

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_

Filed on behalf of Akorn Inc.

By: Michael R. Dzwonczyk

Azy S. Kokabi

Travis B. Ribar

Sughrue Mion, PLLC

2100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20037

Telephone: 202-293-7060

Facsimile: 202-293-7860

email: [mdzwonczyk@sughrue.com](mailto:mdzwonczyk@sughrue.com)

[akokabi@sughrue.com](mailto:akokabi@sughrue.com)

[tribar@sughrue.com](mailto:tribar@sughrue.com)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AKORN INC.  
Petitioner

v.

ALLERGAN, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2017-00594

Patent No. 8,685,930

---

**REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR JOINDER**

**Table of Contents**

I. Summary ..... 1

II. Response to Patent Owner’s Argument..... 2

III. Conclusion ..... 3

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ..... 5

**I. SUMMARY**

Petitioner Akorn's motion for joinder should be granted because it is timely, typical, and presents nothing out of the ordinary for the Board to consider.

The Board has routinely granted motions for joinder where, party seeking joinder presents the same arguments and the same grounds as in the IPR to which joinder is sought. *See, e.g., Samsung Electronics, Co., Ltd. v. Raytheon Co.*, IPR2016-00962, Paper 12 (PTAB August 24, 2016); *Perfect World Entm't, Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc., et al.*, IPR2015-01026, Paper 10, (PTAB Aug. 3, 2015); *Fujitsu Semiconductor Limited v. Zond, LLC*, IPR2014-00845, Paper 14 (PTAB Oct. 2, 2014); *Enzymotec Ltd. v. Neptune Technologies & Bioresources, Inc.*, IPR2014-00556, Paper 19 (PTAB Jul. 9, 2014). This is the same situation here, and Petitioner Akorn's Motion for Joinder should be granted, consistent with the Board's "policy preference for joining a party that does not present new issues that might complicate or delay an existing proceeding." *Enzymotec*, IPR2014-00556, Paper 19, at 5; *see also* 157 Cong. Rec. S1376 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl) ("The Office anticipates that joinder will be allowed as of right – if an *inter partes* review is instituted on the basis of a petition, for example, a party that files an *identical petition* will be joined to that proceeding . . .") (emphasis added).

The Board has also routinely granted joinder where, as here, the joining party agrees to an understudy role in the joined proceeding. See, e.g., *Amerigen Pharm. Ltd. v. UCB Pharma GMBH*, IPR2016-01665, slip op. at 4-7 (PTAB December 7, 2016) (Paper No. 26).

Furthermore, the Board has also routinely granted joinder where, as here, the petitioner files its Petition and Motion for Joinder within 30 days of the institution of the trial in the IPR to which joinder is sought. See, e.g., *Samsung Electronics, Co., Ltd. v. Raytheon Co.*, IPR2016-00962, Paper 12 (PTAB August 24, 2016); *Nintendo of Am., Inc., et al. v. Babbage Holdings, LLC*, IPR2015-00568, Paper 12 (PTAB Mar. 18, 2015)).

Accordingly, Petitioner Akorn's Motion for Joinder should be granted, since it is consistent with motions for joinder that have been routinely granted.

## II. RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S ARGUMENT

Patent Owner's sole argument against joinder is an interpretation of 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) and (c) that Patent Owner itself acknowledges has already been addressed and rebuffed by the Board. In particular, Patent Owner argues that Petitioner Akorn's IPR Petition was time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)-(c). See Patent Owner Allergan, Inc.'s Opposition to Motion for Joinder, IPR2017-00594, Paper 8 (February 6, 2017), at 5. Patent Owner acknowledges, however, that its

argument is not one that is consistent with the Board's current position on this issue. *Id.* at FN 1 (“Allergan 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. *See Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn Inc.*, IPR2013-00109, Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2013); *see also Achates Reference Publ'g, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 803 F.3d 652 (Fed. Cir. 2015); 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b).”). Indeed, in *Microsoft* and *Samsung*, the Board granted joinder specifically because the exception to the one-year time bar applied. *Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn Inc.*, IPR2013-00109, Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2013) at 4; *Samsung Electronics, Co., Ltd. v. Raytheon Co.*, IPR2016-00962, Paper 12 (PTAB August 24, 2016) at 4.

Accordingly, there is no disagreement between the parties that the Board, by granting joinder in, for example, *Microsoft* (IPR2013-00109) and *Samsung* (IPR2016-00962), has confirmed that 35 U.S.C. § 315 does not bar joinder in the present instance.

### III. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Petitioner Akorn respectfully requests that the Board grant its Motion for Joinder.

# 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.