Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

IPR2017-01603, Paper No. 11
IPR2017-01078, Paper No. 9
Entered: September 25, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVARTIS AG,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01063
Patent 9,006,224 B2

WEST-WARD PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVARTIS AG,
Patent Owner.

Cases IPR2017-01078
Patent 9,006,224 B2

Before LORA M. GREEN, CHRISTOPHER L. CRUMBLEY, and ROBERT A. POLLOCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CRUMBLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Motions for Joinder
35 U.S.C. § 315(c); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)

I. INTRODUCTION

On February 15, 2017, the Board instituted an *inter partes* review trial of claims 1–3 of U.S. Patent No. 9,006,224 B2 (Ex. 1001,[1] "the '224 patent"). *Par Pharm. v. Novartis AG*, Case IPR2016-01479 (PTAB Feb. 15, 2017) (Paper 8) ("the Par IPR"). Trial in that matter is pending on the following grounds of unpatentability:

1. Whether claims 1–3 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as having been obvious over the combined disclosures of Öberg 2004,[2] Boulay 2004,[3] and O'Donnell;[4]

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, when substantively identical documents have been filed in both cases we will cite only to the docket of IPR2017-01063.

[2] K. Öberg, *Treatment of neuroendocrine tumors of the gastrointestinal tract*, 27(4) ONCOLOGÍA 57–61 (2004) (Ex. 1027).

[3] A. Boulay et al., *Antitumor efficacy of intermittent treatment schedules with the rapamycin derivative RAD001 correlates with Prolonged Inactivation of Ribosomal Protein S6 Kinase 1 in Peripheral Blood Mononuclear Cells*, 64 CANCER RES. 252–261 (2004) (Ex. 1005).

[4] A. O'Donnell et al., *A phase I study of the oral mTOR inhibitor RAD001 as a monotherapy to identify the optimal biologically effective dose using toxicity, pharmacokinetic (PK) and pharmacodynamics (PD) endpoints in patients with solid tumors*, 22 PROC. AM. SOC'Y OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY 200(803 ab.) (2003) (Ex. 1029).

2. Whether claim 2 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as having been obvious over the combined disclosures of Öberg 2004, Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, and Tabernero;[5]

3. Whether claims 1–3 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as having been obvious over the combined disclosures of Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, and Duran;[6] and

4. Whether claim 2 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as having been obvious over the combined disclosures of Boulay 2004, O'Donnell, Duran, and Tabernero.

Two additional petitions have now been filed with the Board, each seeking joinder with the Par IPR. In IPR2017-01063, Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–3 of the '224 patent. IPR2017-01063, Paper 1. Concurrently with its Petition, Argentum filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3), seeking joinder with the Par IPR. The owner of the '224 patent, Novartis AG, filed a Response to the Motion for Joinder (Paper 9) but waived the filing of a preliminary response (Paper 10).

In IPR2017-01078, West-Ward Pharmaceuticals International Limited filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–3 of the '224 patent. IPR2017-01078, Paper 1. Concurrently with its Petition, West-Ward filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3), seeking joinder with the Par IPR. Novartis filed

---

[5] J. Tabernero et al., *A phase I study with tumor molecular pharmacodynamics (MPD) evaluation of dose and schedule of the oral mTOR-inhibitor Everolimus (RAD001) in patients (pts) with advanced solid tumors*, 23(16S) J. CLINICAL ONCOLOGY 3007 (2005) (Ex. 1038).

[6] I. Duran et al., *A phase II trial of temsirolimus in metastatic Neuroendocrine Carcinomas (NECs)*, 23(16S) SUPPLEMENT TO J. CLINICAL ONCOLOGY 3096 (ab.) (2005) (Ex. 1011).

a Response to the Motion for Joinder (Paper 6) but waived the filing of a preliminary response (Paper 8).

Both newly-filed Petitions assert the same grounds of unpatentability as those on which trial was instituted in the Par IPR. IPR2017-01063, Paper 1, 1; IPR2017-01078, Paper 1, 1.

As a threshold matter, we determine that the Motions for Joinder were timely. Our Rules provide that a request for joinder must be filed "no later than one month after the institution date of any *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested." 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). The Motions were filed on or before March 15, 2017, less than one month after the February 15, 2017 institution date of the Par I *inter partes* review, and are thus timely.

For the reasons explained below, we grant both Motions.

II. THE PETITIONS WARRANT INSTITUTION

The controlling statute regarding joinder of a party to an *inter partes* review is 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which reads as follows:

> (c) JOINDER.--If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

The statute makes clear that joinder of a party to an instituted *inter partes* review is within the Board's[7] discretion. That discretion may only be

[7] By regulation, the Director's discretion has been delegated to the Board. 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a).

exercised, however, if the party seeking joinder "files a petition . . . that the Director . . . determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review." 35 U.S.C. § 315(c). As a threshold issue, therefore, we must first determine whether the instant Petitions warrant institution of an *inter partes* review.

The grounds of unpatentability asserted in the instant Petitions are identical to those instituted in the Par IPR. Argentum and West-Ward state that their Petitions include the same grounds and arguments as those in the Par IPR, and note that the parties rely on the same expert witness, Mark J. Ratain, M.D., as Par does. IPR2017-01063, Paper 3, 4; IPR2017-01078, Paper 3, 7–8.

We previously determined, upon consideration of the Petition and Novartis' Preliminary Response in the Par IPR, that the record in that proceeding established a reasonable likelihood that Par would prevail with respect to claims 1–3. IPR2016-01479, Paper 8, 18. Furthermore, Novartis waived any preliminary response to the Petitions, so we are not presented with any arguments against institution of trial that were not previously considered in the Par IPR. Given the identical grounds and evidence presented in the present proceedings, we likewise determine that the instant Petitions warrant institution on all presented grounds. We rely on, and hereby incorporate by reference, the reasoning set forth in our Decision on Institution in the Par IPR. *See id.* at 5–18.

III. DISCRETION TO GRANT JOINDER

Having determined that the instant Petitions warrant institution, we must determine whether to exercise our discretion to join Argentum and West-Ward as parties to the Par IPR. As the moving parties, Argentum and West-Ward bear the burden of showing that joinder is appropriate. 37 C.F.R. §§

DOCKET ALARM

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.