

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LUPIN LTD. and LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SENJU PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01097 (Patent 8,754,131 B2)  
Case IPR2015-01099 (Patent 8,669,290 B2)  
Case IPR2015-01100 (Patent 8,927,606 B1)  
Case IPR2015-01105 (Patent 8,871,813 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before FRANCISCO C. PRATS, ERICA A. FRANKLIN, and  
GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

OBERMANN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

*Modifying Due Date 7 of the Scheduling Order*  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.5(c)(1)*

---

<sup>1</sup> This order addresses issues common to all cases; therefore, we issue a single order to be entered in each proceeding. The parties are authorized to use this style heading when filing a single paper in multiple proceedings, provided that such heading includes a footnote attesting that “the word-for-word identical paper is filed in each proceeding identified in the heading.”

IPR2015-01097 (Patent 8,754,131 B2)  
IPR2015-01099 (Patent 8,669,290 B2)  
IPR2015-01100 (Patent 8,927,606 B1)  
IPR2015-01105 (Patent 8,871,813 B2)

During a telephone conference held on December 11, 2015, Patent Owner requested a modification of Due Date 7, the date set for final hearing in each proceeding. *See* Paper 10<sup>2</sup> (Scheduling Order, setting Due Date 7 as June 6, 2016). We granted that request and changed Due Date 7, the date for final hearing, if requested and granted, from June 6, 2016, to June 9, 2016.

Patent Owner retained a court reporter for the telephone conference. Patent Owner agreed to file, in due course, the transcript of the telephone conference as an exhibit in each proceeding. The reasons supporting Patent Owner's request for a modification of Due Date 7 are reflected in that transcript, which shall serve as the official record of the telephone conference.

For completeness of the record, we attach to this Order copies of email communications that prompted the telephone conference. Attachments A, B, C, and D.

It is

ORDERED that Due Date 7 set in the Scheduling Order (Paper 10) is changed in each proceeding from June 6, 2016, to June 9, 2016.

---

<sup>2</sup> Paper numbers are identical in each proceeding.

IPR2015-01097 (Patent 8,754,131 B2)  
IPR2015-01099 (Patent 8,669,290 B2)  
IPR2015-01100 (Patent 8,927,606 B1)  
IPR2015-01105 (Patent 8,871,813 B2)

PETITIONER:

Deborah H. Yellin  
[DYellin@crowell.com](mailto:DYellin@crowell.com)

Jonathan M. Lindsay  
[JLindsay@crowell.com](mailto:JLindsay@crowell.com)

PATENT OWNER:

Bryan C. Diner  
[bryan.diner@finnegan.com](mailto:bryan.diner@finnegan.com)

Justin J. Hasford  
[justin.hasford@finnegan.com](mailto:justin.hasford@finnegan.com)

Joshua L. Goldberg  
[joshua.goldberg@finnegan.com](mailto:joshua.goldberg@finnegan.com)

IPR2015-01097 (Patent 8,754,131 B2)  
IPR2015-01099 (Patent 8,669,290 B2)  
IPR2015-01100 (Patent 8,927,606 B1)  
IPR2015-01105 (Patent 8,871,813 B2)

## ATTACHMENT A

Counsel: Please the first line of this e-mail should be IPR089 not IPR809.  
Thank you,  
Maria

**From:** Vignone, Maria **On Behalf Of** Trials  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 09, 2015 2:30 PM  
**To:** Diner, Bryan; Trials  
**Cc:** Malik, Jitty; EXT- [bryan.skelton@alston.com](mailto:bryan.skelton@alston.com); Soderstrom, Lance; [Dyellin@crowell.com](mailto:Dyellin@crowell.com); [jlindsay@crowell.com](mailto:jlindsay@crowell.com); Hasford, Justin; Goldberg, Joshua; Ferrill, Elizabeth  
**Subject:** RE: Unopposed Second Request for Extension of Time to File Oppositions to Motion for Joinder (IPR2016-00089; IPR2016-00090; IPR2016-00091)

Re:  
IPR2015-00902 (IPR902)  
IPR2015-00903 (IPR903)  
IPR2015-01097 (IPR097)  
IPR2015-01099 (IPR099)  
IPR2015-01100 (IPR100)  
IPR2015-01105 (IPR105)  
IPR2015-01871 (IPR871)  
IPR2016-00089 (IPR089)  
IPR2016-00090 (IPR090)  
IPR2016-00091 (IPR091)

Counsel:

Patent Owner's (Senju's) time for filing any opposition to InnoPharma's motions for joinder in IPR809, IPR900, and IPR091 is extended from December 11, 2015, to December 18, 2015.

The parties are requested to address the following matters during the telephone conference set for December 11, 2015, at 2 pm EST, pertaining to the alleged "agreed upon proposed schedule that would apply to all ten (10) IPRs" ("Proposed Global Schedule"). Email to Board from Mr. Bryan Diner ("Diner Email") (transmitted December 4, 2015).

1. IPR902 is not the subject of a motion for joinder. The panel shall not disturb the hearing date set in IPR902.
2. IPR903 is the subject of a motion for joinder filed in IPR871. Should the petition and motion for joinder be granted in IPR871, the joined proceeding in IPR903 shall proceed on the schedule currently set in IPR903. See IPR871 (Paper 10) (reflecting agreement to conditions of joinder

IPR2015-01097 (Patent 8,754,131 B2)  
IPR2015-01099 (Patent 8,669,290 B2)  
IPR2015-01100 (Patent 8,927,606 B1)  
IPR2015-01105 (Patent 8,871,813 B2)

that will not increase the complexity of IPR903 to a degree warranting a change in the schedule set in IPR903).

3. The parties should address the Proposed Global Schedule as it relates to the remaining seven (7) IPRs identified in the Diner Email, keeping in mind that the Board shall enter no schedule in any IPR before determining that the petition warrants institution.

4. Regarding the motions for joinder that are pending in IPR089, IPR090, and IPR091, please address the following issues: a) To facilitate our consideration of the motions, will InnoPharma agree to proceed in IPR097, IPR100, and IPR105 based only upon the arguments and evidence advanced by Lupin in those earlier-filed actions and accept a back-seat, “understudy” role in the joined proceedings, without any right to separate or additional briefing or discovery, much as Lupin has agreed in connection with the motion for joinder pending in IPR871 (*see* Paper 10); b) In the event that the petitions and joinder motions are granted, will Lupin permit InnoPharma to rely upon its declarant(s) in the joined proceedings.; and (c) in this scenario, would Senju oppose joinder.

Thank you,

Maria Vignone  
Paralegal Operations Manager  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
571-272-4645

# 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.