

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. IPR2017-00600

Patent No. 8,648,048

---

**MOTION FOR JOINDER**

**Table of Contents**

I. Statement of precise relief requested..... 1

II. Statement of material facts .....2

III. Applicable legal standard .....3

IV. Argument .....4

    A. Joinder is timely .....4

    B. Joinder is appropriate because both IPRs present the same grounds of unpatentability concerning the same claims of the same patent.....4

    C. Joinder is appropriate because the Akorn IPR proposes no additional grounds of unpatentability.....5

    D. Joinder will not impact the existing trial schedule.....6

    E. Joinder will simplify briefing and discovery .....6

V. Conclusion .....7

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....8

**I. STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED**

Petitioner Akorn, Inc. (“Akorn”) requests joinder and/or consolidation of its today-filed Petition (“the Akorn Petition”) for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,048 (“the ‘048 Patent”) (“the Akorn IPR”) with IPR2016-01131, filed June 3, 2016 by Mylan Pharms. Inc. (“the Mylan IPR”). The Mylan IPR was instituted on December 8, 2016. *Mylan Pharm., Inc. v. Allergan, Inc.*, IPR2016-01131, slip op. at 22 (PTAB December 8, 2016) (Paper 8).

The Akorn Petition is substantially the same as the Petition in the Mylan IPR. The Akorn Petition involves the same patent, the same claims, and presents the same grounds of unpatentability, using the same evidence, as the Petition in the Mylan IPR, except where Akorn-specific substitutions were required. The Akorn IPR challenges the claims as anticipated and/or obvious over the same prior art, based on the same arguments, and relies on the same expert, Dr. Mansoor Amiji as the Mylan IPR. Indeed, Mylan has consented to Akorn’s retention of Dr. Amiji for purposes of the Akorn IPRs.

Joinder is appropriate because the Akorn IPR Petitioner will take on a purely understudy role in the Mylan IPR, and thus joinder will not cause any delay in the Mylan IPR trial schedule. Mylan Pharms., Inc., the Petitioner in the Mylan IPR, is

not opposing this joinder, and joinder will not prejudice any of the parties to the Mylan IPR.

## II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

1. On June 3, 2016, Mylan filed a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“the Mylan Petition”) of claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,048. The Mylan IPR was accorded Case No. IPR2016-01131.

2. The Mylan Petition asserted the following grounds of unpatentability:

a. Ground 1: Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 22-23 are obvious under §103 over Ding ’979 and Sall;

b. Ground 2: Claims 11 and 21 are obvious under §103 over Ding ’979, Sall, and Acheampong; and

c. Ground 3: Claim 15 is obvious under §103 over Ding ’979, Sall, and Glonek.

3. On December 8, 2016, the PTAB granted the Mylan Petition on all of the asserted grounds of unpatentability. *Mylan Pharm., Inc. v. Allergan, Inc.*, IPR2016-01131, slip op. at 22 (PTAB December 8, 2016) (Paper 8).

4. Akorn filed a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review on January 6, 2017, Case No. IPR2017-00600, and filed the present Motion for Joinder the same day.

5. The Petition in the Akorn IPR is substantially identical to the Petition in the Mylan IPR and includes substantially the same exhibits and relies on the same expert as the Petition in the Mylan IPR.

### III. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARD

An *inter partes* review may be joined with another *inter partes* review, subject to the provisions 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), which governs joinder of *inter partes* review proceedings:

(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.

As the moving party, Petitioner bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). The PTAB has indicated that a motion for joinder should set forth the reasons joinder is appropriate, identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition, and explain what impact (if

# 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.