance.

(4)(A) On the initiative of the Secretary or at the request of a sponsor, the Secretary may waive any requirement in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) if the Secretary determines that a waiver is necessary based on what is known or what can be determined about the prevalence or incidence of the disease or condition for which the new drug is under

investigation (including in terms of the patient population that may use the drug), if conducting a clinical investigation in accordance with a diversity action plan would otherwise be impracticable, or if such waiver is necessary to protect public health during a public health emergency.

(B) The Secretary shall issue a written response granting or denying a request from a sponsor for a waiver within 60 days of receiving such request.

(5) No diversity action plan shall be required for a submission described in section 360bbb of this title.

21 U.S.C. 355-1

Risk evaluation and mitigation strategies

(a) Submission of proposed strategy

(1) Initial approval

If the Secretary, in consultation with the office responsible for reviewing the drug and the office responsible for postapproval safety with respect to the drug, determines that a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy is necessary to ensure that the benefits of the drug outweigh the risks of the drug, and informs the person who submits such application of such determination, then such person shall submit to the Secretary as part of such application a proposed risk evaluation and mitigation strategy. In making such a determination, the Secretary shall consider the following factors:

- (A)** The estimated size of the population likely to use the drug involved.
- (B)** The seriousness of the disease or condition that is to be treated with the drug.
- (C)** The expected benefit of the drug with respect to such disease or condition.
- (D)** The expected or actual duration of treatment with the drug.
- (E)** The seriousness of any known or potential adverse events that may be related to the drug and the background incidence of such events in the population likely to use the drug.
- (F)** Whether the drug is a new molecular entity.

(2) Postapproval requirement**(A) In general**

If the Secretary has approved a covered application (including an application approved before the effective date of this section) and did not when approving the application require a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in paragraph (1), may subsequently require such a strategy for the drug involved (including when acting on a supplemental application seeking approval of a new indication for use of the drug) if the Secretary becomes aware of new safety information and makes a determination that such a strategy is necessary to ensure that the benefits of the drug outweigh the risks of the drug.

(B) Submission of proposed strategy

Not later than 120 days after the Secretary notifies the holder of an approved covered application that the Secretary has made a determination under subparagraph (A) with respect to the drug involved, or within such other reasonable time as the Secretary requires to protect the public health, the holder shall submit to the Secretary a proposed risk evaluation and mitigation strategy.

(3) Abbreviated new drug applications

The applicability of this section to an application under section 355(j) of this title is subject to subsection (i).

(4) Non-delegation

Determinations by the Secretary under this subsection for a drug shall be made by individuals at or above the level of individuals empowered to approve a drug (such as division directors within the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research).

(b) Definitions

For purposes of this section:

(1) Adverse drug experience

The term “adverse drug experience” means any adverse event associated with the use of a drug in humans, whether or not considered drug related, including--

(A) an adverse event occurring in the course of the use of the drug in professional practice;

(B) an adverse event occurring from an overdose of the drug, whether accidental or intentional;

(C) an adverse event occurring from abuse of the drug;

(D) an adverse event occurring from withdrawal of the drug; and

(E) any failure of expected pharmacological action of the drug, which may include reduced effectiveness under the conditions of use prescribed in the labeling of such drug, but which may not include reduced effectiveness that is in accordance with such labeling.

(2) Covered application

The term “covered application” means an application referred to in section 355(p)(1)(A) of this title.

(3) New safety information

The term “new safety information”, with respect to a drug, means information derived from a clinical trial, an adverse event report, a postapproval study (including a study under section 355(o)(3) of this title), or peer-reviewed biomedical literature; data derived from the postmarket risk identification and analysis system under section 355(k) of this title; or other scientific data deemed appropriate by the Secretary about--

(A) a serious risk or an unexpected serious risk associated with use of the drug that the Secretary has become aware of (that may be based on a new analysis of existing information) since the drug was approved, since the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy was required, or since the last assessment of the approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for the drug; or

(B) the effectiveness of the approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for the drug obtained since the last assessment of such strategy.

(4) Serious adverse drug experience

The term “serious adverse drug experience” is an adverse drug experience that--

(A) results in--

(i) death;

(ii) an adverse drug experience that places the patient at immediate risk of death from the adverse drug experience as it occurred

121a

(not including an adverse drug experience that might have caused death had it occurred in a more severe form);

(iii) inpatient hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization;

(iv) a persistent or significant incapacity or substantial disruption of the ability to conduct normal life functions; or

(v) a congenital anomaly or birth defect; or

(B) based on appropriate medical judgment, may jeopardize the patient and may require a medical or surgical intervention to prevent an outcome described under subparagraph (A).

(5) Serious risk

The term “serious risk” means a risk of a serious adverse drug experience.

(6) Signal of a serious risk

The term “signal of a serious risk” means information related to a serious adverse drug experience associated with use of a drug and derived from--

(A) a clinical trial;

(B) adverse event reports;

(C) a postapproval study, including a study under section 355(o)(3) of this title;

(D) peer-reviewed biomedical literature;

(E) data derived from the postmarket risk identification and analysis system under section 355(k)(4) of this title; or

(F) other scientific data deemed appropriate by the Secretary.

(7) Responsible person

The term “responsible person” means the person submitting a covered application or the holder of the approved such application.

(8) Unexpected serious risk

The term “unexpected serious risk” means a serious adverse drug experience that is not listed in the labeling of a drug, or that may be symptomatically and pathophysiologically related to an adverse drug experience identified in the labeling, but differs from such adverse drug experience because of greater severity, specificity, or prevalence.

(c) Contents

A proposed risk evaluation and mitigation strategy under subsection (a) shall--

(1) include the timetable required under subsection (d); and

(2) to the extent required by the Secretary, in consultation with the office responsible for reviewing the drug and the office responsible for postapproval safety with respect to the drug, include additional elements described in subsections (e) and (f).

(d) Minimal strategy

For purposes of subsection (c)(1), the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug shall require a

timetable for submission of assessments of the strategy that--

(1) includes an assessment, by the date that is 18 months after the strategy is initially approved;

(2) includes an assessment by the date that is 3 years after the strategy is initially approved;

(3) includes an assessment in the seventh year after the strategy is so approved; and

(4) subject to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)--

(A) is at a frequency specified in the strategy;

(B) is increased or reduced in frequency as necessary as provided for in subsection (g)(4)(A); and

(C) is eliminated after the 3-year period described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that serious risks of the drug have been adequately identified and assessed and are being adequately managed.

(e) Additional potential elements of strategy

(1) In general

The Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), may under such subsection require that the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug include 1 or more of the additional elements described in this subsection if the Secretary makes the determination required with respect to each element involved.

(2) Medication Guide; patient package insert

The risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug may require that, as applicable, the responsible person develop for distribution to each patient when the drug is dispensed--

(A) a Medication Guide, as provided for under part 208 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations); and

(B) a patient package insert, if the Secretary determines that such insert may help mitigate a serious risk of the drug.

(3) Communication plan

The risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug may require that the responsible person conduct a communication plan to health care providers, if, with respect to such drug, the Secretary determines that such plan may support implementation of an element of the strategy (including under this paragraph). Such plan may include--

(A) sending letters to health care providers;

(B) disseminating information about the elements of the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy to encourage implementation by health care providers of components that apply to such health care providers, or to explain certain safety protocols (such as medical monitoring by periodic laboratory tests)¹

(C) disseminating information to health care providers through professional societies about any

¹ So in original. A semicolon probably should appear.

serious risks of the drug and any protocol to assure safe use; or

(D) disseminating information to health care providers about drug formulations or properties, including information about the limitations or patient care implications of such formulations or properties, and how such formulations or properties may be related to serious adverse drug events associated with use of the drug.

(4) Packaging and disposal

The Secretary may require a risk evaluation mitigation strategy for a drug for which there is a serious risk of an adverse drug experience described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (b)(1), taking into consideration the factors described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (f)(2) and in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies with authorities over drug disposal packaging, which may include requiring that--

(A) the drug be made available for dispensing to certain patients in unit dose packaging, packaging that provides a set duration, or another packaging system that the Secretary determines may mitigate such serious risk; or

(B) the drug be dispensed to certain patients with a safe disposal packaging or safe disposal system if the Secretary determines that such safe disposal packaging or system may mitigate such serious risk and is sufficiently available.

(f) Providing safe access for patients to drugs with known serious risks that would otherwise be unavailable

(1) Allowing safe access to drugs with known serious risks

The Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), may require that the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug include such elements as are necessary to assure safe use of the drug, because of its inherent toxicity or potential harmfulness, if the Secretary determines that--

(A) the drug, which has been shown to be effective, but is associated with a serious adverse drug experience, can be approved only if, or would be withdrawn unless, such elements are required as part of such strategy to mitigate a specific serious risk listed in the labeling of the drug; and

(B) for a drug initially approved without elements to assure safe use, other elements under subsections (c), (d), and (e) are not sufficient to mitigate such serious risk.

(2) Assuring access and minimizing burden

Such elements to assure safe use under paragraph (1) shall--

(A) be commensurate with the specific serious risk listed in the labeling of the drug;

(B) within 30 days of the date on which any element under paragraph (1) is imposed, be posted publicly by the Secretary with an explanation of how such elements will mitigate the observed safety risk;

(C) considering such risk, not be unduly burdensome on patient access to the drug, considering in particular--

(i) patients with serious or life-threatening diseases or conditions;

(ii) patients who have difficulty accessing health care (such as patients in rural or medically underserved areas); and

(iii) patients with functional limitations; and

(D) to the extent practicable, so as to minimize the burden on the health care delivery system--

(i) conform with elements to assure safe use for other drugs with similar, serious risks; and

(ii) be designed to be compatible with established distribution, procurement, and dispensing systems for drugs.

(3) Elements to assure safe use

The elements to assure safe use under paragraph (1) shall include 1 or more goals to mitigate a specific serious risk listed in the labeling of the drug and, to mitigate such risk, may require that--

(A) health care providers who prescribe the drug have particular training or experience, or are specially certified (the opportunity to obtain such training or certification with respect to the drug shall be available to any willing provider from a frontier area in a widely available training or certification method (including an on-line course or via mail) as approved by the Secretary at reasonable cost to the provider);

(B) pharmacies, practitioners, or health care settings that dispense the drug are specially certified (the opportunity to obtain such certification shall be available to any willing provider from a frontier area);

(C) the drug be dispensed to patients only in certain health care settings, such as hospitals;

(D) the drug be dispensed to patients with evidence or other documentation of safe-use conditions, such as laboratory test results;

(E) each patient using the drug be subject to certain monitoring; or

(F) each patient using the drug be enrolled in a registry.

(4) Implementation system

The elements to assure safe use under paragraph (1) that are described in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (3) may include a system through which the applicant is able to take reasonable steps to--

(A) monitor and evaluate implementation of such elements by health care providers, pharmacists, and other parties in the health care system who are responsible for implementing such elements; and

(B) work to improve implementation of such elements by such persons.

(5) Evaluation of elements to assure safe use

The Secretary, through the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee (or successor committee) or other advisory committee of the Food and Drug Administration, shall--

(A) seek input from patients, physicians, pharmacists, and other health care providers about how elements to assure safe use under this subsection for 1 or more drugs may be standardized so as not to be--

(i) unduly burdensome on patient access to the drug; and

(ii) to the extent practicable, minimize the burden on the health care delivery system;

(B) periodically evaluate, for 1 or more drugs, the elements to assure safe use of such drug to assess whether the elements--

(i) assure safe use of the drug;

(ii) are not unduly burdensome on patient access to the drug; and

(iii) to the extent practicable, minimize the burden on the health care delivery system; and

(C) considering such input and evaluations--

(i) issue or modify agency guidance about how to implement the requirements of this subsection; and

(ii) modify elements under this subsection for 1 or more drugs as appropriate.

(6) Additional mechanisms to assure access

The mechanisms under section 360bbb of this title to provide for expanded access for patients with serious or life-threatening diseases or conditions may be used to provide access for patients with a serious or life-threatening disease or condition, the treatment of which is not an approved use for the drug, to a drug

that is subject to elements to assure safe use under this subsection. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations for how a physician may provide the drug under the mechanisms of section 360bbb of this title.

(7) Repealed. Pub.L. 113-5, Title III, § 302(c)(1), Mar. 13, 2013, 127 Stat. 185

(8) Limitation

No holder of an approved covered application shall use any element to assure safe use required by the Secretary under this subsection to block or delay approval of an application under section 355(b)(2) or (j) of this title or to prevent application of such element under subsection (i)(1)(B) to a drug that is the subject of an abbreviated new drug application.

(g) Assessment and modification of approved strategy

(1) Voluntary assessments

After the approval of a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy under subsection (a), the responsible person involved may, subject to paragraph (2), submit to the Secretary an assessment of the approved strategy for the drug involved at any time.

(2) Required assessments

A responsible person shall submit an assessment of the approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug--

(A) when submitting a supplemental application for a new indication for use under section 355(b) of this title or under section 262 of Title 42, unless the drug is not subject to section 353(b) of this title and the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for the

drug includes only the timetable under subsection (d);

(B) when required by the strategy, as provided for in such timetable under subsection (d);

(C) within a time period to be determined by the Secretary, if the Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), determines that an assessment is needed to evaluate whether the approved strategy should be modified to--

(i) ensure the benefits of the drug outweigh the risks of the drug; or

(ii) minimize the burden on the health care delivery system of complying with the strategy.

(3) Requirements for assessments

An assessment under paragraph (1) or (2) of an approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug shall include, with respect to each goal included in the strategy, an assessment of the extent to which the approved strategy, including each element of the strategy, is meeting the goal or whether 1 or more such goals or such elements should be modified.

(4) Modification

(A) On initiative of responsible person

After the approval of a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy by the Secretary, the responsible person may, at any time, submit to the Secretary a proposal to modify the approved strategy. Such proposal may propose the addition, modification, or removal of any goal or element of the approved strategy and shall include an

adequate rationale to support such proposed addition, modification, or removal of any goal or element of the strategy.

(B) On initiative of Secretary

After the approval of a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy by the Secretary, the Secretary may, at any time, require a responsible person to submit a proposed modification to the strategy within 120 days or within such reasonable time as the Secretary specifies, if the Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), determines that 1 or more goals or elements should be added, modified, or removed from the approved strategy to--

(i) ensure the benefits of the drug outweigh the risks of the drug;

(ii) minimize the burden on the health care delivery system of complying with the strategy;
or

(iii) accommodate different, comparable aspects of the elements to assure safe use for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 355(j) of this title, and the applicable listed drug.

(h) Review of proposed strategies; review of assessments and modifications of approved strategies

(1) In general

The Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), shall promptly review each proposed risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug submitted under subsection (a) and each

assessment of and proposed modification to an approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug submitted under subsection (g), and, if necessary, promptly initiate discussions with the responsible person about such proposed strategy, assessment, or modification.

(2) Action

(A) In general

(i) Timeframe

Unless the dispute resolution process described under paragraph (3) or (4) applies, and, except as provided in clause (ii) or clause (iii) below, the Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), shall review and act on the proposed risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug or any proposed modification to any required strategy within 180 days of receipt of the proposed strategy or modification.

(ii) Minor modifications

The Secretary shall review and act on a proposed minor modification, as defined by the Secretary in guidance, within 60 days of receipt of such modification.

(iii) REMS modification due to safety labeling changes

Not later than 60 days after the Secretary receives a proposed modification to an approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy to conform the strategy to approved safety labeling changes, including safety labeling changes

initiated by the responsible person in accordance with FDA regulatory requirements, or to a safety labeling change that the Secretary has directed the holder of the application to make pursuant to section 355(o)(4) of this title, the Secretary shall review and act on such proposed modification to the approved strategy.

(iv) Guidance

The Secretary shall establish, through guidance, that responsible persons may implement certain modifications to an approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy following notification to the Secretary.

(B) Inaction

An approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy shall remain in effect until the Secretary acts, if the Secretary fails to act as provided under subparagraph (A).

(C) Public availability

Upon acting on a proposed risk evaluation and mitigation strategy or proposed modification to a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall make publicly available an action letter describing the actions taken by the Secretary under such subparagraph (A).

(3) Dispute resolution at initial approval

If a proposed risk evaluation and mitigation strategy is submitted under subsection (a)(1) in an application for initial approval of a drug and there is a dispute about the strategy, the responsible person shall use

the major dispute resolution procedures as set forth in the letters described in section 101(c) of the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007.

(4) Dispute resolution in all other cases

(A) Request for review

(i) In general

The responsible person may, after the sponsor is required to make a submission under subsection (a)(2) or (g), request in writing that a dispute about the strategy be reviewed by the Drug Safety Oversight Board under subsection (j), except that the determination of the Secretary to require a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy is not subject to review under this paragraph. The preceding sentence does not prohibit review under this paragraph of the particular elements of such a strategy.

(ii) Scheduling

Upon receipt of a request under clause (i), the Secretary shall schedule the dispute involved for review under subparagraph (B) and, not later than 5 business days of² scheduling the dispute for review, shall publish by posting on the Internet or otherwise a notice that the dispute will be reviewed by the Drug Safety Oversight Board.

(B) Scheduling review

If a responsible person requests review under subparagraph (A), the Secretary--

² So in original.

(i) shall schedule the dispute for review at 1 of the next 2 regular meetings of the Drug Safety Oversight Board, whichever meeting date is more practicable; or

(ii) may convene a special meeting of the Drug Safety Oversight Board to review the matter more promptly, including to meet an action deadline on an application (including a supplemental application).

(C) Agreement after discussion or administrative appeals

(i) Further discussion or administrative appeals

A request for review under subparagraph (A) shall not preclude further discussions to reach agreement on the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy, and such a request shall not preclude the use of administrative appeals within the Food and Drug Administration to reach agreement on the strategy, including appeals as described in the letters described in section 101(c) of the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007 for procedural or scientific matters involving the review of human drug applications and supplemental applications that cannot be resolved at the divisional level. At the time a review has been scheduled under subparagraph (B) and notice of such review has been posted, the responsible person shall either withdraw the request under subparagraph (A) or terminate the use of such administrative appeals.

(ii) Agreement terminates dispute resolution

At any time before a decision and order is issued under subparagraph (G), the Secretary (in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2)) and the responsible person may reach an agreement on the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy through further discussion or administrative appeals, terminating the dispute resolution process, and the Secretary shall issue an action letter or order, as appropriate, that describes the strategy.

(D) Meeting of the Board

At a meeting of the Drug Safety Oversight Board described in subparagraph (B), the Board shall--

- (i) hear from both parties via written or oral presentation; and
- (ii) review the dispute.

(E) Record of proceedings

The Secretary shall ensure that the proceedings of any such meeting are recorded, transcribed, and made public within 90 days of the meeting. The Secretary shall redact the transcript to protect any trade secrets and other information that is exempted from disclosure under section 552 of Title 5 or section 552a of Title 5.

(F) Recommendation of the Board

Not later than 5 days after any such meeting, the Drug Safety Oversight Board shall provide a written recommendation on resolving the dispute

to the Secretary. Not later than 5 days after the Board provides such written recommendation to the Secretary, the Secretary shall make the recommendation available to the public.

(G) Action by the Secretary

(i) Action letter

With respect to a proposal or assessment referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall issue an action letter that resolves the dispute not later than the later of--

(I) the action deadline for the action letter on the application; or

(II) 7 days after receiving the recommendation of the Drug Safety Oversight Board.

(ii) Order

With respect to an assessment of an approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy under subsection (g)(1) or under any of subparagraphs (B) through (D) of subsection (g)(2), the Secretary shall issue an order, which shall be made public, that resolves the dispute not later than 7 days after receiving the recommendation of the Drug Safety Oversight Board.

(H) Inaction

An approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategy shall remain in effect until the Secretary acts, if the Secretary fails to act as provided for under subparagraph (G).

(I) Effect on action deadline

With respect to a proposal or assessment referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall be considered to have met the action deadline for the action letter on the application if the responsible person requests the dispute resolution process described in this paragraph and if the Secretary has complied with the timing requirements of scheduling review by the Drug Safety Oversight Board, providing a written recommendation, and issuing an action letter under subparagraphs (B), (F), and (G), respectively.

(J) Disqualification

No individual who is an employee of the Food and Drug Administration and who reviews a drug or who participated in an administrative appeal under subparagraph (C)(i) with respect to such drug may serve on the Drug Safety Oversight Board at a meeting under subparagraph (D) to review a dispute about the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for such drug.

(K) Additional expertise

The Drug Safety Oversight Board may add members with relevant expertise from the Food and Drug Administration, including the Office of Pediatrics, the Office of Women's Health, or the Office of Rare Diseases, or from other Federal public health or health care agencies, for a meeting under subparagraph (D) of the Drug Safety Oversight Board.

(5) Use of advisory committees

The Secretary may convene a meeting of 1 or more advisory committees of the Food and Drug Administration to--

(A) review a concern about the safety of a drug or class of drugs, including before an assessment of the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy or strategies of such drug or drugs is required to be submitted under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (g)(2);

(B) review the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy or strategies of a drug or group of drugs; or

(C) review a dispute under paragraph (3) or (4).

(6) Process for addressing drug class effects

(A) In general

When a concern about a serious risk of a drug may be related to the pharmacological class of the drug, the Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), may defer assessments of the approved risk evaluation and mitigation strategies for such drugs until the Secretary has convened 1 or more public meetings to consider possible responses to such concern.

(B) Notice

If the Secretary defers an assessment under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall--

(i) give notice of the deferral to the holder of the approved covered application not later than 5 days after the deferral;

(ii) publish the deferral in the Federal Register; and

(iii) give notice to the public of any public meetings to be convened under subparagraph (A), including a description of the deferral.

(C) Public meetings

Such public meetings may include--

(i) 1 or more meetings of the responsible person for such drugs;

(ii) 1 or more meetings of 1 or more advisory committees of the Food and Drug Administration, as provided for under paragraph (6); or

(iii) 1 or more workshops of scientific experts and other stakeholders.

(D) Action

After considering the discussions from any meetings under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may--

(i) announce in the Federal Register a planned regulatory action, including a modification to each risk evaluation and mitigation strategy, for drugs in the pharmacological class;

(ii) seek public comment about such action; and

(iii) after seeking such comment, issue an order addressing such regulatory action.

(7) International coordination

The Secretary, in consultation with the offices described in subsection (c)(2), may coordinate the

timetable for submission of assessments under subsection (d), or a study or clinical trial under section 355(o)(3) of this title, with efforts to identify and assess the serious risks of such drug by the marketing authorities of other countries whose drug approval and risk management processes the Secretary deems comparable to the drug approval and risk management processes of the United States. If the Secretary takes action to coordinate such timetable, the Secretary shall give notice to the responsible person.

(8) Effect

Use of the processes described in paragraphs (6) and (7) shall not be the sole source of delay of action on an application or a supplement to an application for a drug.

(i) Abbreviated new drug applications

(1) In general

A drug that is the subject of an abbreviated new drug application under section 355(j) of this title is subject to only the following elements of the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy required under subsection (a) for the applicable listed drug:

(A) A Medication Guide or patient package insert, if required under subsection (e) for the applicable listed drug.

(B) A packaging or disposal requirement, if required under subsection (e)(4) for the applicable listed drug.

(C)(i) Elements to assure safe use, if required under subsection (f) for the listed drug, which,

subject to clause (ii), for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 355(j) of this title may use--

(I) a single, shared system with the listed drug under subsection (f); or

(II) a different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use under subsection (f).

(ii) The Secretary may require a drug that is the subject of an application under section 355(j) of this title and the listed drug to use a single, shared system under subsection (f), if the Secretary determines that no different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use could satisfy the requirements of subsection (f).

(2) Action by Secretary

For an applicable listed drug for which a drug is approved under section 355(j) of this title, the Secretary--

(A) shall undertake any communication plan to health care providers required under subsection (e)(3) for the applicable listed drug;

(B) shall permit packaging systems and safe disposal packaging or safe disposal systems that are different from those required for the applicable listed drug under subsection (e)(4); and

(C) shall inform the responsible person for the drug that is so approved if the risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for the applicable listed drug is modified.

(3) Shared REMS

If the Secretary approves, in accordance with paragraph (1)(C)(i)(II), a different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use under subsection (f) for a drug that is the subject of an abbreviated new drug application under section 355(j) of this title, the Secretary may require that such different comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use can be used with respect to any other drug that is the subject of an application under section 355(j) or 355(b) of this title that references the same listed drug.

(j) Drug Safety Oversight Board

(1) In general

There is established a Drug Safety Oversight Board.

(2) Composition; meetings

The Drug Safety Oversight Board shall--

(A) be composed of scientists and health care practitioners appointed by the Secretary, each of whom is an employee of the Federal Government;

(B) include representatives from offices throughout the Food and Drug Administration, including the offices responsible for postapproval safety of drugs;

(C) include at least 1 representative each from the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Health and Human Services (other than the Food and Drug Administration);

(D) include such representatives as the Secretary shall designate from other appropriate agencies that wish to provide representatives; and

(E) meet at least monthly to provide oversight and advice to the Secretary on the management of important drug safety issues.

(k) Waiver in public health emergencies

The Secretary may waive any requirement of this section with respect to a qualified countermeasure (as defined in section 247d-6a(a)(2) of Title 42) to which a requirement under this section has been applied, if the Secretary determines that such waiver is required to mitigate the effects of, or reduce the severity of, the circumstances under which--

(1) a determination described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 360bbb-3(b)(1) of this title has been made by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary, respectively; or

(2) the identification of a material threat described in subparagraph (D) of section 360bbb-3(b)(1) of this title has been made pursuant to section 247d-6b of Title 42.

(l) Provision of samples not a violation of strategy

The provision of samples of a covered product to an eligible product developer (as those terms are defined in section 355-2(a) of this title) shall not be considered a violation of the requirements of any risk evaluation and mitigation strategy that may be in place under this section for such drug.

(m) Separate REMS

When used in this section, the term “different, comparable aspect of the elements to assure safe use”

146a

means a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for a drug that is the subject of an application under section 355(j) of this title that uses different methods or operational means than the strategy required under subsection (a) for the applicable listed drug, or other application under section 355(j) of this title with the same such listed drug, but achieves the same level of safety as such strategy.

21 C.F.R. 10.30
Citizen petition

(a) This section applies to any petition submitted by a person (including a person who is not a citizen of the United States) except to the extent that other sections of this chapter apply different requirements to a particular matter.

(b) A petition (including any attachments) must be submitted in accordance with § 10.20 and, if applicable, § 10.31. The certification requirement in this section does not apply to petitions subject to the certification requirement of § 10.31. The petition must also be submitted in accordance with the following paragraphs, as applicable:

(1) Electronic submission. Petitions (including any attachments) may be electronically submitted in accordance with paragraph (b)(3) of this section and § 10.20 through <http://www.regulations.gov> at Docket No. FDA 2013–S–0610. It is only necessary to submit one copy.

(2) Mail, delivery services, or other non-electronic submissions. A petition (including any attachments), that is not electronically submitted under paragraph (b)(1) of this section, must be submitted in accordance with paragraph (b)(3) of this section and § 10.20 and delivered to this address: Dockets Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. Submit two copies (original and redacted version) for confidential petitions. Otherwise, only one copy is necessary.

(3) Petition format. A petition submitted under paragraphs (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this section must be in accordance with § 10.20 and in the following format:

Citizen Petition

Date: _____

The undersigned submits this petition under __ (relevant statutory sections, if known) of the __ (Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or the Public Health Service Act or any other statutory provision for which authority has been delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs) to request the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to __ (issue, amend, or revoke a regulation or order or take or refrain from taking any other form of administrative action).

A. Action Requested

((1) If the petition requests the Commissioner to issue, amend, or revoke a regulation, the exact wording of the existing regulation (if any) and the proposed regulation or amendment requested.)

((2) If the petition requests the Commissioner to issue, amend, or revoke an order, a copy of the exact wording of the citation to the existing order (if any) and the exact wording requested for the proposed order.)

((3) If the petition requests the Commissioner to take or refrain from taking any other form of administrative action, the specific action or relief requested.)

B. Statement of Grounds

(A full statement, in a well-organized format, of the factual and legal grounds on which the petitioner relies, including all relevant information and views on which the petitioner relies, as well as representative information known to the petitioner which is unfavorable to the petitioner's position.)

C. Environmental Impact

(A) Claim for categorical exclusion under §§ 25.30, 25.31, 25.32, 25.33, or § 25.34 of this chapter or an environmental assessment under § 25.40 of this chapter.)

D. Economic Impact

(The following information is to be submitted only when requested by the Commissioner following review of the petition: A statement of the effect of requested action on: (1) Cost (and price) increases to industry, government, and consumers; (2) productivity of wage earners, businesses, or government; (3) competition; (4) supplies of important materials, products, or services; (5) employment; and (6) energy supply or demand.)

E. Certification

The undersigned certifies, that, to the best knowledge and belief of the undersigned, this petition includes all information and views on which the petition relies, and that it includes representative data and information known to the petitioner which are unfavorable to the petition.

(Signature) _____

(Name of petitioner) _____

(Mailing address) _____

(Telephone number) _____

(c) A petition that appears to meet the requirements of paragraph (b)(3) of this section, § 10.20, and, if applicable, § 10.31, will be filed by the Dockets Management Staff, stamped with the date of filing, and assigned a unique docket number. The unique docket number identifies the docket file established by the Dockets Management Staff for all submissions relating to the petition, as provided in this part. Subsequent submissions relating to the matter must refer to the assigned docket number assigned in this paragraph and will be filed in the established docket file. Related petitions may be filed together and given the same docket number. The Dockets Management Staff will promptly notify the petitioner of the filing and unique docket number of the petition.

(d) An interested person may submit comments to the Dockets Management Staff on a filed petition, which comments become part of the docket file. The comments are to specify the docket number of the petition and include, if applicable, the verification under § 10.31, and may support or oppose the petition in whole or in part. A request for alternative or different administrative action must be submitted as a separate petition.

(e)(1) The Commissioner shall, in accordance with paragraph (e)(2), rule upon each petition filed under paragraph (c) of this section, taking into consideration (i) available agency resources for the category of subject matter, (ii) the priority assigned to the petition considering both the category of subject matter involved and the overall work of the agency, and (iii) time requirements established by statute.

(2) Except as provided in paragraphs (e)(4) and (5) of this section, the Commissioner shall furnish a response to each petitioner within 180 days of receipt of the petition. The response will either:

(i) Approve the petition, in which case the Commissioner shall concurrently take appropriate action (e.g., publication of a Federal Register notice) implementing the approval;

(ii) Deny the petition;

(iii) Dismiss the petition if at any time the Commissioner determines that changes in law, facts, or circumstances since the date on which the petition was submitted have rendered the petition moot; or

(iv) Provide a tentative response, indicating why the agency has been unable to reach a decision on the petition, e.g., because of the existence of other agency priorities, or a need for additional information. The tentative response may also indicate the likely ultimate agency response, and may specify when a final response may be furnished.

(3) The Commissioner may grant or deny such a petition, in whole or in part, and may grant such other relief or take other action as the petition warrants. If, at any time, the Commissioner determines that changes in law, facts, or circumstances since the date on which the petition was submitted have rendered the petition moot, the Commissioner may dismiss the petition. The petitioner is to be notified of the Commissioner's decision. The decision will be placed in the public docket file and

152a

may also be in the form of a notice published in the Federal Register.

(4) The Commissioner shall furnish a response to each petitioner within 90 days of receipt of a petition filed under section 505(j)(2)(C) of the act. The response will either approve or disapprove the petition. Agency action on a petition shall be governed by § 314.93 of this chapter.

(5) The Commissioner intends to furnish a response to each petitioner within 150 days of receipt of a petition subject to section 505(q) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(f) If a petition filed under paragraph (c) of this section requests the Commissioner to issue, amend, or revoke a regulation, § 10.40 or § 10.50 also apply.

(g) A petitioner may supplement, amend, or withdraw a petition without Agency approval and without prejudice to resubmission at any time until the Commissioner rules on the petition, unless the petition has been referred for a hearing under parts 12, 13, 14, or 15 of this chapter. After a ruling or referral, a petition may be supplemented, amended, or withdrawn only with the approval of the Commissioner. The Commissioner may approve withdrawal, with or without prejudice against resubmission of the petition.

(h) In reviewing a petition the Commissioner may use the following procedures:

(1) Conferences, meetings, discussions, and correspondence under § 10.65.

(2) A hearing under parts 12, 13, 14, 15, or 16.

- (3) A Federal Register notice requesting information and views.
 - (4) A proposal to issue, amend, or revoke a regulation, in accordance with § 10.40 or § 12.20.
 - (5) Any other specific public procedure established in this chapter and expressly applicable to the matter.
- (i) The record of the administrative proceeding consists of the following:
- (1) The petition, including all information on which it relies, filed by the Dockets Management Staff.
 - (2) All comments received on the petition, including all information submitted as a part of the comments.
 - (3) If the petition resulted in a proposal to issue, amend, or revoke a regulation, all of the documents specified in § 10.40(g).
 - (4) The record, consisting of any transcripts, minutes of meetings, reports, Federal Register notices, and other documents resulting from the optional procedures specified in paragraph (h) of this section, except a transcript of a closed portion of a public advisory committee meeting.
 - (5) The Commissioner's decision on the petition, including all information identified or filed by the Commissioner with the Dockets Management Staff as part of the record supporting the decision.
 - (6) All documents filed with the Dockets Management Staff under § 10.65(h).

(7) If a petition for reconsideration or for a stay of action is filed under paragraph (j) of this section, the administrative record specified in § 10.33(k) or § 10.35(h).

(j) The administrative record specified in paragraph (i) of this section is the exclusive record for the Commissioner's decision. The record of the administrative proceeding closes on the date of the Commissioner's decision unless some other date is specified. Thereafter any interested person may submit a petition for reconsideration under § 10.33 or a petition for stay of action under § 10.35. A person who wishes to rely upon information or views not included in the administrative record shall submit them to the Commissioner with a new petition to modify the decision in accordance with this section.

(k) This section does not apply to the referral of a matter to a United States attorney for the initiation of court enforcement action and related correspondence, or to requests, suggestions, and recommendations made informally in routine correspondence received by FDA. Routine correspondence does not constitute a petition within the meaning of this section unless it purports to meet the requirements of this section. Action on routine correspondence does not constitute final administrative action subject to judicial review under § 10.45.

(l) The Dockets Management Staff will maintain a chronological list of each petition filed under this section and § 10.85, but not of petitions submitted elsewhere in the agency under § 10.25(a)(1), showing:

(1) The docket number;

155a

- (2) The date the petition was filed by the Dockets Management Staff;
- (3) The name of the petitioner;
- (4) The subject matter involved; and
- (5) The disposition of the petition.

21 C.F.R. 10.45

**Court review of final administrative action;
exhaustion of administrative remedies**

(a) This section applies to court review of final administrative action taken by the Commissioner, including action taken under §§ 10.25 through 10.40 and § 16.1(b), except action subject to § 10.50 and part 12.

(b) A request that the Commissioner take or refrain from taking any form of administrative action must first be the subject of a final administrative decision based on a petition submitted under § 10.25(a) or, where applicable, a hearing under § 16.1(b) before any legal action is filed in a court complaining of the action or failure to act. If a court action is filed complaining of the action or failure to act before the submission of the decision on a petition under § 10.25(a) or, where applicable, a hearing under § 16.1(b), the Commissioner shall request dismissal of the court action or referral to the agency for an initial administrative determination on the grounds of a failure to exhaust administrative remedies, the lack of final agency action as required by 5 U.S.C. 701 et seq., and the lack of an actual controversy as required by 28 U.S.C. 2201.

(c) A request that administrative action be stayed must first be the subject of an administrative decision based upon a petition for stay of action submitted under § 10.35 before a request is made that a court stay the action. If a court action is filed requesting a stay of administrative action before the Commissioner's decision on a petition submitted in a timely manner pursuant to § 10.35, the Commissioner shall

request dismissal of the court action or referral to the agency for an initial determination on the grounds of a failure to exhaust administrative remedies, the lack of final agency action as required by 5 U.S.C. 701 et seq., and the lack of an actual controversy as required by 28 U.S.C. 2201. If a court action is filed requesting a stay of administrative action after a petition for a stay of action is denied because it was submitted after expiration of the time period provided under § 10.35, or after the time for submitting such a petition has expired, the Commissioner will request dismissal of the court action on the ground of a failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

(d) Unless otherwise provided, the Commissioner's final decision constitutes final agency action (reviewable in the courts under 5 U.S.C. 701 et seq. and, where appropriate, 28 U.S.C. 2201) on a petition submitted under § 10.25(a), on a petition for reconsideration submitted under § 10.33, on a petition for stay of action submitted under § 10.35, on an advisory opinion issued under § 10.85, on a matter involving administrative action which is the subject of an opportunity for a hearing under § 16.1(b) of this chapter, or on the issuance of a final regulation published in accordance with § 10.40, except that the agency's response to a petition filed under section 505(j)(2)(C) of the act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(2)(C)) and § 314.93 of this chapter will not constitute final agency action until any petition for reconsideration submitted by the petitioner is acted on by the Commissioner.

(1) It is the position of FDA except as otherwise provided in paragraph (d)(2) of this section, that:

(i) Final agency action exhausts all administrative remedies and is ripe for preenforcement judicial review as of the date of the final decision, unless applicable law explicitly requires that the petitioner take further action before judicial review is available;

(ii) An interested person is affected by, and thus has standing to obtain judicial review of final agency action; and

(iii) It is not appropriate to move to dismiss a suit for preenforcement judicial review of final agency action on the ground that indispensable parties are not joined or that it is an unconsented suit against the United States if the defect could be cured by amending the complaint.

(2) The Commissioner shall object to judicial review of a matter if:

(i) The matter is committed by law to the discretion of the Commissioner, e.g., a decision to recommend or not to recommend civil or criminal enforcement action under sections 302, 303, and 304 of the act; or

(ii) Review is not sought in a proper court.

(e) An interested person may request judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner in the courts without first petitioning the Commissioner for reconsideration or for a stay of action, except that in accordance with paragraph (c) of this section, the person shall request a stay by the Commissioner under § 10.35 before requesting a stay by the court.

(f) The Commissioner shall take the position in an action for judicial review under 5 U.S.C. 701 et seq., whether or not it includes a request for a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. 2201, or in any other case in which the validity of administrative action is properly challenged, that the validity of the action must be determined solely on the basis of the administrative record specified in §§ 10.30(i), 10.33(k), 10.35(h), 10.40(g), and 16.80(a) or the administrative record applicable to any decision or action under the regulations referenced in § 16.1(b), and that additional information or views may not be considered. An interested person who wishes to rely upon information or views not included in the administrative record shall submit them to the Commissioner with a new petition to modify the action under § 10.25(a).

(g) The Commissioner requests that all petitions for judicial review of a particular matter be filed in a single U.S. District court. If petitions are filed in more than one jurisdiction, the Commissioner will take appropriate action to prevent a multiplicity of suits in various jurisdictions, such as:

- (1) A request for transfer of one or more suits to consolidate separate actions, under 28 U.S.C. 1404(a) or 28 U.S.C. 2112(a);
- (2) A request that actions in all but one jurisdiction be stayed pending the conclusion of one proceeding;
- (3) A request that all but one action be dismissed pending the conclusion of one proceeding, with the suggestion that the other plaintiffs intervene in that one suit; or

(4) A request that one of the suits be maintained as a class action in behalf of all affected persons.

(h)(1) For the purpose of 28 U.S.C. 2112(a), a copy of any petition filed in any U.S. Court of Appeals challenging a final action of the Commissioner shall be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, or by personal delivery to the Chief Counsel of FDA. The petition copy shall be time-stamped by the clerk of the court when the original is filed with the court. The petition copy should be addressed to: Office of the Chief Counsel (GCF-1), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. The Chief Counsel requests that the purpose of all petitions mailed or delivered to the Office of Chief Counsel to satisfy 28 U.S.C. 2112(a) be clearly identified in a cover letter.

(2) If the Chief Counsel receives two or more petitions filed in two or more U.S. Courts of Appeals for review of any agency action within 10 days of the effective date of that action for the purpose of judicial review, the Chief Counsel will notify the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation of any petitions that were received within the 10-day period, in accordance with the applicable rule of the panel.

(3) For the purpose of determining whether a petition for review has been received within the 10-day period under paragraph (h)(2) of this section, the petition shall be considered to be received on the date of delivery, if personally delivered. If the delivery is accomplished by mail, the date of receipt shall be the date noted on the return receipt card.

161a

(i) Upon judicial review of administrative action under this section:

(1) If a court determines that the administrative record is inadequate to support the action, the Commissioner shall determine whether to proceed with such action.

(i) If the Commissioner decides to proceed with the action, the court will be requested to remand the matter to the agency to reopen the administrative proceeding and record, or on the Commissioner's own initiative the administrative proceeding and record may be reopened upon receipt of the court determination. A reopened administrative proceeding will be conducted under the provisions of this part and in accordance with any directions of the court.

(ii) If the Commissioner concludes that the public interest requires that the action remain in effect pending further administrative proceedings, the court will be requested not to stay the matter in the interim and the Commissioner shall expedite the further administrative proceedings.

(2) If a court determines that the administrative record is adequate, but the rationale for the action must be further explained:

(i) The Commissioner shall request either that further explanation be provided in writing directly to the court without further administrative proceedings, or that the administrative proceeding be reopened in accordance with paragraph (i)(1)(i) of this section; and

162a

(ii) If the Commissioner concludes that the public interest requires that the action remain in effect pending further court or administrative proceedings, the court will be requested not to stay the matter in the interim and the Commissioner shall expedite the further proceedings.

21 C.F.R. 312.300(a)

General

(a) Scope. This subpart contains the requirements for the use of investigational new drugs and approved drugs where availability is limited by a risk evaluation and mitigation strategy (REMS) when the primary purpose is to diagnose, monitor, or treat a patient's disease or condition. The aim of this subpart is to facilitate the availability of such drugs to patients with serious diseases or conditions when there is no comparable or satisfactory alternative therapy to diagnose, monitor, or treat the patient's disease or condition.

* * * * *

21 C.F.R. 314.50
Content and format of an NDA

NDA's and supplements to approved NDA's are required to be submitted in the form and contain the information, as appropriate for the particular submission, required under this section. Three copies of the NDA are required: An archival copy, a review copy, and a field copy. An NDA for a new chemical entity will generally contain an application form, an index, a summary, five or six technical sections, case report tabulations of patient data, case report forms, drug samples, and labeling, including, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter. Other NDA's will generally contain only some of those items, and information will be limited to that needed to support the particular submission. These include an NDA of the type described in section 505(b)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, an amendment, and a supplement. The NDA is required to contain reports of all investigations of the drug product sponsored by the applicant, and all other information about the drug pertinent to an evaluation of the NDA that is received or otherwise obtained by the applicant from any source. FDA will maintain guidance documents on the format and content of NDA's to assist applicants in their preparation.

(a) Application form. The applicant must submit a completed and signed application form that contains the following:

- (1) The name and address of the applicant; the date of the NDA; the NDA number if previously issued (for example, if the NDA is a resubmission or an amendment or supplement); the name of the drug

product, including its established, proprietary, code, and chemical names; the dosage form and strength; the route of administration; the identification numbers of all INDs (as defined in § 312.3(b) of this chapter) that are referenced in the NDA; the identification numbers of all drug master files and other applications under this part that are referenced in the NDA; and the drug product's proposed indications for use.

(2) A statement whether the submission is an original submission, a 505(b)(2) application, a resubmission, or a supplement to an application under § 314.70.

(3) A statement whether the applicant proposes to market the drug product as a prescription or an over-the-counter product.

(4) A check-list identifying what enclosures required under this section the applicant is submitting.

(5) The applicant, or the applicant's attorney, agent, or other authorized official must sign the NDA. If the person signing the NDA does not reside or have a place of business within the United States, the NDA is required to contain the name and address of, and be countersigned by, an attorney, agent, or other authorized official who resides or maintains a place of business within the United States.

(b) Index. The archival copy of the NDA is required to contain a comprehensive index by volume number and page number to the summary under paragraph (c) of this section, the technical sections under

paragraph (d) of this section, and the supporting information under paragraph (f) of this section.

(c) Summary.

(1) An NDA is required to contain a summary of the NDA in enough detail that the reader may gain a good general understanding of the data and information in the NDA, including an understanding of the quantitative aspects of the data. The summary is not required for supplements under § 314.70. Resubmissions of an NDA should contain an updated summary, as appropriate. The summary should discuss all aspects of the NDA, and synthesize the information into a well-structured and unified document. The summary should be written at approximately the level of detail required for publication in, and meet the editorial standards generally applied by, referred scientific and medical journals. In addition to the agency personnel reviewing the summary in the context of their review of the NDA, FDA may furnish the summary to FDA advisory committee members and agency officials whose duties require an understanding of the NDA. To the extent possible, data in the summary should be presented in tabular and graphic forms. FDA has prepared a guideline under § 10.90(b) that provides information about how to prepare a summary. The summary required under this paragraph may be used by FDA or the applicant to prepare the Summary Basis of Approval document for public disclosure (under § 314.430(e)(2)(ii)) when the NDA is approved.

(2) The summary is required to contain the following information:

(i) The proposed text of the labeling, including, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter, for the drug, with annotations to the information in the summary and technical sections of the NDA that support the inclusion of each statement in the labeling, and, if the NDA is for a prescription drug, statements describing the reasons for omitting a section or subsection of the labeling format in § 201.57 of this chapter.

(ii) A statement identifying the pharmacologic class of the drug and a discussion of the scientific rationale for the drug, its intended use, and the potential clinical benefits of the drug product.

(iii) A brief description of the marketing history, if any, of the drug outside the United States, including a list of the countries in which the drug has been marketed, a list of any countries in which the drug has been withdrawn from marketing for any reason related to safety or effectiveness, and a list of countries in which applications for marketing are pending. The description is required to describe both marketing by the applicant and, if known, the marketing history of other persons.

(iv) A summary of the chemistry, manufacturing, and controls section of the NDA.

(v) A summary of the nonclinical pharmacology and toxicology section of the NDA.

(vi) A summary of the human pharmacokinetics and bioavailability section of the NDA.

167a

(vii) A summary of the microbiology section of the NDA (for anti-infective drugs only).

(viii) A summary of the clinical data section of the NDA, including the results of statistical analyses of the clinical trials.

(ix) A concluding discussion that presents the benefit and risk considerations related to the drug, including a discussion of any proposed additional studies or surveillance the applicant intends to conduct postmarketing.

(d) Technical sections. The NDA is required to contain the technical sections described below. Each technical section is required to contain data and information in sufficient detail to permit the agency to make a knowledgeable judgment about whether to approve the NDA or whether grounds exist under section 505(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to refuse to approve the NDA. The required technical sections are as follows:

(1) Chemistry, manufacturing, and controls section. A section describing the composition, manufacture, and specification of the drug substance and the drug product, including the following:

(i) Drug substance. A full description of the drug substance including its physical and chemical characteristics and stability; the name and address of its manufacturer; the method of synthesis (or isolation) and purification of the drug substance; the process controls used during manufacture and packaging; and the specifications necessary to ensure the identity, strength, quality, and purity of

the drug substance and the bioavailability of the drug products made from the substance, including, for example, tests, analytical procedures, and acceptance criteria relating to stability, sterility, particle size, and crystalline form. The NDA may provide additionally for the use of alternatives to meet any of these requirements, including alternative sources, process controls, and analytical procedures. Reference to the current edition of the U.S. Pharmacopeia and the National Formulary may satisfy relevant requirements in this paragraph.

(ii)(a) Drug product. A list of all components used in the manufacture of the drug product (regardless of whether they appear in the drug product) and a statement of the composition of the drug product; the specifications for each component; the name and address of each manufacturer of the drug product; a description of the manufacturing and packaging procedures and in-process controls for the drug product; the specifications necessary to ensure the identity, strength, quality, purity, potency, and bioavailability of the drug product, including, for example, tests, analytical procedures, and acceptance criteria relating to sterility, dissolution rate, container closure systems; and stability data with proposed expiration dating. The NDA may provide additionally for the use of alternatives to meet any of these requirements, including alternative components, manufacturing and packaging procedures, in-process controls, and analytical procedures. Reference to the current edition of the U.S. Pharmacopeia and the National

Formulary may satisfy relevant requirements in this paragraph.

(b) Unless provided by paragraph (d)(1)(ii)(a) of this section, for each batch of the drug product used to conduct a bioavailability or bioequivalence study described in § 320.38 or § 320.63 of this chapter or used to conduct a primary stability study: The batch production record; the specification for each component and for the drug product; the names and addresses of the sources of the active and noncompensial inactive components and of the container and closure system for the drug product; the name and address of each contract facility involved in the manufacture, processing, packaging, or testing of the drug product and identification of the operation performed by each contract facility; and the results of any test performed on the components used in the manufacture of the drug product as required by § 211.84(d) of this chapter and on the drug product as required by § 211.165 of this chapter.

(c) The proposed or actual master production record, including a description of the equipment, to be used for the manufacture of a commercial lot of the drug product or a comparably detailed description of the production process for a representative batch of the drug product.

(iii) Environmental impact. The NDA is required to contain either a claim for categorical exclusion under § 25.30 or 25.31 of this chapter or an environmental assessment under § 25.40 of this chapter.

170a

(iv) The applicant may, at its option, submit a complete chemistry, manufacturing, and controls section 90 to 120 days before the anticipated submission of the remainder of the NDA. FDA will review such early submissions as resources permit.

(v) The applicant must include a statement certifying that the field copy of the NDA has been provided to the applicant's home FDA district office.

(2) Nonclinical pharmacology and toxicology section. A section describing, with the aid of graphs and tables, animal and in vitro studies with drug, including the following:

(i) Studies of the pharmacological actions of the drug in relation to its proposed therapeutic indication and studies that otherwise define the pharmacologic properties of the drug or are pertinent to possible adverse effects.

(ii) Studies of the toxicological effects of the drug as they relate to the drug's intended clinical uses, including, as appropriate, studies assessing the drug's acute, subacute, and chronic toxicity; carcinogenicity; and studies of toxicities related to the drug's particular mode of administration or conditions of use.

(iii) Studies, as appropriate, of the effects of the drug on reproduction and on the developing fetus.

(iv) Any studies of the absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion of the drug in animals.

(v) For each nonclinical laboratory study subject to the good laboratory practice regulations under part

58 a statement that it was conducted in compliance with the good laboratory practice regulations in part 58, or, if the study was not conducted in compliance with those regulations, a brief statement of the reason for the noncompliance.

(3) Human pharmacokinetics and bioavailability section. A section describing the human pharmacokinetic data and human bioavailability data, or information supporting a waiver of the submission of in vivo bioavailability data under subpart B of part 320, including the following:

(i) A description of each of the bioavailability and pharmacokinetic studies of the drug in humans performed by or on behalf of the applicant that includes a description of the analytical procedures and statistical methods used in each study and a statement with respect to each study that it either was conducted in compliance with the institutional review board regulations in part 56, or was not subject to the regulations under § 56.104 or § 56.105, and that it was conducted in compliance with the informed consent regulations in part 50.

(ii) If the NDA describes in the chemistry, manufacturing, and controls section tests, analytical procedures, and acceptance criteria needed to assure the bioavailability of the drug product or drug substance, or both, a statement in this section of the rationale for establishing the tests, analytical procedures, and acceptance criteria, including data and information supporting the rationale.

(iii) A summarizing discussion and analysis of the pharmacokinetics and metabolism of the active

ingredients and the bioavailability or bioequivalence, or both, of the drug product.

(4) Microbiology section. If the drug is an anti-infective drug, a section describing the microbiology data, including the following:

(i) A description of the biochemical basis of the drug's action on microbial physiology.

(ii) A description of the antimicrobial spectra of the drug, including results of in vitro preclinical studies to demonstrate concentrations of the drug required for effective use.

(iii) A description of any known mechanisms of resistance to the drug, including results of any known epidemiologic studies to demonstrate prevalence of resistance factors.

(iv) A description of clinical microbiology laboratory procedures (for example, in vitro sensitivity discs) needed for effective use of the drug.

(5) Clinical data section. A section describing the clinical investigations of the drug, including the following:

(i) A description and analysis of each clinical pharmacology study of the drug, including a brief comparison of the results of the human studies with the animal pharmacology and toxicology data.

(ii) A description and analysis of each controlled clinical study pertinent to a proposed use of the drug, including the protocol and a description of the statistical analyses used to evaluate the study. If the study report is an interim analysis, this is to be noted and a projected completion date provided.

Controlled clinical studies that have not been analyzed in detail for any reason (e.g., because they have been discontinued or are incomplete) are to be included in this section, including a copy of the protocol and a brief description of the results and status of the study.

(iii) A description of each uncontrolled clinical study, a summary of the results, and a brief statement explaining why the study is classified as uncontrolled.

(iv) A description and analysis of any other data or information relevant to an evaluation of the safety and effectiveness of the drug product obtained or otherwise received by the applicant from any source, foreign or domestic, including information derived from clinical investigations, including controlled and uncontrolled studies of uses of the drug other than those proposed in the NDA, commercial marketing experience, reports in the scientific literature, and unpublished scientific papers.

(v) An integrated summary of the data demonstrating substantial evidence of effectiveness for the claimed indications. Evidence is also required to support the dosage and administration section of the labeling, including support for the dosage and dose interval recommended. The effectiveness data must be presented by gender, age, and racial subgroups and must identify any modifications of dose or dose interval needed for specific subgroups. Effectiveness data from other subgroups of the population of patients treated, when appropriate, such as patients with renal

failure or patients with different levels of severity of the disease, also must be presented.

(vi) A summary and updates of safety information, as follows:

(a) The applicant must submit an integrated summary of all available information about the safety of the drug product, including pertinent animal data, demonstrated or potential adverse effects of the drug, clinically significant drug/drug interactions, and other safety considerations, such as data from epidemiological studies of related drugs. The safety data must be presented by gender, age, and racial subgroups. When appropriate, safety data from other subgroups of the population of patients treated also must be presented, such as for patients with renal failure or patients with different levels of severity of the disease. A description of any statistical analyses performed in analyzing safety data should also be included, unless already included under paragraph (d)(5)(ii) of this section.

(b) The applicant must, under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, update periodically its pending NDA with new safety information learned about the drug that may reasonably affect the statement of contraindications, warnings, precautions, and adverse reactions in the draft labeling and, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter. These “safety update reports” must include the same kinds of information (from clinical studies, animal studies, and other sources) and must be submitted in the same

format as the integrated summary in paragraph (d)(5)(vi)(a) of this section. In addition, the reports must include the case report forms for each patient who died during a clinical study or who did not complete the study because of an adverse event (unless this requirement is waived). The applicant must submit these reports (1) 4 months after the initial submission; (2) in a resubmission following receipt of a complete response letter; and (3) at other times as requested by FDA. Before submitting the first such report, applicants are encouraged to consult with FDA regarding further details on its form and content.

(vii) If the drug has a potential for abuse, a description and analysis of studies or information related to abuse of the drug, including a proposal for scheduling under the Controlled Substances Act. A description of any studies related to overdose is also required, including information on dialysis, antidotes, or other treatments, if known.

(viii) An integrated summary of the benefits and risks of the drug, including a discussion of why the benefits exceed the risks under the conditions stated in the labeling.

(ix) A statement with respect to each clinical study involving human subjects that it either was conducted in compliance with the institutional review board regulations in part 56, or was not subject to the regulations under § 56.104 or § 56.105, and that it was conducted in compliance with the informed consent regulations in part 50.

(x) If a sponsor has transferred any obligations for the conduct of any clinical study to a contract research organization, a statement containing the name and address of the contract research organization, identification of the clinical study, and a listing of the obligations transferred. If all obligations governing the conduct of the study have been transferred, a general statement of this transfer—in lieu of a listing of the specific obligations transferred—may be submitted.

(xi) If original subject records were audited or reviewed by the sponsor in the course of monitoring any clinical study to verify the accuracy of the case reports submitted to the sponsor, a list identifying each clinical study so audited or reviewed.

(6) Statistical section. A section describing the statistical evaluation of clinical data, including the following:

(i) A copy of the information submitted under paragraph (d)(5)(ii) of this section concerning the description and analysis of each controlled clinical study, and the documentation and supporting statistical analyses used in evaluating the controlled clinical studies.

(ii) A copy of the information submitted under paragraph (d)(5)(vi)(a) of this section concerning a summary of information about the safety of the drug product, and the documentation and supporting statistical analyses used in evaluating the safety information.

(7) Pediatric use section. A section describing the investigation of the drug for use in pediatric

populations, including an integrated summary of the information (the clinical pharmacology studies, controlled clinical studies, or uncontrolled clinical studies, or other data or information) that is relevant to the safety and effectiveness and benefits and risks of the drug in pediatric populations for the claimed indications, a reference to the full descriptions of such studies provided under paragraphs (d)(3) and (d)(5) of this section, and information required to be submitted under § 314.55.

(e) Samples and labeling.

(1) Upon request from FDA, the applicant must submit the samples described below to the places identified in the Agency's request. FDA generally will ask applicants to submit samples directly to two or more Agency laboratories that will perform all necessary tests on the samples and validate the applicant's analytical procedures.

(i) Four representative samples of the following, each sample in sufficient quantity to permit FDA to perform three times each test described in the NDA to determine whether the drug substance and the drug product meet the specifications given in the NDA:

(a) The drug product proposed for marketing;

(b) The drug substance used in the drug product from which the samples of the drug product were taken; and

(c) Reference standards and blanks (except that reference standards recognized in an official compendium need not be submitted).

178a

(ii) Samples of the finished market package, if requested by FDA.

(2) The applicant must submit the following in the archival copy of the NDA:

(i) Three copies of the analytical procedures and related descriptive information contained in the chemistry, manufacturing, and controls section under paragraph (d)(1) of this section for the drug substance and the drug product that are necessary for FDA's laboratories to perform all necessary tests on the samples and to validate the applicant's analytical procedures. The related descriptive information includes a description of each sample; the proposed regulatory specifications for the drug; a detailed description of the methods of analysis; supporting data for accuracy, specificity, precision and ruggedness; and complete results of the applicant's tests on each sample.

(ii) Copies of the label and all labeling for the drug product (including, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter) for the drug product (4 copies of draft labeling or 12 copies of final printed labeling).

(f) Case report forms and tabulations. The archival copy of the NDA is required to contain the following case report tabulations and case report forms:

(1) Case report tabulations. The NDA is required to contain tabulations of the data from each adequate and well-controlled study under § 314.126 (Phase 2 and Phase 3 studies as described in §§ 312.21(b) and (c) of this chapter), tabulations of the data from the earliest clinical pharmacology studies (Phase 1

studies as described in § 312.21(a) of this chapter), and tabulations of the safety data from other clinical studies. Routine submission of other patient data from uncontrolled studies is not required. The tabulations are required to include the data on each patient in each study, except that the applicant may delete those tabulations which the agency agrees, in advance, are not pertinent to a review of the drug's safety or effectiveness. Upon request, FDA will discuss with the applicant in a "pre-NDA" conference those tabulations that may be appropriate for such deletion. Barring unforeseen circumstances, tabulations agreed to be deleted at such a conference will not be requested during the conduct of FDA's review of the NDA. If such unforeseen circumstances do occur, any request for deleted tabulations will be made by the director of the FDA division responsible for reviewing the NDA, in accordance with paragraph (f)(3) of this section.

(2) Case report forms. The NDA is required to contain copies of individual case report forms for each patient who died during a clinical study or who did not complete the study because of an adverse event, whether believed to be drug related or not, including patients receiving reference drugs or placebo. This requirement may be waived by FDA for specific studies if the case report forms are unnecessary for a proper review of the study.

(3) Additional data. The applicant must submit to FDA additional case report forms and tabulations needed to conduct a proper review of the NDA, as requested by the director of the FDA division responsible for reviewing the NDA. The applicant's

failure to submit information requested by FDA within 30 days after receipt of the request may result in the agency viewing any eventual submission as a major amendment under § 314.60 and extending the review period as necessary. If desired by the applicant, the FDA division director will verify in writing any request for additional data that was made orally.

(4) Presentation and format. Applicants are invited to meet with FDA before submitting an NDA to discuss the presentation and format of supporting information. If the applicant and FDA agree, the applicant may submit tabulations of patient data and case report forms in an alternate form.

(g) Other. The following general requirements apply to the submission of information within the summary under paragraph (c) of this section and within the technical sections under paragraph (d) of this section.

(1) The applicant ordinarily is not required to resubmit information previously submitted, but may incorporate the information by reference. A reference to information submitted previously is required to identify the file by name, reference number, volume, and page number in the agency's records where the information can be found. A reference to information submitted to the agency by a person other than the applicant is required to contain a written statement that authorizes the reference and that is signed by the person who submitted the information.

(2) The applicant must submit an accurate and complete English translation of each part of the NDA that is not in English. The applicant must

submit a copy of each original literature publication for which an English translation is submitted.

(3) If an applicant who submits an NDA under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act obtains a “right of reference or use,” as defined under § 314.3(b), to an investigation described in clause (A) of section 505(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the applicant must include in its NDA a written statement signed by the owner of the data from each such investigation that the applicant may rely on in support of the approval of its NDA, and provide FDA access to, the underlying raw data that provide the basis for the report of the investigation submitted in its NDA.

(h) Patent information. The NDA is required to contain the patent information described under § 314.53.

(i) Patent certification—

(1) Contents. A 505(b)(2) application is required to contain the following:

(i) Patents claiming drug substance, drug product, or method of use.

(A) An appropriate patent certification or statement with respect to each patent issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of its knowledge, claims the drug substance or drug product on which investigations that are relied upon by the applicant for approval of its 505(b)(2) application were conducted or that

claims an approved use for such drug and for which information is required to be filed under section 505(b) and (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53. For each such patent, the applicant must provide the patent number and certify, in its opinion and to the best of its knowledge, one of the following circumstances:

(1) That the patent information has not been submitted to FDA. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph I Certification”;

(2) That the patent has expired. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph II Certification”;

(3) The date on which the patent will expire. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph III Certification”; or

(4)(i) That the patent is invalid, unenforceable, or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug product for which the 505(b)(2) application is submitted. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph IV Certification”. This certification must be submitted in the following form:

I, (name of applicant), certify that Patent No. ___ (is invalid, unenforceable, or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of) (name of proposed drug product) for which this 505(b)(2) application is submitted.

(ii) The certification must be accompanied by a statement that the applicant will comply with the requirements under § 314.52(a) with

respect to providing a notice to each owner of the patent or its representative and to the NDA holder (or, if the NDA holder does not reside or maintain a place of business within the United States, its attorney, agent, or other authorized official) for the drug product that is claimed by the patent or a use of which is claimed by the patent and with the requirements under § 314.52(b) with respect to sending the notice and under § 314.52(c) with respect to the content of the notice.

(B) If the drug on which investigations that are relied upon by the applicant were conducted is itself a licensed generic drug of a patented drug first approved under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, an appropriate patent certification or statement under this section with respect to each patent that claims the first-approved patented drug or that claims an approved use for such a drug.

(C) If, before the date of submission of an original 505(b)(2) application, there is a drug product approved in an NDA that is pharmaceutically equivalent to the drug product for which the original 505(b)(2) application is submitted, an appropriate patent certification or statement under this section with respect to each patent that claims the drug substance or drug product or that claims an approved use for one such drug product.

(ii) No relevant patents. If, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of its knowledge, there are

no patents described in paragraph (i)(1)(i) of this section, a certification in the following form:

In the opinion and to the best knowledge of (name of applicant), there are no patents that claim the drug or drugs on which investigations that are relied upon in this 505(b)(2) application were conducted or that claim a use of such drug or drugs.

(iii) Method-of-use patent.

(A) If information that is submitted under section 505(b) or (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53 is for a method-of-use patent, and the labeling for the drug product for which the applicant is seeking approval does not include an indication or other condition of use that is covered by the method-of-use patent, a statement explaining that the method-of-use patent does not claim a proposed indication or other condition of use.

(B) If the labeling of the drug product for which the applicant is seeking approval includes an indication or other condition of use that, according to the patent information submitted under section 505(b) or (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53 or in the opinion of the applicant, is claimed by a method-of-use patent, the applicant must submit an applicable certification under paragraph (i)(1)(i) of this section.

(2) [Reserved]

(3) Licensing agreements. If a 505(b)(2) application is submitted for a drug or method of using a drug claimed by a patent and the applicant has a

licensing agreement with the patent owner, the applicant must submit a paragraph IV certification as to that patent and a statement that the applicant has been granted a patent license. If the patent owner consents to approval of the 505(b)(2) application (if otherwise eligible for approval) as of a specific date, the 505(b)(2) application must contain a written statement from the patent owner that it has a licensing agreement with the applicant and that it consents to approval of the 505(b)(2) application as of a specific date.

(4) Untimely filing of patent information.

(i) If a patent described in paragraph (i)(1)(i)(A) of this section is issued and the holder of the approved NDA for the patented drug does not file with FDA the required information on the patent within 30 days of issuance of the patent, an applicant who submitted a 505(b)(2) application that, before the submission of the patent information, contained an appropriate patent certification or statement is not required to submit a patent certification or statement to address the patent or patent information that is late-listed with respect to the pending 505(b)(2) application. Except as provided in § 314.53(f)(1), an NDA holder's amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent will be considered untimely filing of patent information unless:

(A) The amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent is submitted within 30 days of patent issuance;

(B) The amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent

is submitted within 30 days of approval of a corresponding change to product labeling; or

(C) The amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent is submitted within 30 days of a decision by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office or by a Federal district court, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, or the U.S. Supreme Court that is specific to the patent and alters the construction of a method-of-use claim(s) of the patent, and the amendment contains a copy of the decision.

(ii) An applicant whose 505(b)(2) application is submitted after the NDA holder's untimely filing of patent information or whose 505(b)(2) application was previously filed but did not contain an appropriate patent certification or statement at the time of the patent submission must submit a certification under paragraph (i)(1)(i) of this section and/or a statement under paragraph (i)(1)(iii) of this section as to that patent.

(5) Disputed patent information. If an applicant disputes the accuracy or relevance of patent information submitted to FDA, the applicant may seek a confirmation of the correctness of the patent information in accordance with the procedures under § 314.53(f). Unless the patent information is withdrawn, the applicant must submit an appropriate certification or statement for each listed patent.

(6) Amended certifications. A patent certification or statement submitted under paragraphs (i)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section may be amended at any

time before the approval of the 505(b)(2) application. An applicant must submit an amended certification as an amendment to a pending 505(b)(2) application. If an applicant with a pending 505(b)(2) application voluntarily makes a patent certification for an untimely filed patent, the applicant may withdraw the patent certification for the untimely filed patent. Once an amendment is submitted to change the certification, the 505(b)(2) application will no longer be considered to contain the prior certification.

(i) After finding of infringement. An applicant who has submitted a paragraph IV certification and is sued for patent infringement must submit an amendment to change its certification if a court enters a final decision from which no appeal has been or can be taken, or signs and enters a settlement order or consent decree in the action that includes a finding that the patent is infringed, unless the final decision, settlement order, or consent decree also finds the patent to be invalid. In its amendment, the applicant must certify under paragraph (i)(1)(i)(A)(3) of this section that the patent will expire on a specific date or, with respect to a patent claiming a method of use, the applicant may instead provide a statement under paragraph (i)(1)(iii) of this section if the applicant amends its 505(b)(2) application such that the applicant is no longer seeking approval for a method of use claimed by the patent. Once an amendment for the change has been submitted, the 505(b)(2) application will no longer be considered to contain a paragraph IV certification to the patent. If a final

decision finds the patent to be invalid and infringed, an amended certification is not required.

(ii) After request to remove a patent or patent information from the list. If the list reflects that an NDA holder has requested that a patent or patent information be removed from the list and no ANDA applicant is eligible for 180-day exclusivity based on a paragraph IV certification to that patent, the patent or patent information will be removed and any applicant with a pending 505(b)(2) application (including a tentatively approved 505(b)(2) application) who has made a certification with respect to such patent must submit an amendment to withdraw its certification. In the amendment, the applicant must state the reason for withdrawing the certification or statement (that the patent has been removed from the list). If the list reflects that an NDA holder has requested that a patent or patent information be removed from the list and one or more first applicants are eligible for 180-day exclusivity based on a paragraph IV certification to that patent, the patent will remain listed until any 180-day exclusivity based on that patent has expired or has been extinguished. A 505(b)(2) applicant is not required to provide or maintain a certification to a patent or patent information that remains listed only for purposes of a first applicant's 180-day exclusivity for its ANDA. Once an amendment to withdraw the certification has been submitted, the 505(b)(2) application will no longer be considered to contain a paragraph IV certification to the patent. If removal of a patent from the list results in there being no patents listed for the listed drug(s)

identified in the 505(b)(2) application, the applicant must submit an amended certification reflecting that there are no listed patents.

(iii) Other amendments.

(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (i)(4) and (i)(6)(iii)(B) of this section:

(1) An applicant must amend a submitted certification or statement if, at any time before the approval of the 505(b)(2) application, the applicant learns that the submitted certification or statement is no longer accurate; and

(2) An applicant must submit an appropriate patent certification or statement under paragraph (i)(1) of this section if, after submission of the 505(b)(2) application, a new patent is issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of its knowledge, claims a listed drug relied upon or that claims an approved use for such listed drug for which information is required to be filed under section 505(b) and (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53.

(B) An applicant is not required to submit a supplement to change a submitted certification when information on an otherwise applicable patent is submitted after the approval of the 505(b)(2) application.

(j) Claimed exclusivity. A new drug product, upon approval, may be entitled to a period of marketing exclusivity under the provisions of § 314.108. If an applicant believes its drug product is entitled to a

period of exclusivity, it must submit with the NDA prior to approval the following information:

(1) A statement that the applicant is claiming exclusivity.

(2) A reference to the appropriate paragraph under § 314.108 that supports its claim.

(3) If the applicant claims exclusivity under § 314.108(b)(2), information to show that, to the best of its knowledge or belief, a drug has not previously been approved under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act containing any active moiety in the drug for which the applicant is seeking approval.

(4) If the applicant claims exclusivity under § 314.108(b)(4) or (b)(5), the following information to show that the NDA contains “new clinical investigations” that are “essential to approval of the NDA or supplement” and were “conducted or sponsored by the applicant:”

(i) “New clinical investigations.” A certification that to the best of the applicant’s knowledge each of the clinical investigations included in the NDA meets the definition of “new clinical investigation” set forth in § 314.108(a).

(ii) “Essential to approval.” A list of all published studies or publicly available reports of clinical investigations known to the applicant through a literature search that are relevant to the conditions for which the applicant is seeking approval, a certification that the applicant has thoroughly searched the scientific literature and, to the best of the applicant’s knowledge, the list is complete and

accurate and, in the applicant's opinion, such published studies or publicly available reports do not provide a sufficient basis for the approval of the conditions for which the applicant is seeking approval without reference to the new clinical investigation(s) in the NDA, and an explanation as to why the studies or reports are insufficient.

(iii) "Conducted or sponsored by." If the applicant was the sponsor named in the Form FDA 1571 for an IND under which the new clinical investigation(s) that is essential to the approval of its NDA was conducted, identification of the IND by number. If the applicant was not the sponsor of the IND under which the clinical investigation(s) was conducted, a certification that the applicant or its predecessor in interest provided substantial support for the clinical investigation(s) that is essential to the approval of its NDA, and information supporting the certification. To demonstrate "substantial support," an applicant must either provide a certified statement from a certified public accountant that the applicant provided 50 percent or more of the cost of conducting the study or provide an explanation of why FDA should consider the applicant to have conducted or sponsored the study if the applicant's financial contribution to the study is less than 50 percent or the applicant did not sponsor the investigational new drug. A predecessor in interest is an entity, e.g., a corporation, that the applicant has taken over, merged with, or purchased, or from which the applicant has purchased all rights to the drug. Purchase of nonexclusive rights to a clinical

investigation after it is completed is not sufficient to satisfy this definition.

(k) Financial certification or disclosure statement. The NDA must contain a financial certification or disclosure statement or both as required by part 54 of this chapter.

(l) Format of an original NDA—

(1) Archival copy. The applicant must submit a complete archival copy of the NDA that contains the information required under paragraphs (a) through (f) of this section. FDA will maintain the archival copy during the review of the NDA to permit individual reviewers to refer to information that is not contained in their particular technical sections of the NDA, to give other agency personnel access to the NDA for official business, and to maintain in one place a complete copy of the NDA. Except as required by paragraph (l)(1)(i) of this section, applicants may submit the archival copy on paper or in electronic format provided that electronic submissions are made in accordance with part 11 of this chapter.

(i) Labeling. The content of labeling required under § 201.100(d)(3) of this chapter (commonly referred to as the package insert or professional labeling), including all text, tables, and figures, must be submitted to the agency in electronic format as described in paragraph (l)(5) of this section. This requirement is in addition to the requirements of paragraph (e)(2)(ii) of this section that copies of the formatted label and all labeling be submitted. Submissions under this paragraph must be made in accordance with part 11 of this chapter, except

for the requirements of § 11.10(a), (c) through (h), and (k), and the corresponding requirements of § 11.30.

(ii) [Reserved]

(2) Review copy. The applicant must submit a review copy of the NDA. Each of the technical sections, described in paragraphs (d)(1) through (6) of this section, in the review copy is required to be separately bound with a copy of the application form required under paragraph (a) of this section and a copy of the summary required under paragraph (c) of this section.

(3) Field copy. The applicant must submit a field copy of the NDA that contains the technical section described in paragraph (d)(1) of this section, a copy of the application form required under paragraph (a) of this section, a copy of the summary required under paragraph (c) of this section, and a certification that the field copy is a true copy of the technical section described in paragraph (d)(1) of this section contained in the archival and review copies of the NDA.

(4) Binding folders. The applicant may obtain from FDA sufficient folders to bind the archival, the review, and the field copies of the NDA.

(5) Electronic format submissions. Electronic format submissions must be in a form that FDA can process, review, and archive. FDA will periodically issue guidance on how to provide the electronic submission (e.g., method of transmission, media, file formats, preparation and organization of files).

21 C.F.R. 314.94
Content and format of an ANDA

ANDAs are required to be submitted in the form and contain the information required under this section. Three copies of the ANDA are required, an archival copy, a review copy, and a field copy. FDA will maintain guidance documents on the format and content of ANDAs to assist applicants in their preparation.

(a) ANDAs. Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, the applicant must submit a complete archival copy of the ANDA that includes the following:

(1) Application form. The applicant must submit a completed and signed application form that contains the information described under § 314.50(a)(1), (a)(3), (a)(4), and (a)(5). The applicant must state whether the submission is an ANDA under this section or a supplement to an ANDA under § 314.97.

(2) Table of contents. The archival copy of the ANDA is required to contain a table of contents that shows the volume number and page number of the contents of the submission.

(3) Basis for ANDA submission. An ANDA must refer to a listed drug. Ordinarily, that listed drug will be the drug product selected by the Agency as the reference standard for conducting bioequivalence testing. The ANDA must contain:

(i) The name of the reference listed drug, including its dosage form and strength. For an ANDA based on an approved petition under § 10.30 of this

chapter and § 314.93, the reference listed drug must be the same as the listed drug referenced in the approved petition.

(ii) A statement as to whether, according to the information published in the list, the reference listed drug is entitled to a period of marketing exclusivity under section 505(j)(5)(F) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(iii) For an ANDA based on an approved petition under § 10.30 of this chapter and § 314.93, a reference to the FDA–assigned docket number for the petition and a copy of FDA’s correspondence approving the petition.

(4) Conditions of use.

(i) A statement that the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling proposed for the drug product have been previously approved for the reference listed drug.

(ii) A reference to the applicant’s annotated proposed labeling and to the currently approved labeling for the reference listed drug provided under paragraph (a)(8) of this section.

(5) Active ingredients.

(i) For a single-active-ingredient drug product, information to show that the active ingredient is the same as that of the reference single-active-ingredient listed drug, as follows:

(A) A statement that the active ingredient of the proposed drug product is the same as that of the reference listed drug.

196a

(B) A reference to the applicant's annotated proposed labeling and to the currently approved labeling for the reference listed drug provided under paragraph (a)(8) of this section.

(ii) For a combination drug product, information to show that the active ingredients are the same as those of the reference listed drug except for any different active ingredient that has been the subject of an approved petition, as follows:

(A) A statement that the active ingredients of the proposed drug product are the same as those of the reference listed drug, or if one of the active ingredients differs from one of the active ingredients of the reference listed drug and the ANDA is submitted under the approval of a petition under § 314.93 to vary such active ingredient, information to show that the other active ingredients of the drug product are the same as the other active ingredients of the reference listed drug, information to show that the different active ingredient is an active ingredient of another listed drug or of a drug that does not meet the definition of "new drug" in section 201(p) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and such other information about the different active ingredient that FDA may require.

(B) A reference to the applicant's annotated proposed labeling and to the currently approved labeling for the reference listed drug provided under paragraph (a)(8) of this section.

(6) Route of administration, dosage form, and strength.

(i) Information to show that the route of administration, dosage form, and strength of the drug product are the same as those of the reference listed drug except for any differences that have been the subject of an approved petition, as follows:

(A) A statement that the route of administration, dosage form, and strength of the proposed drug product are the same as those of the reference listed drug.

(B) A reference to the applicant's annotated proposed labeling and to the currently approved labeling for the reference listed drug provided under paragraph (a)(8) of this section.

(ii) If the route of administration, dosage form, or strength of the drug product differs from the reference listed drug and the ANDA is submitted under an approved petition under § 314.93, such information about the different route of administration, dosage form, or strength that FDA may require.

(7) Bioequivalence.

(i) Information that shows that the drug product is bioequivalent to the reference listed drug upon which the applicant relies. A complete study report must be submitted for the bioequivalence study upon which the applicant relies for approval. For all other bioequivalence studies conducted on the same drug product formulation as defined in § 314.3(b), the applicant must submit either a complete or summary report. If a summary report of a bioequivalence study is submitted and FDA determines that there may be bioequivalence

issues or concerns with the product, FDA may require that the applicant submit a complete report of the bioequivalence study to FDA; or

(ii) If the ANDA is submitted pursuant to a petition approved under § 314.93, the results of any bioavailability or bioequivalence testing required by the Agency, or any other information required by the Agency to show that the active ingredients of the proposed drug product are of the same pharmacological or therapeutic class as those in the reference listed drug and that the proposed drug product can be expected to have the same therapeutic effect as the reference listed drug. If the proposed drug product contains a different active ingredient than the reference listed drug, FDA will consider the proposed drug product to have the same therapeutic effect as the reference listed drug if the applicant provides information demonstrating that:

(A) There is an adequate scientific basis for determining that substitution of the specific proposed dose of the different active ingredient for the dose of the member of the same pharmacological or therapeutic class in the reference listed drug will yield a resulting drug product whose safety and effectiveness have not been adversely affected.

(B) The unchanged active ingredients in the proposed drug product are bioequivalent to those in the reference listed drug.

(C) The different active ingredient in the proposed drug product is bioequivalent to an approved dosage form containing that ingre-

dient and approved for the same indication as the proposed drug product or is bioequivalent to a drug product offered for that indication which does not meet the definition of “new drug” under section 201(p) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(iii) For each in vivo or in vitro bioequivalence study contained in the ANDA:

(A) A description of the analytical and statistical methods used in each study; and

(B) With respect to each study involving human subjects, a statement that the study either was conducted in compliance with the institutional review board regulations in part 56 of this chapter, or was not subject to the regulations under § 56.104 or § 56.105 of this chapter, and that it was conducted in compliance with the informed consent regulations in part 50 of this chapter.

(8) Labeling—

(i) Listed drug labeling. A copy of the currently approved labeling (including, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter) for the listed drug referred to in the ANDA, if the ANDA relies on a reference listed drug.

(ii) Copies of proposed labeling. Copies of the label and all labeling for the drug product including, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter (4 copies of draft labeling or 12 copies of final printed labeling).

200a

(iii) Statement on proposed labeling. A statement that the applicant's proposed labeling including, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter is the same as the labeling of the reference listed drug except for differences annotated and explained under paragraph (a)(8)(iv) of this section.

(iv) Comparison of approved and proposed labeling. A side-by-side comparison of the applicant's proposed labeling including, if applicable, any Medication Guide required under part 208 of this chapter with the approved labeling for the reference listed drug with all differences annotated and explained. Labeling (including the container label, package insert, and, if applicable, Medication Guide) proposed for the drug product must be the same as the labeling approved for the reference listed drug, except for changes required because of differences approved under a petition filed under § 314.93 or because the drug product and the reference listed drug are produced or distributed by different manufacturers. Such differences between the applicant's proposed labeling and labeling approved for the reference listed drug may include differences in expiration date, formulation, bioavailability, or pharmacokinetics, labeling revisions made to comply with current FDA labeling guidelines or other guidance, or omission of an indication or other aspect of labeling protected by patent or accorded exclusivity under section 505(j)(5)(F) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(9) Chemistry, manufacturing, and controls.

201a

(i) The information required under § 314.50(d)(1), except that the information required under § 314.50(d)(1)(ii)(c) must contain the proposed or actual master production record, including a description of the equipment, to be used for the manufacture of a commercial lot of the drug product.

(ii) Inactive ingredients. Unless otherwise stated in paragraphs (a)(9)(iii) through (a)(9)(v) of this section, an applicant must identify and characterize the inactive ingredients in the proposed drug product and provide information demonstrating that such inactive ingredients do not affect the safety or efficacy of the proposed drug product.

(iii) Inactive ingredient changes permitted in drug products intended for parenteral use. Generally, a drug product intended for parenteral use must contain the same inactive ingredients and in the same concentration as the reference listed drug identified by the applicant under paragraph (a)(3) of this section. However, an applicant may seek approval of a drug product that differs from the reference listed drug in preservative, buffer, or antioxidant provided that the applicant identifies and characterizes the differences and provides information demonstrating that the differences do not affect the safety or efficacy of the proposed drug product.

(iv) Inactive ingredient changes permitted in drug products intended for ophthalmic or otic use. Generally, a drug product intended for ophthalmic or otic use must contain the same inactive

ingredients and in the same concentration as the reference listed drug identified by the applicant under paragraph (a)(3) of this section. However, an applicant may seek approval of a drug product that differs from the reference listed drug in preservative, buffer, substance to adjust tonicity, or thickening agent provided that the applicant identifies and characterizes the differences and provides information demonstrating that the differences do not affect the safety or efficacy of the proposed drug product, except that, in a product intended for ophthalmic use, an applicant may not change a buffer or substance to adjust tonicity for the purpose of claiming a therapeutic advantage over or difference from the listed drug, e.g., by using a balanced salt solution as a diluent as opposed to an isotonic saline solution, or by making a significant change in the pH or other change that may raise questions of irritability.

(v) Inactive ingredient changes permitted in drug products intended for topical use. Generally, a drug product intended for topical use, solutions for aerosolization or nebulization, and nasal solutions shall contain the same inactive ingredients as the reference listed drug identified by the applicant under paragraph (a)(3) of this section. However, an ANDA may include different inactive ingredients provided that the applicant identifies and characterizes the differences and provides information demonstrating that the differences do not affect the safety or efficacy of the proposed drug product.

203a

(10) Samples. The information required under § 314.50(e)(1) and (e)(2)(i). Samples need not be submitted until requested by FDA.

(11) Other. The information required under § 314.50(g).

(12) Patent certification—

(i) Patents claiming drug substance, drug product, or method of use.

(A) An appropriate patent certification or statement with respect to each patent issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of its knowledge, claims the reference listed drug or that claims a use of such listed drug for which the applicant is seeking approval under section 505(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and for which information is required to be filed under section 505(b) and (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53. For each such patent, the applicant must provide the patent number and certify, in its opinion and to the best of its knowledge, one of the following circumstances:

(1) That the patent information has not been submitted to FDA. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph I Certification”;

(2) That the patent has expired. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph II Certification”;

204a

(3) The date on which the patent will expire. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph III Certification”; or

(4)(i) That the patent is invalid, unenforceable, or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of the drug product for which the ANDA is submitted. The applicant must entitle such a certification “Paragraph IV Certification”. This certification must be submitted in the following form:

I, (name of applicant), certify that Patent No. _____ (is invalid, unenforceable, or will not be infringed by the manufacture, use, or sale of) (name of proposed drug product) for which this ANDA is submitted.

(ii) The certification must be accompanied by a statement that the applicant will comply with the requirements under § 314.95(a) with respect to providing a notice to each owner of the patent or its representative and to the NDA holder (or, if the NDA holder does not reside or maintain a place of business within the United States, its attorney, agent, or other authorized official) for the listed drug, with the requirements under § 314.95(b) with respect to sending the notice, and with the requirements under § 314.95(c) with respect to the content of the notice.

(B) If the ANDA refers to a listed drug that is itself a licensed generic product of a patented drug first approved under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, an appropriate patent certification or statement

205a

under paragraph (a)(12)(i) and/or (iii) of this section with respect to each patent that claims the first-approved patented drug or that claims a use for such drug.

(ii) No relevant patents. If, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of its knowledge, there are no patents described in paragraph (a)(12)(i) of this section, a certification in the following form:

In the opinion and to the best knowledge of (name of applicant), there are no patents that claim the listed drug referred to in this ANDA or that claim a use of the listed drug.

(iii) Method-of-use patent.

(A) If patent information is submitted under section 505(b) or (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53 for a patent claiming a method of using the listed drug, and the labeling for the drug product for which the applicant is seeking approval does not include an indication or other condition of use that is covered by the method-of-use patent, a statement explaining that the method-of-use patent does not claim a proposed indication or other condition of use.

(B) If the labeling of the drug product for which the applicant is seeking approval includes an indication or other condition of use that, according to the patent information submitted under section 505(b) or (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53 or in the opinion of the applicant, is claimed by a method-

206a

of-use patent, an applicable certification under paragraph (a)(12)(i) of this section.

(iv) [Reserved by 81 FR 69649]

(v) Licensing agreements. If the ANDA is for a drug or method of using a drug claimed by a patent and the applicant has a licensing agreement with the patent owner, the applicant must submit a paragraph IV certification as to that patent and a statement that the applicant has been granted a patent license. If the patent owner consents to approval of the ANDA (if otherwise eligible for approval) as of a specific date, the ANDA must contain a written statement from the patent owner that it has a licensing agreement with the applicant and that it consents to approval of the ANDA as of a specific date.

(vi) Untimely filing of patent information.

(A) If a patent on the listed drug is issued and the holder of the approved NDA for the listed drug does not file with FDA the required information on the patent within 30 days of issuance of the patent, an applicant who submitted an ANDA for that drug that contained an appropriate patent certification or statement before the submission of the patent information is not required to submit a patent certification or statement to address the patent or patent information that is late-listed with respect to the pending ANDA. Except as provided in § 314.53(f)(1), an NDA holder's amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent will be considered untimely filing of patent information unless:

207a

(1) The amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent is submitted within 30 days of patent issuance;

(2) The amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent is submitted within 30 days of approval of a corresponding change to product labeling; or

(3) The amendment to the description of the approved method(s) of use claimed by the patent is submitted within 30 days of a decision by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office or by a Federal district court, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, or the U.S. Supreme Court that is specific to the patent and alters the construction of a method-of-use claim(s) of the patent, and the amendment contains a copy of the decision.

(B) An applicant whose ANDA is submitted after the NDA holder's untimely filing of patent information, or whose pending ANDA was previously submitted but did not contain an appropriate patent certification or statement at the time of the patent submission, must submit a certification under paragraph (a)(12)(i) of this section and/or a statement under paragraph (a)(12)(iii) of this section as to that patent.

(vii) Disputed patent information. If an applicant disputes the accuracy or relevance of patent information submitted to FDA, the applicant may seek a confirmation of the correctness of the patent information in accordance with the procedures

under § 314.53(f). Unless the patent information is withdrawn, the applicant must submit an appropriate certification or statement for each listed patent.

(viii) Amended certifications. A patent certification or statement submitted under paragraphs (a)(12)(i) through (iii) of this section may be amended at any time before the approval of the ANDA. If an applicant with a pending ANDA voluntarily makes a patent certification for an untimely filed patent, the applicant may withdraw the patent certification for the untimely filed patent. An applicant must submit an amended certification as an amendment to a pending ANDA. Once an amendment is submitted to change a certification, the ANDA will no longer be considered to contain the prior certification.

(A) After finding of infringement. An applicant who has submitted a paragraph IV certification and is sued for patent infringement must submit an amendment to change its certification if a court enters a final decision from which no appeal has been or can be taken, or signs and enters a settlement order or consent decree in the action that includes a finding that the patent is infringed, unless the final decision, settlement order, or consent decree also finds the patent to be invalid. In its amendment, the applicant must certify under paragraph (a)(12)(i)(A)(3) of this section that the patent will expire on a specific date or, with respect to a patent claiming a method of use, the applicant may instead provide a statement under paragraph (a)(12)(iii) of this section if the applicant amends its ANDA

such that the applicant is no longer seeking approval for a method of use claimed by the patent. Once an amendment for the change has been submitted, the ANDA will no longer be considered to contain a paragraph IV certification to the patent. If a final judgment finds the patent to be invalid and infringed, an amended certification is not required.

(B) After request to remove a patent or patent information from the list. If the list reflects that an NDA holder has requested that a patent or patent information be removed from the list and no ANDA applicant is eligible for 180-day exclusivity based on a paragraph IV certification to that patent, the patent or patent information will be removed and any applicant with a pending ANDA (including a tentatively approved ANDA) who has made a certification with respect to such patent must submit an amendment to withdraw its certification. In the amendment, the applicant must state the reason for withdrawing the certification or statement (that the patent has been removed from the list). If the list reflects that an NDA holder has requested that a patent or patent information be removed from the list and one or more first applicants are eligible for 180-day exclusivity based on a paragraph IV certification to that patent, the patent will remain listed until any 180-day exclusivity based on that patent has expired or has been extinguished. After any applicable 180-day exclusivity has expired or has been extinguished, the patent or patent information will be removed and any applicant

210a

with a pending ANDA (including a tentatively approved ANDA) who has made a certification with respect to such patent must submit an amendment to withdraw its certification. Once an amendment to withdraw the certification has been submitted, the ANDA will no longer be considered to contain a paragraph IV certification to the patent. If removal of a patent from the list results in there being no patents listed for the listed drug identified in the ANDA, the applicant must submit an amended certification reflecting that there are no relevant patents.

(C) Other amendments.

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (a)(12)(vi) and (a)(12)(viii)(C)(2) of this section:

(i) An applicant must amend a submitted certification or statement if, at any time before the date of approval of the ANDA, the applicant learns that the submitted certification or statement is no longer accurate; and

(ii) An applicant must submit an appropriate patent certification or statement under paragraph (a)(12)(i) and/or (iii) of this section if, after submission of the ANDA, a new patent is issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that, in the opinion of the applicant and to the best of its knowledge, claims the reference listed drug or that claims an approved use for such reference listed drug and for which information is required to be filed under section 505(b) and (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and § 314.53. For

211a

a paragraph IV certification, the certification must not be submitted earlier than the first working day after the day the patent is published in the list.

(2) An applicant is not required to submit a supplement to change a submitted certification when information on a patent on the listed drug is submitted after the approval of the ANDA.

(13) Financial certification or disclosure statement. An ANDA must contain a financial certification or disclosure statement as required by part 54 of this chapter.

(b) Drug products subject to the Drug Efficacy Study Implementation (DESI) review. If the ANDA is for a duplicate of a drug product that is subject to FDA's DESI review (a review of drug products approved as safe between 1938 and 1962) or other DESI-like review and the drug product evaluated in the review is a listed drug, the applicant must comply with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) [Reserved]

(d) Format of an ANDA.

(1) The applicant must submit a complete archival copy of the ANDA as required under paragraphs (a) and (c) of this section. FDA will maintain the archival copy during the review of the ANDA to permit individual reviewers to refer to information that is not contained in their particular technical sections of the ANDA, to give other Agency personnel access to the ANDA for official business,

and to maintain in one place a complete copy of the ANDA.

(i) Format of submission. An applicant may submit portions of the archival copy of the ANDA in any form that the applicant and FDA agree is acceptable, except as provided in paragraph (d)(1)(ii) of this section.

(ii) Labeling. The content of labeling required under § 201.100(d)(3) of this chapter (commonly referred to as the package insert or professional labeling), including all text, tables, and figures, must be submitted to the agency in electronic format as described in paragraph (d)(1)(iii) of this section. This requirement applies to the content of labeling for the proposed drug product only and is in addition to the requirements of paragraph (a)(8)(ii) of this section that copies of the formatted label and all proposed labeling be submitted. Submissions under this paragraph must be made in accordance with part 11 of this chapter, except for the requirements of § 11.10(a), (c) through (h), and (k), and the corresponding requirements of § 11.30.

(iii) Electronic format submissions. Electronic format submissions must be in a form that FDA can process, review, and archive. FDA will periodically issue guidance on how to provide the electronic submission (e.g., method of transmission, media, file formats, preparation and organization of files).

(2) For ANDAs, the applicant must submit a review copy of the ANDA that contains two separate sections. One section must contain the information

described under paragraphs (a)(2) through (6) and (8) and (9) of this section and section 505(j)(2)(A)(vii) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and a copy of the analytical procedures and descriptive information needed by FDA's laboratories to perform tests on samples of the proposed drug product and to validate the applicant's analytical procedures. The other section must contain the information described under paragraphs (a)(3), (7), and (8) of this section. Each of the sections in the review copy is required to contain a copy of the application form described under paragraph (a) of this section.

(3) [Reserved]

(4) The applicant may obtain from FDA sufficient folders to bind the archival, the review, and the field copies of the ANDA.

(5) The applicant must submit a field copy of the ANDA that contains the technical section described in paragraph (a)(9) of this section, a copy of the application form required under paragraph (a)(1) of this section, and a certification that the field copy is a true copy of the technical section described in paragraph (a)(9) of this section contained in the archival and review copies of the ANDA.

21 C.F.R. 314.105(c)
Approval of an NDA and an ANDA

* * * * *

(c) FDA will approve an NDA after it determines that the drug meets the statutory standards for safety and effectiveness, manufacturing and controls, and labeling, and an ANDA after it determines that the drug meets the statutory standards for manufacturing and controls, labeling, and, where applicable, bioequivalence. While the statutory standards apply to all drugs, the many kinds of drugs that are subject to the statutory standards and the wide range of uses for those drugs demand flexibility in applying the standards. Thus FDA is required to exercise its scientific judgment to determine the kind and quantity of data and information an applicant is required to provide for a particular drug to meet the statutory standards. FDA makes its views on drug products and classes of drugs available through guidance documents, recommendations, and other statements of policy.

* * * * *

21 C.F.R. 314.151

**Withdrawal of approval of an abbreviated
new drug application under section 505(j)(5)
of the act**

(a) Approval of an abbreviated new drug application approved under § 314.105(d) may be withdrawn when the agency withdraws approval, under § 314.150(a) or under this section, of the approved drug referred to in the abbreviated new drug application. If the agency proposed to withdraw approval of a listed drug under § 314.150(a), the holder of an approved application for the listed drug has a right to notice and opportunity for hearing. The published notice of opportunity for hearing will identify all drug products approved under § 314.105(d) whose applications are subject to withdrawal under this section if the listed drug is withdrawn, and will propose to withdraw such drugs. Holders of approved applications for the identified drug products will be provided notice and an opportunity to respond to the proposed withdrawal of their applications as described in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section.

(b)(1) The published notice of opportunity for hearing on the withdrawal of the listed drug will serve as notice to holders of identified abbreviated new drug applications of the grounds for the proposed withdrawal.

(2) Holders of applications for drug products identified in the notice of opportunity for hearing may submit written comments on the notice of opportunity for hearing issued on the proposed withdrawal of the listed drug. If an abbreviated new drug application holder submits comments on

the notice of opportunity for hearing and a hearing is granted, the abbreviated new drug application holder may participate in the hearing as a nonparty participant as provided for in § 12.89 of this chapter.

(3) Except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section, the approval of an abbreviated new drug application for a drug product identified in the notice of opportunity for hearing on the withdrawal of a listed drug will be withdrawn when the agency has completed the withdrawal of approval of the listed drug.

(c)(1) If the holder of an application for a drug identified in the notice of opportunity for hearing has submitted timely comments but does not have an opportunity to participate in a hearing because a hearing is not requested or is settled, the submitted comments will be considered by the agency, which will issue an initial decision. The initial decision will respond to the comments, and contain the agency's decision whether there are grounds to withdraw approval of the listed drug and of the abbreviated new drug applications on which timely comments were submitted. The initial decision will be sent to each abbreviated new drug application holder that has submitted comments.

(2) Abbreviated new drug application holders to whom the initial decision was sent may, within 30 days of the issuance of the initial decision, submit written objections.

(3) The agency may, at its discretion, hold a limited oral hearing to resolve dispositive factual issues

that cannot be resolved on the basis of written submissions.

(4) If there are no timely objections to the initial decision, it will become final at the expiration of 30 days.

(5) If timely objections are submitted, they will be reviewed and responded to in a final decision.

(6) The written comments received, the initial decision, the evidence relied on in the comments and in the initial decision, the objections to the initial decision, and, if a limited oral hearing has been held, the transcript of that hearing and any documents submitted therein, shall form the record upon which the agency shall make a final decision.

(7) Except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section, any abbreviated new drug application whose holder submitted comments on the notice of opportunity for hearing shall be withdrawn upon the issuance of a final decision concluding that the listed drug should be withdrawn for grounds as described in § 314.150(a). The final decision shall be in writing and shall constitute final agency action, reviewable in a judicial proceeding.

(8) Documents in the record will be publicly available in accordance with § 10.20(j) of this chapter. Documents available for examination or copying will be placed on public display in the Dockets Management Staff (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, room. 1-23, 12420 Parklawn Dr., Rockville, MD 20857, promptly upon receipt in that office.

(d) If the agency determines, based upon information submitted by the holder of an abbreviated new drug application, that the grounds for withdrawal of the listed drug are not applicable to a drug identified in the notice of opportunity for hearing, the final decision will state that the approval of the abbreviated new drug application for such drug is not withdrawn.

21 C.F.R. 314.430(b)
Availability for public disclosure of data and information in an application or abbreviated application

* * * * *

(b) FDA will not publicly disclose the existence of an application or abbreviated application before an approval letter is sent to the applicant under § 314.105 or tentative approval letter is sent to the applicant under § 314.107, unless the existence of the application or abbreviated application has been previously publicly disclosed or acknowledged.

* * * * *

219a

21. C.F.R. 314.500
Scope

This subpart applies to certain new drug products that have been studied for their safety and effectiveness in treating serious or life-threatening illnesses and that provide meaningful therapeutic benefit to patients over existing treatments (e.g., ability to treat patients unresponsive to, or intolerant of, available therapy, or improved patient response over available therapy).

21 C.F.R. 314.520
Approval with restrictions to assure safe use

(a) If FDA concludes that a drug product shown to be effective can be safely used only if distribution or use is restricted, FDA will require such postmarketing restrictions as are needed to assure safe use of the drug product, such as:

- (1) Distribution restricted to certain facilities or physicians with special training or experience; or
- (2) Distribution conditioned on the performance of specified medical procedures.

(b) The limitations imposed will be commensurate with the specific safety concerns presented by the drug product.