

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 IPR2015-01871
Patent 8,129,431

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

OBERMANN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Instituting *Inter Partes* Review and
Granting Petitioner's Motion for Joinder
37 C.F.R. § 42.108
37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)

Petitioner (“Lupin”) filed a petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1–22 of U.S. Patent No. 8,129,431 (Ex. 1001, “the ’431 patent”). Patent Owner (“Senju”) waived filing a preliminary response. Paper 11. With the petition, Lupin filed a motion (Paper 3, “Mot.”) requesting joinder of the instant proceeding with IPR2015-00903 (“IPR 903”). Lupin’s petition asserts the same grounds, directed to the same patent claims, as those set for trial in IPR 903, which was initiated by a different entity (“InnoPharma”). IPR 903, Paper 15, (“903 Dec.”). Senju opposes Lupin’s motion for joinder. Paper 7, (“Opp.”).

During a telephone conference with the Board held November 17, 2015, Senju, Lupin, and InnoPharma clarified their respective positions relating to the petition and motion. Paper 10, (“Order”). In the event of joinder, Lupin agreed to proceed based solely on the arguments and evidence presented by InnoPharma in IPR 903. *Id.* at 4. Lupin also consented to being added to the case caption of IPR 903 as a petitioner, “without any active participation or involvement that is separate from InnoPharma, unless authorized by the Board upon a request pertaining to an issue unique to Lupin alone.” *Id.* InnoPharma agreed to permit Lupin to rely on the declaration of InnoPharma’s witness. *Id.* at 3. Senju continued to oppose Lupin’s request for joinder. *Id.* at 4.

Institution of Inter Partes Review

We first address whether Lupin’s petition warrants review; only then do we address whether joinder is appropriate. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315 (c) (joinder provision, relating to *inter partes* reviews, requires, as an initial matter, a determination that the petition accompanying the joinder motion warrants institution of review). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314, which provides that an *inter partes* review may be authorized only if “the information presented in the petition . . . and any [preliminary] response . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the

petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

For reasons that follow, we are persuaded that Lupin’s petition warrants institution of an *inter partes* review, for the same reasons stated in our decision instituting review in IPR 903. Lupin’s petition challenges the same patent claims, on the same grounds, as those set for trial in IPR 903. Pet. 20; 903 Dec. 19. The argument and evidence presented in Lupin’s petition, and the argument and evidence presented in InnoPharma’s petition, are essentially identical in substance. *See generally* Pet.; IPR 903, Paper 2 (“903 Pet.”). For example, although Lupin’s petition is supported by the declaration of a different witness, Lupin’s witness in the instant proceeding provides essentially identical testimony as that supplied by InnoPharma’s witness in IPR 903. *Compare* Ex. 1054 (Declaration of Dr. M. Jayne Lawrence) *with* IPR 903, Ex. 1003 (Declaration of Dr. Paul A. Laskar).

In IPR 903, we have already determined that the argument and evidence presented in InnoPharma’s petition warrants institution of an *inter partes* review. 903 Dec. 19. Given that Lupin presents substantively identical arguments and evidence as that raised by InnoPharma in IPR 903, we determine that Lupin’s petition demonstrates a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to at least one claim of the ’431 patent. In particular, for the reasons stated in our decision instituting review in IPR 903, Lupin is reasonably likely to show that (1) claims 1–5, 7–14, and 18–19 are unpatentable as obvious over Ogawa and Sallman; and (2)

claims 6, 15–17, and 20–22 are unpatentable as obvious over Ogawa,¹ Sallmann,² and Fu.³ *Id.* at 4–19.

Grant of the Motion for Joinder

Lupin and InnoPharma “relied upon testimony from separate experts” in their respective petitions. Mot. 6. However, “in order to further simplify the proceeding, Lupin will rely on the same expert as InnoPharma” in any consolidated proceeding, “should InnoPharma permit it.” *Id.* at 7. In that regard, during the telephone conference held on November 17, 2015, these facts became apparent: InnoPharma and Lupin have reached an agreement, regarding their respective roles and the content of the evidence, should the Board join this proceeding with IPR 903. In particular, InnoPharma agrees to permit Lupin to rely on the declaration of InnoPharma’s witness, Dr. Laskar, filed in support of InnoPharma’s petition in IPR 903. Lupin agrees to accept a back-seat role as an “understudy” in any joined proceeding, without any right to separate briefing or discovery in IPR 903. Order 3–4.

To the extent that Lupin’s petition in this proceeding differs from the petition that InnoPharma filed in IPR 903, Lupin agrees to withdraw all additional arguments, as well as its supporting declaration of Dr. Lawrence, and proceed in IPR 903 based on the arguments and evidence provided by InnoPharma in IPR 903. Lupin agrees to assume a primary role in IPR 903 only if InnoPharma

¹ Ogawa *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,910,225, issued Mar. 20, 1990 (Ex. 1004) (“Ogawa”).

² Sallmann *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,107,343, issued Aug. 22, 2000 (Ex. 1009) (“Sallmann”).

³ Fu, Austl. Patent Application No. AU-B-22042/88, published Mar. 16, 1989 (Ex. 1011) (“Fu”).

ceases to participate in IPR 903. In other words, Lupin requests permission to be added to the case caption as a petitioner in IPR 903, without any active participation or involvement that is separate from InnoPharma, unless authorized by the Board upon a request pertaining to an issue unique to Lupin alone. *Id.* at 4.

The Board several times requested counsel for Senju to address what burden, if any, Senju would bear, should joinder be granted on the above terms agreed to between InnoPharma and Lupin. Counsel for Senju advocated that consolidation of ten reviews (including IPR 903, any review instituted in the instant proceeding, and eight other reviews identified during the telephone conference) would foster consistency and efficiency, while opposing consolidation of this proceeding and IPR 903; averred that extending the statutory due date of a final decision in IPR 903, so that the ten reviews can be decided simultaneously, would permit the parties to focus on a trial presently set for April, 2016, in co-pending district court litigation that involves issues similar to those presented here; and argued that the ability of Lupin to request Board pre-authorization to provide separate argument or evidence in IPR 903, on issues unique to Lupin alone, is vague and presents uncertainties that may burden Senju. *Id.* None of those arguments, presented during the telephone conference, persuades us that any prejudice to Senju outweighs the interests of economy and speed that will be facilitated by granting Lupin's request for joinder.

Senju argued also, during the conference and in its written opposition, that Lupin "sat by and watched while other companies initiated IPRs challenging the '431 patent." Opp. 1. Our authorizing statute, however, sets forth the conditions under which a delay in filing a petition for an *inter partes* review will preclude a petitioner from seeking relief in our forum—and Senju does not establish sufficiently that those conditions are present in this case. *See* 35 U.S.C.

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.