

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY  
Petitioner,

v.

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL GMBH  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2018-01425  
U.S. Patent No. 9,890,210

---

**TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL GMBH'S  
OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE**

*Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"*  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Case IPR2018-01425  
Patent No. 9,890,210

Patent Owner, Teva Pharmaceuticals International GmbH ("Teva"), objects under the Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1) to the admissibility of Exhibits 1010, 1011, 1031-1035, 1038-1052, 1055-1057, 1061, 1062, 1064-1077, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1101, 1103-1106, 1136, and 1186-1191 (the "Challenged Evidence"), filed by Petitioner Eli Lilly and Company ("Lilly") on August 8, 2018, with Lilly's Petition for *Inter Partes* Review. Teva's Objections are filed within ten business days of the date of issuance of the Institution of *Inter Partes* Review; therefore, Teva's Objections to Evidence are timely under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1). Teva files these Objections to provide notice to Lilly that Teva may move to exclude the Challenged Evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c), unless cured by Lilly.

## **I. IDENTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR OBJECTIONS**

### **A. Exhibit 1010**

Exhibit 1010 purports to be the "Declaration of Dr. Andrew C. Charles, M.D." Teva objects to paragraphs 26-27, 34, 60-67, 89, 150, and 168-169 in Exhibit 1010 under FRE 402 and FRE 403. Lilly does not cite any of these paragraphs in its Petition, rendering Dr. Charles' testimony in these paragraphs irrelevant under FRE 401. Teva therefore objects to these paragraphs under FRE 402. Teva also objects to these paragraphs under FRE 403 because they have no probative value, create unfair prejudice to Teva, and will only confuse the issues

Case IPR2018-01425  
Patent No. 9,890,210  
and waste the Board's time.

Teva also objects to paragraphs 18-24, 26-28, 34-41, 43-47, 49-51, 62-63, 70, 90, 104, 113-114, 117, 120-121, 130, 134, 136-138, 142, 152-153, and 156-157 of EX1010 because these paragraphs rely on evidence that is inadmissible under FRE 402, 403, 901, 1001(e), and/or 1003. *See infra*.

**B. Exhibit 1011**

Exhibit 1011 purports to be the "Declaration of Dr. Alain P. Vasserot, Ph.D." Teva objects to paragraphs 62-63 and 125-126 in Exhibit 1011 under FRE 402 and FRE 403. Lilly does not cite any of these paragraphs in its Petition, rendering Dr. Vasserot's testimony in these paragraphs irrelevant under FRE 401. Teva therefore objects to these paragraphs under FRE 402. Teva also objects to these paragraphs under FRE 403 because they have no probative value, create unfair prejudice to Teva, and will only confuse the issues and waste the Board's time.

Teva also objects to paragraphs 21-23, 26-28, 30-47, 54-58, 60, 77, 85-86, 88, 90, 93-94, 99-103, 106, 110-112, 115-116, 121 of EX1011 because these paragraphs rely on evidence that is inadmissible under FRE 402, 403, 901, 1001(e), and/or 1003. *See infra*.

**C. Exhibits 1031-1035, 1038-1050, 1052, 1055-1057, 1061, 1062, 1064-1077, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1101, and 1103-1106**

Teva objects to Exhibits 1031-1035, 1038-1050, 1052, 1055-1057, 1061,

Case IPR2018-01425

Patent No. 9,890,210

1062, 1064-1077, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1101, and 1103-1106 as lacking

authentication under FRE 901. In particular, Teva objects to Exhibits 1031-1034, 1038-1050, 1052, 1055-1057, 1061, 1062, 1064-1077, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1101, and 1103-1106 under FRE 901 because Lilly fails to provide sufficient evidence indicating the origin or publication of these documents, and accordingly fails to provide sufficient information regarding their authenticity. Teva further objects to Exhibits 1033, 1035, 1043, 1047, 1050, 1055, and 1074 under FRE 901 because these Exhibits are stamped with a label or other markings not consistent with being the claimed document. Teva further objects to Exhibits 1034, 1040, 1041, 1045, 1046, 1065, 1067, 1074, and 1089 because these Exhibits purport to be published at one date, yet have markings indicating that they were recently downloaded at a later date. Collectively, these Exhibits are inadmissible under FRE 901 because Lilly has failed to provide sufficient evidence indicating the origin of the documents and has not provided sufficient information regarding their authenticity. Further, these Exhibits are not self-authenticating under FRE 902.

Teva also objects to these Exhibits because they are not a "duplicate" as defined by FRE 1001(e) insofar as each exhibit is not "a copy . . . which accurately reproduces the original." Thus, under FRE 1003, these Exhibits are inadmissible because they are not a "duplicate."

Case IPR2018-01425

Patent No. 9,890,210

**D. Exhibit 1051**

Exhibit 1051 purports to be a copy of "Sigma-Aldrich, Biochemicals & Reagents for Life Science Research" catalog. Neither the Petition nor Lilly's experts has established that EX1051 was publicly available before November 14, 2005, the priority date of U.S. Patent No. 9,346,881. Patent Owner therefore objects to Exhibit 1051 as irrelevant under FRE 402 and unfairly prejudicial under FRE 403.

**E. Exhibits 1136 and 1186-1191**

Exhibits 1136 and 1186-1191 purport to be excerpts from the File History of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,597,649 (EX1136) and 9,890,210 (EX1186-1191). Teva objects to these Exhibits under FRE 403 because they are incomplete documents, with only select portions of the whole presented as exhibits. These exhibits are therefore misleading and confusing, and create unfair prejudice to Teva. Teva also objects to these Exhibits under FRE 1002 because as an "excerpt," they are not the original file history document. For the same reason, Teva objects to these Exhibits under FRE 1003 because they are not duplicates of the original file history documents.

# 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.