

Filed: November 30, 2017

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 (US 8,685,930 B2)

Case IPR2016-01128 (US 8,629,111 B2)

Case IPR2016-01129 (US 8,642,556 B2)

Case IPR2016-01130 (US 8,633,162 B2)

Case IPR2016-01131 (US 8,648,048 B2)

Case IPR2016-01132 (US 9,248,191 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

**BRIEF OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AND THE ELECTRONIC  
FRONTIER FOUNDATION AS *AMICI COLLEGII*  
IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION TO TERMINATE**

---

<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.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES . . . . .	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI COLLEGII</i> . . . . .	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT . . . . .	1
ARGUMENT . . . . .	2
I. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is a Public-Interest Administrative Proceeding, Not Private Litigation . . . . .	2
II. Sovereign Immunity Does Not Apply to <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Based on Judicial Precedent . . . . .	8
A. The Board Has Jurisdiction Only over Patents, and Exercises No Jurisdiction over the Patent Owner or Other Parties . . . . .	8
B. The Character and Effect of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Is Closer to Gen- eralized Agency Action than Private Dispute Resolution . . . . .	10
III. The Board Should Certify This Question to the Director . . . . .	13
CONCLUSION . . . . .	15
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE . . . . .	16

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases and Administrative Decisions

<i>Aronson v. Quick Point Pencil Co.</i> , 440 U.S. 257 (1979) . . . . .	4
<i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> , 561 U.S. 593 (2010) . . . . .	4
<i>Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Illinois Foundation</i> , 402 U.S. 313 (1971) . . . . .	7, 10
<i>Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.</i> , 489 U.S. 141 (1989) . . . . .	3–4
<i>California v. Deep Sea Research, Inc.</i> , 523 U.S. 491 (1998) . . . . .	9
<i>Cardinal Chemical Co. v. Morton International, Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 83 (1993) . . . . .	7
<i>Covidien LP v. University of Florida Research Foundation Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01274 to -01276 (PTAB Jan. 25, 2017) (paper no. 21) . . . .	12, 14
<i>Crown Die &amp; Tool Co. v. Nye Tool &amp; Machine Works</i> , 261 U.S. 24 (1923) . . . . .	3
<i>Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016) . . . . .	7
<i>Federal Maritime Commission v. South Carolina State Ports Authority</i> , 535 U.S. 743 (2002) . . . . .	2–3, 7, 9, 12
<i>Federal Trade Commission v. Actavis, Inc.</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2223 (2013) . . . . .	4
<i>Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.</i> , 322 U.S. 238 (1944) . . . . .	1
<i>Idaho v. Coeur d’Alene Tribe</i> , 521 U.S. 261 (1997) . . . . .	11

<i>J.E.M. Ag Supply, Inc. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.</i> , 534 U.S. 124 (2001) . . . . .	4
<i>Kendall v. Winsor</i> , 62 U.S. (21 How.) 322 (1859) . . . . .	3
<i>Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.</i> , 416 U.S. 470 (1974) . . . . .	4
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653 (1969) . . . . .	5, 7, 11
<i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 549 U.S. 118 (2007) . . . . .	7
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Mirowski Family Ventures, LLC</i> , 134 S. Ct. 843 (2014) . . . . .	4
<i>Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Investment Co.</i> , 320 U.S. 661 (1944) . . . . .	3
<i>Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Manufacturing Co.</i> , 243 U.S. 502 (1917) . . . . .	3–4
<i>MPHJ Technology Investments, LLC, In re</i> , 159 F.T.C. 1004 (Mar. 13, 2015) . . . . .	6
<i>MPHJ Technology Investments, LLC v. Ricoh Americas Corp.</i> , 847 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2017) . . . . .	7
<i>New York v. Irving Trust Co.</i> , 288 U.S. 329 (1933) . . . . .	9
<i>Oil States Energy Services, LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC</i> , No. 16-712 (U.S. cert. granted June 12, 2017) . . . . .	14
<i>Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc.</i> , 525 U.S. 55 (1998) . . . . .	4
<i>Pope Manufacturing Co. v. Gormully</i> , 144 U.S. 224 (1892) . . . . .	5

<i>Precision Instrument Manufacturing Co. v. Automotive Maintenance Machinery Co., 324 U.S. 806 (1945)</i>	3–4
<i>Tennessee Student Assistance Corp. v. Hood, 541 U.S. 440 (2004)</i>	2, 8–12
<i>Tennessee v. United States Department of Transportation, 326 F.3d 729 (6th Cir. 2003)</i>	9–11
<i>Triplett v. Lowell, 297 U.S. 638 (1936)</i>	10
<i>United Carbon Co. v. Binney &amp; Smith Co., 317 U.S. 228 (1942)</i>	4
<i>United States v. Singer Manufacturing Co., 374 U.S. 174 (1963)</i>	4
<i>Universal Oil Co. v. Globe Co., 322 U.S. 471 (1944)</i>	4
<i>Van Huffel v. Harkelrode, 284 U.S. 225 (1931)</i>	9
<i>Verizon Maryland Inc. v. Public Service Commission, 535 U.S. 635 (2002)</i>	11
<i>Virginia Office for Protection &amp; Advocacy v. Stewart, 131 S. Ct. 1632 (2011)</i>	11
<i>Young, Ex parte, 209 U.S. 123 (1908)</i>	11
<b>Constitutional Provisions</b>	
U.S. Const. amend. 11	8–9
—— art. I, § 8, cl. 8	3

# 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.