OMICS International
conferenceseries.com

Pharmaceut Reg Affairs 2015, 4:3
http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2167-7689.S1.019

5th International Conference and Exhibition on

Pharmaceutical Regulatory Affairs

August 03-05, 2015 Orlando, USA

The judicialization of the applications submitted to ANVISA

Marcio Raposo de Almeida
MRA Consulting Business, Brazil

One of the biggest problems that businesses face when it comes to ANVISA is the length of its claims. In this situation, which does not include the appeals process in case of refusal, the Company has invested in technology, marketing, research and development, among other things, cannot wait that long for a final decision on its application for registration. The Law 6.360/76, specifically in 3, the Art. 12 provide that the registration will be granted no later than ninety (90) days. (very different time those presented in the table above). The judiciary is deferring injunctions that ANVISA review the claims of the Company and provides deadlines for compliance. Indeed, it is not uncommon to see in the Official Gazette records are granted to have their claims have been reviewed by court order. Importantly, the judge hardly determines that ANVISA grant a record, but expedite the examination of a resource, for example, is common. You cannot generalize the deadlines, because everything depends on the documentation of the quality, complexity, among other factors involving each specific case. The international inspections were also the subject of injunctions in 2014 and today the Inspection Management is doing everything to compliance with judicial decisions and those cases that preferred to wait in line. The goal here is not to encourage the companies to seek the judiciary to solve all your problems, but expose the current panorama of the justiciability of matters involving ANVISA. Solve administratively is always the best option, but to wait years to see their drug application, for example, be analyzed, is too much for one company that has invested and does not see the return with the brevity that the law requires. Finally, ANVISA is doing everything to improve these analyzes, either by creating or modifying regulations its internal structure. So it is important to follow the meetings of the Board of Directors, in addition to the technical meetings with ANVISA make associations and syndicate.

mraposo@mraposo.com.br

Key issues with amended CBE-supplementation for ANDA holders

Martha
Touro College of Pharmacy, USA

FDA's proposed rule to amend the regulations would allow generic manufacturers to change their products' labeling to reflect newly acquired safety information in advance of FDA's review of the change; i.e. changes-being-effected (CBE-0) procedures. Currently, ANDA holders may not use the CBE-0 process to unilaterally change ANDA labeling in a manner that differs from the Reference Listed Drug (RLD). FDA's proposal comes about, in part, because of two recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions. In 2011, in Pliva Inc. v. Mensing the Court held that injured plaintiffs' state-law failure to warn claims against generic manufacturers are pre-empted under federal law. In 2013, in Mut. Pharm Co. Inc. v. Bartlettthe Court held that injured plaintiffs' state-law design defect claims against generic manufacturers that turn on the adequacy of a drug's warnings are also preempted by federal law. In the aftermath of these two decisions, consumers injured by generic drugs are left without recourse. Proponents of FDA's proposed ruleargue that it will provide an avenue to file failure-to-warn tort claims against generic manufacturers and encouraging them to establish extensive drug safety systems to protect the public while creating parity among application holders. Opponents argue that the proposed rule violates FDAs statutory mandate, would increase generic drug prices (and potential shortages), and rather than promoting safety would lead to confusion when labeling for a generic version of a medication will not be the same as labeling for the underlying brand-name drug. The proposed rule would create a regulatory framework whereby multiple different warnings can simultaneously exist in the marketplace for multiple generic versions of a drug. Opponents also argue the billions of dollars that will be diverted to the legal system by consumer plaintiffs could better be devoted to healthcare improvements. Other advocate that in as much as an absence of evidence exists to indicate that current authority of brand manufacturers to make temporary labeling changes upon submission of a CBE-0 supplement has led to improved patient safety, the current policy should be re-evaluated. FDA may proceed with a final proposed rule, which generic manufacturers have vowed to legally challenge or legislation may be proposed.

martha.rumore@touro.edu