

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ASTRAZENECA AB,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01122
Patent RE44,186

Before MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, RAMA G. ELLURU, and
CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ELLURU, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Grant of Motion for Joinder
37 C.F.R. § 42.208
37 C.F.R. § 42.222

Petitioner, Teva Pharmaceuticals, USA, Inc. (“Teva”), filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 4, 6–22, 25–30, 32–37, and 39–42 (the “challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. RE44,186 (Ex. 1001, “the ’186 patent”) (Paper 1, “Pet.”). Concurrently with its Petition, Teva filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3, “Mot.”), seeking to consolidate this case, under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), with the *inter partes* review in *Mylan Pharms., Inc. v. AstraZeneca AB, LLC*, Case IPR2015-01340 (“the Mylan IPR” and Petitioner “Mylan”), which was instituted on May 2, 2016. See IPR2015-01340 (Paper 16, 34–35) (rehearing decision instituting review of claims 1, 2, 4, 6–22, 25–30, 32–37, and 39–42 of the ’186 patent).

Patent Owner AstraZeneca AB (“AstraZeneca”) waived filing a preliminary response. Paper 13. AstraZeneca initially opposed Teva’s Motion for Joinder (Paper 10), but subsequently withdrew its opposition to the Motion for Joinder (Paper 13).

For the reasons set forth below, we conclude that Teva has shown that the Petition warrants institution of *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 4, 6–22, 25–30, 32–37, and 39–42 of the ’186 patent. This conclusion is consistent with our institution decision in the Mylan IPR. See IPR2015-01340, Paper 16, 34–35. Further, we grant Teva’s Motion for Joinder and exercise our discretion to join Teva as a Petitioner to the Mylan IPR. We further terminate the present proceeding, IPR206-01122.

I. PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

Teva indicates that the ’186 patent is the subject of numerous district court cases filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware. Pet. 18. In addition, the ’186 patent is the subject of pending *inter partes* review proceedings, including IPR2016-01029, IPR2016-01104, and IPR2016-

01117. The '186 patent also was the subject of the Mylan IPR, as noted above.

In the Mylan IPR, we instituted *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 4, 6–22, 25–30, 32–37, and 39–42 of the '186 patent on the same grounds of unpatentability asserted in the present Petition, reproduced below. Pet 19; *see also* Mot. 5–6; and IPR2015-01340, Paper 16, 34–35.

Ground	Claims	Description
1	1, 2, 4, 6-11, 25-28, 32-35, 39 and 40	Obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ashworth, Villhauer, Raag and Hanessian
2	12-16, 29, 30, 36, 37, 41 and 42	Obvious under § 103 over Ashworth, Villhauer, Raag, Hanessian, Bachovchin and Glucophage® Label
3	12, 17, 18, 22	Obvious under § 103 over Ashworth, Villhauer, Raag, Hanessian, Bachovchin and Xenical® Label
4	12, 19, 20, 21	Obvious under § 103 over Ashworth, Villhauer, Raag, Hanessian, Bachovchin and Mevacor® Label

Pet. 19.

Teva supports its assertions with the same evidence and arguments proffered in the Mylan IPR. Pet. 24–60. Teva notes that “[i]n this case, joinder will not affect the Board’s ability to issue the decision within [the] required one-year timeframe because the Petition filed in the present Teva IPR is substantially identical to the Mylan IPR.” Mot. 8.

We incorporate our analysis from our institution decision in the Mylan IPR. IPR2015-01340, Paper 16, 6–32, 34–35. For the same reasons, we determine that Teva has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it will prevail with respect to its challenge to claims 1, 2, 4, 6–22, 25–30, 32–37, and 39–42 of the '161 patent on the asserted grounds.

II. MOTION FOR JOINDER

In the Motion for Joinder, Teva seeks joinder with the *inter partes* review in the Mylan IPR. Mot. 1. Teva filed the present Motion on May June 1, 2016, within one month of our decision instituting *inter partes* review in IPR2015-01340, which issued on May 2, 2016. *See* IPR2015-01340, Paper 16; *see also* Mot 2. Therefore, the Motion is timely under 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) (“Any request for joinder must be filed, as a motion under § 42.22, no later than one month after the institution date of any inter partes review for which joinder is requested.”).

The Board, acting on behalf of the Director, has the discretion to join a party to a pending *inter partes* review where the conditions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) are met. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315(c); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a) (“The Board institutes the trial on behalf of the Director.”). Specifically, 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) provides:

If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

As noted above, we have instituted *inter partes* review of claims 1, 2, 4, 6–22, 25–30, 32–37, and 39–42 of the ’186 patent in the Mylan IPR. *See generally* IPR2015-01209, Paper 16. In addition, we determined above that Teva has filed a Petition that warrants institution of *inter partes* review of the same claims. Accordingly, the conditions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) are satisfied, and we must consider whether to exercise our discretion to join Teva as a Petitioner to the Mylan IPR.

In its Motion for Joinder, Teva asserts that:

Joinder is also warranted in order to permit Teva to protect its interests related to the validity and interpretation of the '186 patent claims, and Teva could be prejudiced if it is not permitted to participate in the Mylan IPR. For example, allowing a joined *inter partes* review would avoid potential inconsistency and avoid prejudice to Teva in the event that Mylan and AstraZeneca reach a resolution.

Mot. 11–12.

Upon authorization, Teva and AstraZeneca filed a Joint Stipulation explaining the agreement between Petitioners Mylan and Teva with respect to the level of cooperation that will be maintained should joinder be granted. Paper 12. Pursuant to the stipulation, Teva agrees with Mylan “to share the use of Mylan's experts with Mylan, the ‘Lead Petitioner,’ and all joined petitioners in this IPR proceeding.” *Id.* at 1. Further, as long as Mylan remains a party in the Mylan IPR, Teva agrees to “coordinate any communications with Mylan’s experts through Mylan; not produce their own testifying witness; and not file substantive papers (except for those associated with Board-approved motions that do not affect Mylan or Mylan’s position).” *Id.* Teva also agrees to confer and cooperate with Mylan, and all joined petitioners, on the consolidated filings, and that as long as Mylan remains a party in the Mylan IPR, Mylan will make all Final decisions, will retain responsibility for oral argument (including telephone hearings and appeals) and Teva will not receive separate time and will not separately argue during oral argument, including during telephone hearings and appeals, except when addressing “Board-approved motions that do not affect Mylan or Mylan’s position.” *Id.* at 1, 2. In addition, Teva agrees to coordinate the discovery and testimony relating to witnesses with Mylan,

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.