

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC., TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS
USA, INC., and AKORN INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

SAINT REGIS MOHAWK TRIBE,
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)

**BRIEF OF ASKELADDEN LLC AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN OPPOSITION
TO ST. REGIS MOHAWK TRIBE'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. | INTERESTS OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> | 3 |
| III. | ARGUMENT | 4 |
| | A. Notions of Tribal Sovereign Immunity Do Not Apply to Administrative Proceedings Like This One | 4 |
| | B. The PTAB May Proceed Without a Patent Owner | 9 |
| | C. Post-Institution Acts of the Patent Owner Should Not Divest the Office of Jurisdiction to Complete These Proceedings | 12 |
| | D. The Transaction Should Be Disregarded As a Sham | 14 |
| IV. | CONCLUSION | 15 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Allergan, Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-1455-WCB (E.D. Tex. Oct. 16, 2017) (ECF No. 522) (Ex. 1163) | 2, 14 |
| <i>In re Ayers</i> , 123 U.S. 443 (1887) | 7 |
| <i>In re Business Council of the N. Arapaho Tribe</i> , 29 FCC Rcd. 2650 (F.C.C. Mar. 10, 2014), available at https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-14-331A1.pdf | 6, 7 |
| <i>Cty. of Yakima v. Confederated Tribes and Bands of Yakima Nation</i> , 502 U.S. 251 (1992)..... | 9 |
| <i>In re Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation</i> , 31 FCC Rcd. 8857 (F.C.C. Aug. 10, 2016), available at https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-16-904A1.pdf | 6 |
| <i>Covidien LP v. University of Florida Research Foundation Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01274 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2017) (Paper 21) (Ex. 2095) | 10 |
| <i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Federal Power Commission v. Tuscarora Indian Nation</i> , 362 U.S. 99 (1960)..... | 11 |
| <i>Federal Maritime Commission v. S.C. State Ports Authority</i> , 535 U.S. 743 (2002)..... | 7, 8 |
| <i>Freeport-McMoRan Inc. v. K N Energy, Inc.</i> , 498 U.S. 426 (1991)..... | 12–13 |
| <i>Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma v. Manufacturing Techs., Inc.</i> , 523 U.S. 751 (1998)..... | <i>passim</i> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Kramer v. Caribbean Mills, Inc.</i> , 394 U.S. 823 (1969)..... | 14 |
| <i>Lundgren v. Upper Skagit Indian Tribe</i> , 187 Wn.2d 857 (Wash. 2017), petition for cert. filed, No. 17-387 (S. Ct. Sept. 11, 2017)..... | 13 |
| <i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Community</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2024 (2014)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Nevada v. Hall</i> , 440 U.S. 410 (1979)..... | 5, 13 |
| <i>Oklahoma Tax Comm’n v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe</i> , 498 U.S. 505 (1991)..... | 6, 7 |
| <i>Precision Instrument Mfg. Co. v. Auto. Maint. Mach. Co.</i> , 324 U.S. 806 (1945)..... | 3, 13 |
| <i>Reactive Surfaces Ltd. v. Toyota Motor Corp.</i> , IPR2016-01914 (PTAB July 13, 2017) (Paper 36) (Ex. 2097) | 10 |
| <i>Tennessee Student Assistance Corp. v. Hood</i> , 541 U.S. 440 (2004)..... | 10 |
| <i>Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Curators of the Univ. of Mo.</i> , 473 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 15 |

Statutes

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| 35 U.S.C. § 143..... | 9 |
| 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319..... | 2, 11 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 311..... | 11 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 312..... | 10 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 313..... | 10, 11 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 314..... | 9 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 315..... | 10 |

35 U.S.C. § 317.....10, 12

Leahy-Smith America Invents Act,
Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011) (“AIA”).....*passim*

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....11

U.S. Const. Amend. XI.....7, 9

H.R. Rep. No. 112-98 (2011).....3, 8

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.