

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ALLERGAN, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00583  
Patent 8,633,162 B2

---

Before SHERIDAN K. SNEDDEN, TINA E. HULSE, and  
CHRISTOPHER G. PAULRAJ, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HULSE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Institution of *Inter Partes* Review and Grant of Motion for Joinder  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.108; 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. (“Teva”) filed a Petition, seeking an *inter partes* review of claims 1–24 of U.S. Patent No. 8,633,162 B2 (“the ’162 patent,” Ex. 1001). Paper 4 (“Pet”). Along with the Petition, Teva filed a Motion for Joinder to join this proceeding with *Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Allergan, Inc.*, IPR2016-01130. Paper 3 (“Mot”). Teva filed the Petition and Motion for Joinder in the present proceeding on January 6, 2017, within one month after we instituted trial in IPR2016-01130. 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). Patent Owner Allergan, Inc. (“Allergan”) filed an opposition to Teva’s Motion for Joinder. Paper 8. Via e-mail correspondence to the Board on March 30, 2017, Allergan indicated that it did not intend to file a Preliminary Response to Teva’s Petition. Ex. 3001.

As explained further below, we institute trial on the same grounds as instituted in IPR2016-01130 and grant Teva’s Motion for Joinder.

## II. DISCUSSION

In IPR2016-01130, Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“Mylan”) challenged claims 1–24 of the ’162 patent on the following grounds:

References	Basis	Claims challenged
Ding ’979 <sup>1</sup> and Sall <sup>2</sup>	§ 103(a)	1–10, 12–14, 16–20, and 22–24

---

<sup>1</sup> Ding et al., US 5,474,979, issued Dec. 12, 1995 (Ex. 1006).

<sup>2</sup> Sall et al., *Two Multicenter, Randomized Studies of the Efficacy and Safety of Cyclosporine Ophthalmic Emulsion in Moderate to Severe Dry Eye Disease*, 107 OPTHALMOLOGY 631–39 (2000) (Ex. 1007).

References	Basis	Claims challenged
Ding '979, Sall, and Acheampong <sup>3</sup>	§ 103(a)	11 and 21
Ding '979, Sall, and Glonek <sup>4</sup>	§ 103(a)	15

After considering the Petition and the Patent Owner Preliminary Response, we instituted trial in IPR2016-01130 on all three grounds. IPR2016-01130, Paper 8, 22.

Teva's Petition is substantively identical to Mylan's Petition, challenging the same claims based on the same art and the same grounds. *Compare* IPR2016-01130, Paper 3 *with* IPR2017-00583, Paper 4. For the same reasons stated in our Decision on Institution in IPR2016-01130, we institute trial in this proceeding on the same three grounds. *See* IPR2016-01130, Paper 8.

Having determined that institution is appropriate, we now turn to Teva's Motion for Joinder. Based on authority delegated to us by the Director, we have discretion to join an *inter partes* review to a previously instituted *inter partes* review. 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). Section 315(c) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes

---

<sup>3</sup> Acheampong et al., *Cyclosporine Distribution into the Conjunctiva, Cornea, Lacrimal Gland, and Systemic Blood Following Topical Dosing of Cyclosporine to Rabbit, Dog, and Human Eyes*, LACRIMAL GLAND, TEAR FILM, AND DRY EYE SYNDROMES 2: BASIC SCIENCE AND CLINICAL RELEVANCE 1001–04 (David A. Sullivan et al. eds., 1998) (Ex. 1008).

<sup>4</sup> Glonek et al., US 5,578,586, issued Nov. 26, 1996 (Ex. 1009).

review any person who properly files a petition under section 311.” *Id.*  
When determining whether to grant a motion for joinder we consider factors such as timing and impact of joinder on the trial schedule, cost, discovery, and potential simplification of briefing. *Kyocera Corp. v. SoftView, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00004, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013) (Paper 15).

Under the circumstances of this case, we determine that joinder is appropriate. As Teva notes, the Petition in IPR2017-00583 is substantially identical to the Mylan Petition with no substantive differences. Mot. 7–8. Teva proposes the same claim construction positions and relies upon the same exhibits. *Id.* at 8. Although Teva also submitted the declaration of Dr. Chambliss, Teva has agreed to rely on Mylan’s expert, Dr. Amiji, and withdraw the expert declaration of Dr. Chambliss. *Id.* at 9.

Teva has also agreed to assume a “back-seat, ‘understudy’ role” in the joined proceedings, “without any right to separate or additional briefing or discovery, unless authorized by the Board upon a request to address an issue that is unique to Teva.” *Id.* at 8. Teva further contends that there will be no impact on the trial schedule of IPR2016-01130, and that joinder will promote the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of the proceedings without prejudice to the parties. *Id.* at 10–11.

Allergan opposes Teva’s Motion for Joinder, arguing that the statute prohibits the joinder of time barred petitions to existing *inter partes* review proceedings. Paper 8, 3–5. But Allergan also “acknowledges the Board’s current position that (1) section 315(b)’s one-year time bar exception applies to both petitions and requests for joinder and (2) that institution decisions are not reviewable on appeal.” *Id.* at 5 n.1 (citing *Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn*

*Inc.*, IPR2013-00109, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2013) (Paper 15); *Achates Reference Publ'g, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 803 F.3d 652 (Fed. Cir. 2015); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)). We are not persuaded by Allergan's arguments for the reasons stated in the Board's prior decisions. *See, e.g., Microsoft*, Paper 15 at 4 (“[T]he one-year time bar [under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)] does not apply to a request for joinder.”).

In view of the foregoing, we find that joinder based upon the conditions stated in Teva's Motion for Joinder will have little or no impact on the timing, cost, or presentation of the trial on the instituted grounds. Moreover, discovery and briefing will be simplified if the proceedings are joined. Thus, Teva's Motion for Joinder is *granted*.

### III. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that trial is instituted in IPR2017-00583 on the following grounds:

A. Claims 1–10, 12–14, 16–20, and 22–24 as obvious over Ding '979 and Sall;

B. Claims 11 and 21 as obvious over Ding '979, Sall, and Acheampong; and

C. Claim 15 as obvious over Ding '979, Sall, and Glonek.

FURTHER ORDERED that Teva's Motion for Joinder with IPR2016-01130 is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that IPR2017-00583 is terminated and joined to IPR2016-01130, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72, 42.122, based on the conditions stated in Teva's Motion for Joinder (Paper 3), as discussed above;

# 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.