

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SANDOZ INC.,
APOTEX INC., APOTEX CORP.,
EMCURE PHARMACEUTICALS LTD.,
HERITAGE PHARMA LABS INC.,
HERITAGE PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,
GLENMARK PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., USA,
GLENMARK HOLDING SA,
GLENMARK PHARMACEUTICALS, LTD., MYLAN
LABORATORIES LIMITED, TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,
FRESENIUS KABI USA, LLC, and WOCKHARDT BIO AG,

Petitioners

v.

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00318¹
U.S. Patent 7,772,209

PETITIONER SANDOZ INC.'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE

¹ Cases IPR2016-01429, IPR2016-01393, and IPR2016-01340 have been joined with the instant proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. EXHIBIT 2116 (DR. NIYIKIZA’S TESTIMONY IN A PRIOR PROCEEDING) SHOULD BE EXCLUDED 1

 A. Exhibit 2116 Constitutes Hearsay (And Double Hearsay) Because The Testimony Was Not Given In This Proceeding.....2

 B. Dr. Niyikiza Is Not An Expert And Exhibit 2116 Includes Content Over Which He Had No Personal Knowledge4

 C. Dr. Niyikiza Was Never Made Available for Deposition, and Therefore His Prior Testimony Violates the Board’s Rules4

 1. Lilly’s violation of 37 C.F.R. § 42.53 has deprived Sandoz of cross-examination of Dr. Niyikiza5

 2. The Board has repeatedly limited reliance on testimony that does not comply with its rules9

 D. Exhibit 2116 Is Not A Complete Exhibit.....11

III. PARAGRAPHS 24-28 AND 44-78 OF DR. ZEISEL’S DECLARATION (EXHIBIT 2118) SHOULD BE EXCLUDED 11

IV. CONCLUSION.....14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Altaire Pharm., Inc. v. Paragon Biotech, Inc.</i> , PGR2015-00011 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 1, 2016).....	9, 10
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs V LLC v. Biogen MA Inc.</i> , IPR 2015-01993 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 19, 2016)	9
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Parenteral Meds., Inc.</i> , No. 1:10-CV-1376 (S.D. Ind.).....	1
<i>Flex-Rest, LLC v. Steelcase, Inc.</i> , 455 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	12
<i>GEA Process Eng’g, Inc. v. Steuben Foods, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00041 (PTAB June 11, 2014)	10
<i>Maxliner, Inc. v. Cresta Tech. Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00594 (PTAB Jan. 15, 2016)	11
<i>Organik Kimya AS v. Rohm & Haas Co.</i> , IPR2014-00185 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 18, 2014)	9
<i>Sundance, Inc. v. DeMonte Fabricating Ltd.</i> , 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	12

RULES

Fed. R. Evid. 106	1, 11
Fed. R. Evid. 602	1, 4, 14
Fed. R. Evid. 702	1, 4, 12, 14
Fed. R. Evid. 801	2
Fed. R. Evid. 802	1, 4
Fed. R. Evid. 803	3
Fed. R. Evid. 804	3
Fed. R. Evid. 805	4
Fed. R. Evid. 807	3

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.51 passim
37 C.F.R. § 42.53 1, 5
37 C.F.R. § 42.64 1

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Sandoz Inc. (“Sandoz”) moves pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c) to exclude Exhibit 2116 and Paragraphs 24-28 and 44-78 of Exhibit 2118. Sandoz moves to exclude these exhibits as inadmissible pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 106, 602, 702, 802, and 37 C.F.R. § 42.53.

II. EXHIBIT 2116 (DR. NIYIKIZA’S TESTIMONY IN A PRIOR PROCEEDING) SHOULD BE EXCLUDED

On October 7, 2016, Sandoz timely objected to Exhibit 2116, which consists of 102 pages from the August 22, 2013 direct trial testimony of Dr. Clet Niyikiza, the sole inventor listed on the face of the patent at issue in this IPR. Paper No. 39, Pet. Obj. at 7-8. This testimony was given in litigation, to which Sandoz was not a party, *Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Parenteral Meds., Inc.*, No. 1:10-CV-1376 (S.D. Ind.) (“Teva Litigation”). Lilly relies on 37 pages of Exhibit 2116 in its Patent Owner Response, citing to the exhibit nine times. *See* Paper No. 36, PO Resp. at 10-12, 57, 59. As explained below, the testimony in Exhibit 2116 should be excluded for multiple reasons: (A) as hearsay under Fed. R. Evid. 802; (B) improper expert testimony under Fed. R. Evid. 602 and 702; (C) an improper attempt to circumvent the right to cross-examination in violation of the Board’s rules under 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(1)(ii); and (D) incomplete under Fed. R. Evid. 106.

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.