

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC. and
DR. REDDY'S LABORATORIES, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

HORIZON PHARMA USA, INC. and NUVO PHARMACEUTICALS
(IRELAND) DESIGNATED ACTIVITY COMPANY,
Patent Owners.

Case IPR2017-01995¹ (Patent 9,220,698 B2)
Case IPR2018-00272 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)
Case IPR2018-01341 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)²

Before TONI R. SCHEINER, MICHELLE N. ANKENBRAND, and
DEBRA L. DENNETT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DENNETT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Revising the Scheduling Order
37 C.F.R. 42.5(c)

¹ Petitioner Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc. ("Dr. Reddy's"), from IPR2018-00894 has been joined as a Petitioner to this proceeding.

² We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in all three cases. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for subsequent papers without Board preapproval.

IPR2017-01995 (Patent 9,220,698 B2)
IPR2018-00272 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)
IPR2018-01341 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)

On January 31, 2019, pursuant to Board order, the parties submitted a joint Proposed Scheduling Order in IPR2017–01995 (“the 1995 IPR”) and IPR2018–00272 (“the 272 IPR”). Paper 62.³ In accordance with our prior guidance, the Proposed Scheduling Order consolidates the schedules for the 1995 IPR and the 272 IPR, and proposes an oral argument date for both proceedings of June 14, 2019. *Id.* at 1–2. The Proposed Scheduling Order also notes that we have not yet determined whether to institute review in IPR2018-01341 (“the 1341 IPR”) or whether to grant Petitioner Dr. Reddy’s motion for joinder to the 272 IPR. *Id.* at 1. However, the parties propose the same dates for the 1341 IPR if we institute review and grant the motion for joinder. *Id.*

After having considered the joint Proposed Scheduling Order, we determine that administering all three proceedings under the same schedule is appropriate in order “to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution” of each proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). Accordingly, we adopt the parties’ proposed revisions to the Scheduling Order in the 1995 IPR and the 272 IPR, with the exception of DUE DATE 3, which we schedule as the due date for Patent Owner’s Sur-reply.⁴ The attached DUE DATE APPENDIX supersedes the DUE DATE APPENDIX attached to the Scheduling Order issued in the 1995 IPR and the 272 IPR (1995 IPR, Paper 19; 272 IPR, Paper 10). Should we institute review and grant the motion for

³ The parties submitted substantively similar papers in each proceeding. Unless otherwise noted, citations are to the papers filed in the 1995 IPR.

⁴ *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, August 2018 Update, 83 Fed. Reg. 39,989 (Aug. 13, 2018) at 14 (explaining that a patent owner sur-reply “essentially replaces the previous practice of filing observations on cross-examination testimony”); 1995 IPR Paper 60, 2–3 n.4.

IPR2017-01995 (Patent 9,220,698 B2)
IPR2018-00272 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)
IPR2018-01341 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)

joinder in the 1341 IPR, the same schedule will apply because granting the joinder motion will join Dr. Reddy's to the 272 IPR and terminate the 1341 IPR.

It is

ORDERED that the 1995 IPR and the 272 IPR shall be administered under a single schedule as reflected in the DUE DATE APPENDIX attached to this Order; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the DUE DATE APPENDIX attached to this Order supersedes the DUE DATE APPENDIX attached to the Scheduling Order issued in each of the 1995 IPR and the 272 IPR.

IPR2017-01995 (Patent 9,220,698 B2)
IPR2018-00272 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)
IPR2018-01341 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)

DUE DATE APPENDIX

- DUE DATE 1 March 1, 2019
Patent owner's response to the petition in the 272 IPR (this date will also apply to Petitioner Dr. Reddy's petition from the 1341 IPR if we institute review and join Dr. Reddy's to the 272 IPR)
- DUE DATE 2 April 26, 2019
Petitioner's reply to patent owner's response to petition
- DUE DATE 3 May 10, 2019
Patent owner's sur-reply to patent owner's response
- DUE DATE 4 May 17, 2019
Motion to exclude evidence
Request for oral argument
- DUE DATE 5 May 24, 2019
Opposition to motion to exclude
- DUE DATE 6 May 31, 2019
Reply to opposition to motion to exclude
Request for prehearing conference
- DUE DATE 7 June 14, 2019
Oral argument (if requested)

IPR2017-01995 (Patent 9,220,698 B2)
IPR2018-00272 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)
IPR2018-01341 (Patent 9,393,208 B2)

PETITIONERS:

Brandon M. White
Emily Greb
Bryan D. Beel
PERKINS COIE LLP
bmwhite@perkinscoie.com
egreb@perkinscoie.com
bmwhite@perkinscoie.com

Alan Pollack
Stuart D. Sender
Louis Weinstein
BUDD LARNER PC
apollack@buddlerner.com
ssender@buddlerner.com
lweinstein@buddlerner.com

PATENT OWNERS:

Thomas A. Blinka
Jonathan G. Graves
Susan Krumplitsch
Ellen Scordino
Lauren Krickl
COOLEY LLP
tblinka@cooley.com
jgraves@cooley.com
skrumplitsch@cooley.com
escordino@cooley.com
lkrickl@cooley.com

Margaret J. Sampson
Stephen M. Hash
Jeffrey S. Gritton
BAKER BOTTS LLP
Margaret.Sampson@bakerbotts.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.