

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LUPIN LTD., LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,  
INNOPHARMA LICENSING, INC., INNOPHARMA LICENSING LLC,  
INNOPHARMA INC., INNOPHARMA LLC,  
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC., and MYLAN INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

SENJU PHARMACEUTICAL CO., LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01097 (Patent 8,754,131 B2)<sup>1</sup>  
Case IPR2015-01100 (Patent 8,927,606 B1)<sup>2</sup>  
Case IPR2015-01105 (Patent 8,871,813 B2)<sup>3</sup>

---

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

OBERMANN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER<sup>4</sup>  
Granting Petitioners' Motion to Seal  
*37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14*

---

<sup>1</sup> Case IPR2016-00089 has been joined with this proceeding.

<sup>2</sup> Case IPR2016-00091 has been joined with this proceeding.

<sup>3</sup> Case IPR2016-00090 has been joined with this proceeding.

<sup>4</sup> This Order addresses issues common to each proceeding; therefore, we enter the identical order in each proceeding.

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

In an Order dated June 21, 2016, the Board denied a joint request to seal Exhibits 2082, 2109, and Patent Owner’s Response. Paper 60.<sup>5</sup> We stated that, “[a]lthough the parties have established that those materials represent or contain confidential information, a protective order has not been entered in the captioned proceedings and an adequate proposed protective order” had not been filed. *Id.* at 3–4 (bridging sentence). Concurrently herewith, we issue an order granting a joint request for entry of an Amended Proposed Stipulated Protective Order, which governs the disclosure of confidential information in these proceedings. A Final Written Decision was entered by the Board on September 12, 2016. Paper 70.

On July 29, 2016, the Board received Petitioners’ Motion to Seal, which renews the request to seal Exhibits 2082, 2109, and Patent Owner’s Response. Paper 65 (“Motion”). Given that we previously determined that the parties had demonstrated sufficiently that those documents reflect confidential information (Paper 60, 3–4), and in light of our concurrent order entering the Amended Proposed Stipulated Protective Order to govern disclosure of confidential information in these proceedings, we *grant* the Motion.

*Requiring a Joint Stipulation and Counsel Certification*

Within thirty five (35) days after entry of the Final Written Decision, Patent Owner and Petitioner shall file a Joint Stipulation that identifies with particularity the exact portions (by page or paragraph number) of all sealed

---

<sup>5</sup> Substantially similar papers were filed in each proceeding. Mot. 1. For convenience, we refer to papers filed in IPR2015-01097.

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

papers and exhibits that are cited in the Final Written Decision. The Joint Stipulation shall include a Counsel Certification attesting to the accuracy and completeness of the Joint Stipulation, including a statement verifying that the exact portion of each paper and exhibit cited in the Final Written Decision is identified (by page or paragraph number) in the Joint Stipulation.

We specifically provided the parties advance notice “that information subject to a protective order will become public if identified in a final written decision in this proceeding.” Paper 58, 5. Further, the Rules of Practice for Trial Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Rules of Practice”) provide that:

Confidential information that is subject to a protective order ordinarily will become public 45 days after denial of a petition to institute a trial or 45 days after final judgment in a trial. *There is an expectation that information will be made public where the existence of the information is referred to in a decision to grant or deny a request to institute a review or is identified in a final written decision following a trial.* A party seeking to maintain the confidentiality of information, however, may file a motion to expunge the information from the record prior to the information becoming public.

77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48761, Section I.E.6. (Aug. 14, 2012) (emphasis added). There is a presumption, therefore, that any confidential information cited in the Final Written Decision shall become public forty five (45) days after entry of the Final Written Decision.

A strong public interest favors maintaining a complete and understandable record of the patent history, including the factual basis for the Board’s findings and the intelligibility of the Final Written Decision. By placing confidential information before the Board, Petitioner accepted the risk that the information will become public if relied upon in the Final

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

Written Decision. Rules of Practice, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48761, Section I.E.6. (Aug. 14, 2012) (“There is an expectation that information will be made public where the existence of the information . . . is identified in a final written decision following a trial.”).

Accordingly, all papers and exhibits identified in the Joint Stipulation shall be unsealed and made publicly available forty five (45) days after entry of the Final Written Decision, unless a revised public version of the paper or exhibit, conforming to the following requirements, is filed no later than thirty five (35) days (that is, ten days prior to the date set for unsealing) after entry of the Final Written Decision. Specifically, a party may prevent the unsealing of any paper or exhibit identified in the Joint Stipulation by filing, no later than thirty five (35) days after entry of the Final Written Decision, a revised public version of the paper or exhibit in which each page or paragraph cited in the Final Written Decision is left unredacted. Material not cited in the Final Written Decision may be redacted in the revised public version.

It is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion to Seal is *granted* to the extent set forth in this Order;

FURTHER ORDERED that, within thirty five (35) days after entry of the Final Written Decision, Patent Owner and Petitioner shall file a Joint Stipulation as described in this Order, which identifies with particularity the exact portions (by page or paragraph number) of all sealed papers and exhibits that are cited in the Final Written Decision;

IPR2015-01097 (Patent 8,754,131 B2)

IPR2015-01100 (Patent 8,927,606 B1)

IPR2015-01105 (Patent 8,871,813 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Stipulation shall include a Counsel Certification attesting to the accuracy and completeness of the Joint Stipulation, including a statement verifying that the exact portion of each paper and exhibit cited in the Final Written Decision is identified (by page or paragraph number) in the Joint Stipulation;

FURTHER ORDERED that all papers and exhibits identified in the Joint Stipulation shall be unsealed and made publicly available forty five (45) days after entry of the Final Written Decision, unless a revised public version of the paper or exhibit, conforming to the requirements of this Order, is filed no later than thirty five (35) days (that is, ten days prior to the date set for unsealing) after entry of the Final Written Decision;

FURTHER ORDERED that a party may prevent the unsealing of any paper or exhibit identified in the Joint Stipulation by filing, no later than thirty five (35) days after entry of the Final Written Decision, a revised public version of the paper or exhibit in which each page or paragraph cited in the Final Written Decision is left unredacted.

# 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.