

**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)

---

**Brief Amicus Curiae of the Seneca Nation  
in Support of the Patent Owner, Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe**

---

<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**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</b> .....	iii
<b>STATEMENT OF INTEREST</b> .....	1
<b>ARGUMENT</b> .....	2
I.    Dismissal Is Appropriate Where A Tribal Sovereign Cannot Be Joined....	2
II.   Third Party Representation Cannot Be Used To Justify Going Forward To Determine The Legal Rights Of A Sovereign Tribe .....	6
III.  Tribes Have Been Held To Be Indispensable And The Case Dismissed In A Variety Of Contexts .....	8
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	11
<b>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</b> .....	12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Am. Greyhound Racing, Inc. v. Hull</i> , 305 F.3d 1015 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	3
<i>Clinton v. Babbitt</i> , 180 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 1999).....	9
<i>Davis v. United States</i> , 192 F.3d 951 (10th Cir. 1999), <i>cert. denied</i> , 542 U.S. 937 (2004) .....	3
<i>Dawavendewa v. Salt River Project Agr. Imp. &amp; Power Dist.</i> , 276 F.3d 1150 (9th Cir. 2002).....	3, 9
<i>E.E.O.C. v. Peabody W. Coal Co.</i> , 610 F.3d 1070 (9th Cir. 2010) .....	8-9
<i>Enterprise Mgmt. Consultants, Inc. v. United States ex rel. Hodel</i> , 883 F.2d 890 (10th Cir. 1989) .....	3, 7
<i>Fluent v. Salamanca Indian Lease Authority</i> , 928 F.2d 542 (2d Cir. 1991) .....	5, 6-7
<i>Jamul Action Comm. v. Chaudhuri</i> , 200 F.Supp.3d 1042 (E.D. Cal. 2016) .....	8
<i>Kescoli v. Babbitt</i> , 101 F.3d 1304 (9th Cir. 1996).....	6
<i>Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma v. Mfg. Tech., Inc.</i> , 523 U.S. 751 (1998) .....	3
<i>Klamath Tribe Claims Comm. v. United States</i> , 106 Fed. Cl. 87, 95 (2012), <i>aff'd</i> , 541 Fed.Appx. 974 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	3, 4, 5
<i>Lomayaktewa v. Hathaway</i> , 520 F.2d 1324 (9th Cir. 1975), <i>cert. denied</i> , 425 U.S. 903 (1976).....	4, 5, 8-9
<i>Makah Indian Tribe v. Verity</i> , 910 F.2d 555 (9th Cir. 1990) .....	5
<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills</i> , ___ U.S. ___, 134 S.Ct. 2024 (2014).....	2, 11
<i>Northern Arapaho Tribe v. Harnsberger</i> , 660 F.Supp.2d 1264 (D. Wyo. 2009).....	9
<i>Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Tribe of Okla.</i> , 498 U.S. 505 (1991).....	4

*Philippines v. Pimentel*, 553 U.S. 851 (2008) ..... 4-5

*Puyallup Tribe, Inc., v. Dep't of Game of Wash.*, 433 U.S. 165 (1977) ..... 3-4

*Quileute Indian Tribe v. Babbitt*, 18 F.3d 1456 (9th Cir. 1994).....8

*Rosales v. Dutschke*, Slip Copy, 2017 WL 3730500 (E.D. Cal. 2017) .....10

*Rosales v. United States*, 73 Fed.Appx. 913 (9th Cir. 2003).....7

*Sac & Fox Nation v. Hanson*, 47 F.3d 1061 (10th Cir. 1995), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 810 (1995)..... 2-3

*Tewa Tesuque v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 240 (10th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 420 U.S. 962 (1975).....4

*Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation v. Wold Engineering, P.C.*, 476 U.S. 877 (1986) .....2

*Union Pacific Railroad Co. v. Runyon*, 2017 WL 923915 (D. Or. 2017) .....10

*United States v. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.*, 309 U.S. 506 (1940) .....4

*Vann v. Salazar*, 883 F.Supp.2d 44 (D.D.C. 2011) ..... 9-10

*White v. Univ. of Cal.*, 765 F.3d 1010 (9th Cir. 2014) .....3

**Statutes**

37 CFR § 42.20(d) .....1

**Other Authorities**

Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, 82 Fed. Reg. 4915 (Jan. 17, 2017)..... 1

Fed. Rule Civ. Pro. 19.....2

## STATEMENT OF INTEREST

The Seneca Nation is a sovereign Indian nation comprised of more than 8,000 citizens, whom occupy five territories (Allegany, Cattaraugus, Oil Springs, Niagara Falls, and Buffalo Creek) in Western New York, over which the Nation exercises its governing authority. The Nation is part of the historic Six Nations Confederacy and has governed itself in accordance with a written constitution establishing a tripartite form of government consisting of legislative, executive, and judicial functions since 1848. The Nation is a federally recognized Indian nation. Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, 82 Fed. Reg. 4915, 4918 (Jan. 17, 2017)

The Nation hereby submits this amicus brief in response to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) request for briefing from amicus curiae, Paper No. 96 (Nov. 3, 2017), pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.20(d), in order to address incorrect legal assertions made regarding the indispensable party analysis as it applies to tribal sovereigns. The Nation has the strongest interest in assuring the doctrine of sovereign immunity as applied to Indian nations is understood and respected in federal legal and administrative proceedings. It is of significant importance that this Board adhere to the longstanding practices of the application of the indispensable party analysis and criteria in regards to Indian nations.

# 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.