

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MYLAN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NOVEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00174
Patent 9,730,900 B2

Before JAMES T. MOORE, SUSAN L. C. MITCHELL, and KRISTI L. R.
SAWERT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SAWERT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Joint Motion to Terminate Proceeding
35 U.S.C. § 317; 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72, 42.74

On September 5, 2018, Mylan Technologies, Inc. (“Petitioner”) and Noven Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a joint motion to terminate this proceeding pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. Paper 11 (“Motion” or “Mot.”). The motion was accompanied by a true, unredacted copy of a binding settlement term sheet (Ex. 2024), and a joint request to treat the binding settlement term sheet as business confidential information, to be kept separate from the patent file, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) (Paper 12).

The parties represent in their joint motion that they “have settled their dispute and executed a binding term sheet to terminate th[is] *inter partes* review[.]” Mot. 1. The parties state that the binding settlement term sheet “reflects all essential terms of a settlement agreement between the [p]arties.” *Id.* at 2. Additionally, the parties state that they have filed identical motions to terminate the related *inter partes* review proceedings IPR2018-00173 and IPR2018-01119, and that the related district court case between the parties, *Noven Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Mylan Technologies Inc.*, 1:17-cv-01777 (D. Del.), and related Federal Circuit Appeal No. 18-2287, have been dismissed. *Id.* at n.1, 3–4.

The Board generally expects that a case “will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits.” Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,768 (Aug. 14, 2012); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. We entered a Decision denying institution of *inter partes* review in this case on June 12, 2018 (Paper 8), and Petitioner timely filed a request for rehearing on July 12, 2018 (Paper 9). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). No order on whether to rehear the Board’s Decision denying institution, however, has been issued. Under the

circumstances presented here, therefore, we determine that it is appropriate to terminate this proceeding with respect to both Petitioner and Patent Owner. Accordingly, we dismiss Petitioner's request for rehearing as moot and grant the parties' joint motion to terminate.

We also determine that the parties have complied with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) to have the binding settlement term sheet treated as business confidential information and kept separate from the files of the patent at issue in this proceeding. Thus, we grant the Joint Request to treat the binding settlement term sheet as business confidential.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the joint motion to terminate the proceeding is GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that the joint request to treat the parties' binding settlement term sheet as business confidential information, to be kept separate from the patent file, is GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's request for rehearing is DISMISSED as moot; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the instant proceeding is TERMINATED.

IPR2018-00174
Patent 9,730,900 B2

PETITIONER:

Steven W. Parmelee
sparmelee@wsgr.com

Michael T. Rosato
mrosato@wsgr.com

Jad A. Mills
jmills@wsgr.com

PATENT OWNER:

Courtenay C. Brinckerhoff
cbrinckerhoff@foley.com

Jason N. Mock
jmock@foley.com