

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Filed: August 12, 2015

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE DRUGS VI LLC

PETITIONER

V.

CELGENE CORPORATION

PATENT OWNER

---

CASE NO.: IPR2015-01102

PATENT NO. 6,315,720

FILED: OCTOBER 23, 2000

ISSUED: NOVEMBER 13, 2001

INVENTORS: BRUCE A. WILLIAMS, JOSEPH K. KAMINSKI

TITLE: METHODS FOR DELIVERING A DRUG TO A PATIENT WHILE  
AVOIDING THE OCCURRENCE OF AN ADVERSE SIDE EFFECT KNOWN  
OR SUSPECTED OF BEING CAUSED BY THE DRUG

---

**OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(6) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.12**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction .....1

II. Statement of Material Facts.....3

III. Response to Patent Owner’s “Relevant Facts” .....5

IV. Argument.....7

    A. The Petitions are proper under the AIA and serve public interests. ....7

    B. Neither the Petition nor RPI abused or improperly used process. ....9

    C. The Board cannot dismiss petitions prior to institution as a sanction.....14

V. Conclusion.....15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Brennan</i> , 952 F.2d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	13
<i>Baker Driveaway Co. v. Bankhead Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 478 F. Supp. 857 (E.D. Mich. 1979) .....	14
<i>Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas</i> , 536 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	15
<i>Earl v. Winne</i> , 34 N.J. Super. 606 (Law Div. 1955).....	6
<i>Edward Katzinger Co. v. Chicago Metallic Mfg.</i> , 329 U.S. 394 (1947) .....	9
<i>Houlahan v. WorldWide</i> , 677 F. Supp. 2d 195 (D.D.C. 2010).....	10, 11, 12
<i>Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. JP Morgan Chase &amp; Co.</i> , 781 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	14, 15
<i>Lear v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653 (1969) .....	1, 9
<i>Morowitz v. Marvel</i> , 423 A.2d 196 (D.C. 1980).....	11
<i>Nader v. Democratic Nat’l Comm.</i> , 555 F. Supp. 2d (D.D.C. 2008) .....	10, 12, 13
<i>Neumann v. Vidal</i> , 710 F.2d 856 (D.C. Cir. 1983) .....	10
<i>Prof’l Real Estate Investors, Inc. v. Columbia Pictures Indus.</i> , 508 U.S. 49 (1993) .....	13
<i>Scott v. District of Columbia</i> , 101 F.3d 748 (D.C. Cir. 1996).....	11
<i>SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.</i> , 403 F.3d 1131 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	9
<i>State v. Roth</i> , 289 N.J. Super. 152 (1996).....	6
<i>Tedards v. Auty</i> , 232 N.J. Super. 541 (App. Div. 1989).....	6
<i>U.S. v. Pendergraft</i> , 297 F.3d 1198 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002) .....	6

### Federal Communications Commission

5 FCC Rcd. 3911 (1999).....	10
-----------------------------	----

### U.S. Code

35 U.S.C. § 316.....	14
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(d) .....	12

## TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
<b>1034</b>	Orange Book Drug Product Listing Corresponding to the ‘501 Patent, as published by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on August 4, 2015
<b>1035</b>	Orange Book Drug Product Listing Corresponding to U.S. Patent No. 6,315,720, as published by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on August 4, 2015
<b>1036</b>	Pricing Information for Revlimid® (lenalidomide) capsules from “Information for Vermont Prescribers of Prescription Drugs,” from Medi-Span and Celgene Corporation (July 1, 2015)
<b>1037</b>	Pricing Information for Thalomid® (thalidomide) capsules from “Information for Vermont Prescribers of Prescription Drugs,” from Medi-Span and Celgene Corporation (July 1, 2015)
<b>1038</b>	Pricing Information for Pomalyst® (pomalidomide) capsules from “Information for Vermont Prescribers of Prescription Drugs,” from Medi-Span and Celgene Corporation (July 1, 2015)
<b>1039</b>	<i>Celgene Corp. v. Barr Laboratories, Inc. et al.</i> , Complaint, filed January 18, 2007, U.S. Dist. Ct. New Jersey, Case No.: 2:33-av-00001
<b>1040</b>	<i>Celgene Corp. v. Natco Pharma Ltd.</i> , U.S. Dist. Ct. New Jersey, Complaint, Case No: 2:10-cv-05197-SDW-SCM
<b>1041</b>	<i>Celgene Corp. v. Lannett Holdings Inc., et al.</i> , Complaint, U.S. Dist. Ct. New Jersey, Case No. 2:15-cv-00697-SDW-SCM
<b>1042</b>	<i>Celgene v. Barr</i> , Stipulated Dismissal, dated and filed May 21, 2010, in U.S. Dist. Ct. New Jersey Case No. 2:07-cv-00286-SDW-MCA
<b>1043</b>	<i>International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craft Workers Local 1 Health Fund v. Celgene Corp.</i> , Class Action Antitrust Complaint, filed November 7, 2014, U.S. Dist. Ct. New Jersey, 2:14-cv-06997-KSH-CLW

Exhibit No.	Description
1044	Celgene Letter Motion dated September 3, 2014, to Bifurcate and Stay Expert discovery re: REMS Patents, in <i>Celgene Corp. v Natco Pharma Ltd.</i> , U.S. Dist. Ct. New Jersey, Case No: 2:10-cv-05197-SDW-SCM
1045	October 24, 2014, Court Order granting Celgene Motion to Bifurcate and Stay Expert discovery re: REMS Patents, in <i>Celgene Corp. v Natco Pharma Ltd.</i> , U.S. Dist. Ct. New Jersey, Case No: 2:10-cv-05197-SDW-SCM
1046	Orange Book Patents Corresponding to Celgene's Thalomid® (thalidomide) capsules, as published by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on August 6, 2015
1047	Orange Book Patents Corresponding to Celgene's Revlimid® (lenalidomide) capsules, as published by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on August 6, 2015
1048	Orange Book Patents Corresponding to Celgene's Pomalyst® (pomalidomide) capsules, as published by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration on August 6, 2015
1049	To Promote Innovation: The Proper Balance of Competition and Patent Law and Policy—A Report by the Federal Trade Commission October 2003
1050	“Evergreening: A Deceptive Device in Patent Rights,” Gaurav Dwivedi <i>et al.</i> , <i>Tech. in Society</i> (2010) 32:324–30
1051	“Pay-for-Delay: How Drug Company Pay-Offs Cost Consumers Billions,” FTC Staff Study January 2010
1052	May 28, 2015 Statement of the Federal Trade Commission on <i>FTC v. Cephalon, Inc.</i>
1053	“The Impact of Exempting the Pharmaceutical Industry from Patent Reviews,” Dean Baker, Center for Economic and Policy Research (July 2015)
1054	Declaration of Juan (Julie) Wu, Ph.D., M.S. (“ <i>Wu Decl.</i> ”)
1055	<i>Review of Recent Judicial Decisions on Patent Law: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary</i> , 112 <sup>th</sup> Cong. 29 (2011)

# 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.