

**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 SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ON  
LITIGATION WAIVER**

---

<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 IPR2017-00601., have respectively been  
joined with the captioned proceedings. The word-for-word identical page is filed in  
each proceeding identified in the caption pursuant to the Board's Scheduling Order  
(Paper 10).

The Board’s rulings in *Ericsson Inc. v. Regents of the University of Minnesota*, IPR2017-01186 (Paper 14) (“*Ericsson*”) and *LSI Corp. v. Regents of the University of Minnesota*, IPR2017-01068 (Paper 19) are wrongly decided. “Immunity encompasses not merely whether [a sovereign] may be sued, but where it may be sued,” even when multiple forums are available. *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 99 (1984).

Mylan contends the IPR is the same as a “mirror-image” counterclaim, which in some circumstances, can be asserted against a tribe. When filing suit, a tribe does not waive immunity, even to compulsory counterclaims. *Okla. Tax Comm’n v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe of Okla.*, 498 U.S. 505, 509 (1991); *United States v. U. S. Fid. & Guar. Co.*, 309 U.S. 506, 513 (1940) (“Possessing ... immunity from direct suit, we are of the opinion [the Indian nations] possess a similar immunity from cross-suit.”).

A mirror-image claim means exactly that—matters that must be resolved and are presumed to be at issue in a case based on the claims of the tribe. “Having placed a question before the court, a sovereign acknowledges the court’s authority to resolve that question, whether in favor of the sovereign or in favor of a counterclaimant seeking the opposite resolution.” *Tohono O’odham Nation v. Ducey*, 174 F.Supp.3d 1194, 1204 (D. Az. 2016). “A tribe’s waiver of sovereign immunity may be limited to the issues necessary to decide the action brought by

the tribe; the waiver is not necessarily broad enough to encompass related matters, even if those matters arise from the same set of underlying facts.” *McClendon v. United States*, 885 F.2d 627, 630 (9th Cir. 1989).

This IPR does not fall within the mirror-image counterclaim exception. IPRs are not counterclaims. *Ericsson* at 8 n.4. Resolution of the district court case does not rely upon resolution of the IPR claims. EX. 1165. An IPR is a separate proceeding that can be filed whether or not a district court action is filed, and it presents legal questions that are different than a counterclaim in the district court. *Ericsson* at 11. Thus, waiver cannot extend from one proceeding to another. *Biomedical Patent Management Corp. v. California Dept. of Health Services*, 505 F.3d 1328, 1339-40 (Fed. Cir 2007) (proceeding not continuous so as to apply waiver in each forum). And even if the two proceedings are related, there is a bright-line rule for tribes: “[P]articipation in an administrative proceeding does not waive tribal immunity in an action filed by another party seeking review of the agency’s decision.” *Kescoli v. Babbitt*, 101 F.3d 1304, 1310 (9th Cir. 1996); *Quileute Indian Tribe v. Babbitt*, 18 F.3d 1456, 1459–60 (9th Cir.1994). See also *Contour Spa at the Hard Rock v. Seminole Tribe of Florida*, 692 F.3d 1200, 1208-1209 (11th Cir. 2012) (adhering to *Potowatomi*, rejecting application of *Lapides* to tribes); *Bodi v. Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians*, 832 F.3d 1011, 1017 (9th Cir. 2016) (same). Thus, the Board’s *Ericsson* “logic” cannot apply here.

Dated: January 12, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

/Alfonso Chan /

Alfonso Chan

Reg. No. 45,964

achan@shorechan.com

Michael Shore\*

mshore@shorechan.com

Christopher Evans\*

cevans@shorechan.com

SHORE CHAN DEPUMPO LLP

901 Main Street, Suite 3300

Dallas, TX 75201

Tel: (214) 593-9110

Fax: (214) 593-9111

Marsha Schmidt\*

Attorney at Law

14928 Perrywood Drive

Burtonsville, MD 20866

marsha@mkschmidtlaw.com

Tel: (301) 949-5176

\*admitted *pro hac vice*

*Attorneys for Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe*

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 42.6(e)(4) and 42.205(b), the undersigned certifies that on January 12, 2018, a complete and entire copy of *Patent Owner's Supplemental Brief on Litigation Waiver* was provided, via electronic service, to the Petitioners by serving the correspondence address of record as follows:

Steven W. Parmelee  
Michael T. Rosato  
Jad A. Mills  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5100  
Seattle, WA 98104-7036  
[sparmelee@wsgr.com](mailto:sparmelee@wsgr.com)  
[mrosato@wsgr.com](mailto:mrosato@wsgr.com)  
[jmills@wsgr.com](mailto:jmills@wsgr.com)

Wendy L. Devine  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
One Market Street, Spear Tower Floor 33  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1126  
[wdevine@wsgr.com](mailto:wdevine@wsgr.com)

Douglas H. Carsten  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
12235 El Camino Real, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92130  
[dcarsten@wsgr.com](mailto:dcarsten@wsgr.com)

Richard Torczon  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
1700 K Street NW, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20006  
[rtorczon@wsgr.com](mailto:rtorczon@wsgr.com)

# 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.