

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS IV LLC

Petitioner

v.

PHARMACYCLICS, INC.

Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2015-01076

Patent No. 8,754,090

---

**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR  
SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.12**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I.    Congress Expressly Authorized Any Person to File a Petition for IPR.....	2
A.    CFAD Has Standing to Bring This IPR.....	2
B.    PO’s Citation to Legislative History Is Inapplicable.....	4
II.   The <i>Noerr-Pennington</i> Doctrine Bars PO’s Abuse of Process and Improper Use of the Proceedings Claims.....	5
A.    The <i>Noerr-Pennington</i> Doctrine Protects CFAD’s Right to Bring This IPR Petition.....	5
B.    PO Has Failed to Establish That CFAD’s Petition Falls Within the Narrow Sham Exception to the <i>Noerr-               Pennington</i> Doctrine .....	7
1.  PO has failed to allege, let alone establish, that CFAD’s petition is objectively baseless.....	7
2.  PO has failed to establish CFAD’s petition is brought with the specific intent to further wrongful conduct through the use of the process rather than the outcome of the process.....	8
C.    PO’s Abuse of Process and Improper Use Claims Are Legally Deficient in Other Respects.....	10
III.  Dismissal of This Proceeding as a Sanction Would Be Arbitrary, Capricious and Would Violate Due Process .....	12

IV.	The Public Has a Strong Interest in Invalidating Poor-Quality Patents.....	13
A.	The Supreme Court and Congress Have Recognized the Strong Public Interest in Invalidating Poor-Quality Patents .....	13
B.	The Public Has Expressed a Strong Interest in Having Poor-Quality Pharmaceutical Patents Invalidated through the IPR Process.....	13
	CONCLUSION.....	15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Brennan</i> , 952 F.2d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	6
<i>Cal. Motor Transp. Co. v. Trucking Unlimited</i> , 404 U.S. 508 (1972).....	6
<i>Dassault Systemes, S.A. v. Childress</i> , No. 09-10534, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167548 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 3, 2014) .....	11
<i>Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. MacLean</i> , 135 S.Ct. 913 (2015).....	3
<i>E.R.R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc.</i> , 365 U.S. 127 (1961).....	6
<i>FilmTec Corp. v. Hydranautics</i> , 67 F.3d 931 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	7
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trs. of Columbia Univ. in the City of N.Y.</i> , IPR2012-00006, Paper 28 (PTAB Mar. 12, 2013).....	8
<i>In re Applications of High Plains Wireless, L.P.</i> , 15 F.C.C. Rcd. 4620 (2000).....	11
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653 (1969).....	1, 13, 15
<i>LKQ Corp. v. ClearLamp, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00020, Paper 18 (PTAB Mar. 29, 2013).....	8
<i>Loral Space &amp; Communications, Inc. v. Viasat, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00236, IPR2014-00239, IPR2014-00240, Paper 9 (PTAB July 7, 2014).....	4

...

<i>Macauto U.S.A. v. BOS GmbH &amp; KG,</i> IPR2012-00004, Paper 18 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2013) .....	8
<i>Nader v. Democratic Nat’l Comm.,</i> 555 F.Supp.2d 137 (D.D.C. 2008).....	passim
<i>Pope Manufacturing Co. v. Gormully,</i> 144 U.S. 224 (1892).....	13
<i>Prof’l Real Estate Investors, Inc. (“PRE”) v. Columbia Pictures Indus.,</i> 508 U.S. 49 (1993).....	7, 8
<i>Proportion-Air, Inc. v. Buzmatics,</i> 57 F.3d 1085, 1995 U.S. App. LEXIS 25871 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	6
<i>Russello v. United States,</i> 464 U.S. 16 (1983).....	4
<i>Satellite Broadcasting Co. v. FCC,</i> 824 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1987).....	12
<i>SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.,</i> 403 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	13
<i>Wenger Mfg., Inc. v. Coating Mach. Sys., Inc.,</i> No. 4-98-CV-90083, 1999 WL 33268173 (S.D. Iowa Sept. 30, 1999) .....	11
<i>World Enters. v. Aquila, Inc.,</i> 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 122830 (D. Utah 2013) .....	11
<b><u>Other Authorities</u></b>	
U.S. Const. Amend. I. ....	5
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(d) .....	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.12(7) .....	10

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.