

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FAMY CARE LIMITED

Petitioner

v.

ALLERGAN, INC.

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,629,111 B2 to Acheampong *et al.*

Issue Date: January 14, 2014

Title: Methods of Providing Therapeutic Effects Using Cyclosporin Components

Inter Partes Review Trial No. 2017-00567

**PETITIONER'S REPLY MOTION FOR JOINDER
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.23, 42.24(c)(2), and 42.25(a)(2)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PATENT OWNER’S TERMS 1

II. RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS AGAINST
JOINDER..... 1

 A. FCL and Mylan’s arguments are very similar when not
 identical. 1

 B. The FCL and Mylan expert affidavits are substantially
 similar. 2

 C. Discovery Consolidation and Burden 3

III. CONCLUSION..... 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>Apotex, Inc. and Mylan Pharm. Inc., v. Novartis AG and Mitsubishi Pharma Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00518 | 3 |
| <i>Dell, Inc. v. Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00385..... | 3, 4 |
| <i>Sierra Wireless America, Inc., et al. v. M2M Solutions LLC</i> , IPR2016-01073..... | 4 |
| <i>Torrent Pharm. Ltd. v. Novartis AG and Mitsubishi Pharma Corp.</i> , IPR2014- 00784..... | 3 |

Other Authorities

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b) | 5 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)..... | 5 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c)(2) | 1 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.25(a)(2) | 1 |

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.23, 42.24(c)(2), and 42.25(a)(2), Petitioner Famy Care Limited (“FCL”) respectfully submits this Reply Motion for Joinder to reply to Patent Owner Allergan Inc.’s (“Allergan”) opposition (Paper 9).

I. PATENT OWNER’S TERMS

Allergan offered to withdraw its opposition to joinder if four conditions are met. (Paper 9 at 2). First, FCL’s opening brief had already agreed to one of Allergan’s “conditions”—that FCL agree to conduct the “cross-examination of Patent Owner’s witnesses... within the timeframe that the rules allot for one party.” (*Compare id.* with Paper 5 at 8). So, only three purported “conditions” remain in dispute. None should preclude joinder.

II. RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS AGAINST JOINDER

Allergan did not refute or respond to any of FCL’s Material Facts (*see* Paper 5 at 2-4). These facts should therefore be considered admitted.

A. FCL and Mylan’s arguments are very similar when not identical.

Allergan alleges that Famy Care’s Petition introduces “additional arguments.” (Paper 9 at 2). However, as explained in FCL’s opening brief, the claims challenged in each petition, and the prior art used, are identical:

| | Mylan Petition | Famy Care Petition |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Claims Challenged | 1-27 | 1-27 |

| | Mylan Petition | Famy Care Petition |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cited Prior Art | Ding '979, Sall, and Acheampong | Ding '979, Sall, and Acheampong |

(See Paper 5, Statement of Facts, at 2-3). The Mylan and FCL Petitions also assert identical grounds for unpatentability:

| Ground | Mylan Claims | FCL Claims | Mylan Basis | FCL Basis | Mylan Art | FCL Art |
|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 1-27 | 1-27 | § 102 | § 102 | Ding '979 | Ding '979 |
| 2 | 1-27 | 1-27 | § 103 | § 103 | Ding '979, Sall | Ding '979, Sall |
| 3 | 11, 16 | 11, 16 | § 103 | § 103 | Ding '979, Sall, Acheampong | Ding '979, Sall, Acheampong |

(*Id.*) It would waste Board and party resources for these very similar petitions to proceed separately, with separate discovery, briefing, motions, and argument.

B. The FCL and Mylan expert affidavits are substantially similar.

Allergan notes FCL relies on two new experts rather than relying on Mylan's expert. (Paper 9 at 2). But the FCL experts support grounds for unpatentability nearly identical to Mylan's as discussed above. Moreover, as noted in the motion, FCL's experts include a distinguished clinician who can provide the Board a valuable perspective on the secondary considerations arguments Allergan leans heavily on. As the Board has noted, secondary considerations evidence is most appropriately developed during trial, and Dr. Lemp will help do so. FCL's experts respond to Allergan's proffered secondary considerations evidence, and

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.