

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA,  
INC., and AKORN INC.,<sup>1</sup>  
Petitioners,

v.

ALLERGAN, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01127 (8,685,930 B2)  
Case IPR2016-01128 (8,629,111 B2)  
Case IPR2016-01129 (8,642,556 B2)  
Case IPR2016-01130 (8,633,162 B2)  
Case IPR2016-01131 (8,648,048 B2)  
Case IPR2016-01132 (9,248,191 B2)

---

**PATENT OWNER'S REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO  
MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION  
BASED ON TRIBAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY**

---

<sup>1</sup> Cases IPR2017-00576 and IPR2017-00594, IPR2017-00578 and IPR2017- 00596,  
IPR2017-00579 and IPR2017-00598, IPR2017-00583 and IPR2017- 00599,  
IPR2017-00585 and IPR2017-00600, and IPR2017-00586 and IPR2017-00601 have  
respectively been joined with the captioned proceedings. The word-for-word  
identical paper is filed in each proceeding identified in the caption pursuant to the  
Board's Scheduling Order (Paper 10).

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITY ..... 1

    A. The Tribe is the Patent Owner..... 1

        1. The Tribe Did Not Transfer “Substantially All” Rights to Allergan..... 2

        2. The Assignment of the Patents-at-Issue to the Tribe is Valid..... 5

        3. Petitioners’ “Sham Transaction” Argument Lacks Legal and Factual Support..... 6

    B. The Tribe is an Indispensable Party..... 10

    C. Petitioners’ Remaining Arguments Do Not Withstand Scrutiny..... 12

    D. The Tribe Seeks to Strengthen the U.S. Patent System. .... 13

III. CONCLUSION ..... 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES:**

*Alfred E. Mann Found. For Sci. Research v. Cochlear Corp.*,  
604 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....3, 4

*C & L Enterprises, Inc. v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe of Oklahoma*,  
532 U.S. 411 (2001)..... 4

*Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*,  
668 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 11

*Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma v. Mfg. Techs., Inc.*,  
523 U.S. 751 (1998).....8, 10

*Kroll v. Bd. of Trustees of Univ. of Illinois*,  
934 F.2d 904 (7th Cir. 1991)..... 10

*Maysonet-Robles v. Cabrero*,  
323 F.3d 43 (1st Cir. 2003) ..... 9

*Memorylink Corp. v. Motorola Sols., Inc., Motorola Mobility, Inc.*,  
773 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 6

*Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Community*,  
134 S.Ct. 2024 (2014)..... 8

*Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe of Oklahoma*,  
498 U.S. 505 (1991)..... 9

*Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*,  
436 U.S. 49 (1978)..... 13

*Secured Worldwide LLC v. Kinney*,  
No. 15 CIV. 1761 CM, 2015 WL 1514738 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 1, 2015)..... 6

*Sicom Sys., Ltd. v. Agilent Techs., Inc.*,  
427 F.3d 971 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 4

*SiRF Tech., Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*,  
601 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 5

*Surprenant v. Massachusetts Tpk. Auth.*,  
768 F. Supp. 2d 312 (D. Mass. 2011)..... 10

*W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*,  
198 F. Supp. 3d 366 (D. Del. 2016)..... 6

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS:**

*Covidien LP v. Univ. of Fla. Research Found. Inc.*,  
Case IPR 2016-01274, Paper 21 (Jan. 25, 2017) ..... 8, 12

*Neochord, Inc. v. Univ. of Md., et al*,  
Case IPR2016-00208, Paper 28 (May 23, 2017) ..... 4, 8, 12

*Reactive Surfaces Ltd., LLP v. Toyota Motor Corp.*,  
Case IPR2016-01914, Paper 36 (July 13, 2017) ..... 8, 11, 12

**STATUTES:**

28 U.S.C. § 1359 ..... 7

35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 12

35 U.S.C. § 261 ..... 5

35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 ..... 7

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners' Opposition is premised entirely on their unsubstantiated claim that the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe ("Tribe") is not the Patent Owner. That premise is false. Allergan *permanently and irrevocably* assigned ownership of the Patents-at-Issue to the Tribe. Moreover, when the Tribe licensed back to Allergan certain limited field-of-use rights, the Tribe retained substantial rights to the Patents-at-Issue. Petitioners failed to cite any case law or make any coherent legal arguments that would provide the Board with any basis for finding that the agreements between the Tribe and Allergan are a "sham."

The only issue before the Board is whether the Tribe's sovereign immunity necessitates dismissal of the above-captioned IPRs. Petitioners do not contest that (1) the Tribe is a sovereign entity protected by sovereign immunity and (2) the Tribe's immunity has not been abrogated or waived. Petitioners' concessions lead to only one outcome: the IPRs must be dismissed.

## II. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITY

### A. The Tribe is the Patent Owner.

Petitioners attempt to cast doubt on the Tribe's ownership of the Patents-at-Issue by arguing that (i) Allergan, not the Tribe, is the owner because the Tribe transferred substantially all rights to Allergan or (ii) Allergan's assignment to the Tribe was a sham. But neither argument is supported by any facts or applicable legal authority.

# 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.