

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
Patent 9,890,210 B2

**TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL
GMBH'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Exhibit 1287 lacks foundation and should be excluded.	2
II.	Lilly relies upon inadmissible deposition testimony.	7
III.	Multiple exhibits are not relevant and/or prejudicial.	12
IV.	Portions of Exhibits 1010, 1011, 1325, and 1326 are irrelevant, prejudicial, and lack probative value.....	13
V.	Conclusion	15

Teva Pharmaceuticals International GmbH (“Teva”) submits this motion pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.62 and 42.64(c) and in accordance with Due Date 4 of the Scheduling Order (Paper 15). Teva requests exclusion of the entirety of Exhibits 1087, 1110, 1247, 1261, 1262, 1264, 1265, 1267-1279, 1281, 1286, 1287, 1293, 1296, 1311, 1313, 1314, 1316, and 1317, and portions of Exhibits 1010, 1011, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1304, 1325, and 1326. Teva timely objected to all of these exhibits either through written Objections to Evidence or during deposition proceedings.

The Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE) govern the admissibility of evidence in *inter partes* review proceedings. 37 C.F.R. § 42.62. As shown herein, the challenged exhibits contain irrelevant and prejudicial information under FRE 401, 402, and 403, and/or are unauthenticated in violation of FRE 901. Accordingly, the Board should exclude the objected-to exhibits in their entirety for the reasons that follow.

The Board should not dismiss this Motion as moot if the Board does not rely on the inadmissible evidence in reaching its Final Written Decision. Instead, Teva respectfully requests that the Board rule on the motion so that petitioner Eli Lilly and Company (“Lilly”) cannot continue to rely upon the exhibits and paragraphs identified herein on appeal. Not excluding the exhibits would force Teva to address them again, e.g., on appeal, thereby wasting party resources.

I. Exhibit 1287 lacks foundation and should be excluded.

Teva moves to exclude Exhibit 1287 under FRE 901, because Lilly has failed to provide sufficient evidence indicating the origin of the exhibit and has not provided sufficient information regarding its authenticity as a publicly accessible document. Teva objected to Exhibit 1287 in a timely manner (Paper 39, 2-3; EX1303, 176:2-18), and Lilly's efforts to correct the evidentiary deficiencies with supplemental evidence only serve to highlight why Exhibit 1287 should be excluded from this proceeding.

Exhibit 1287 is purported to be the doctoral thesis of Keith Tan from the University of Cambridge. "Whether a reference is publicly accessible is determined on a case-by-case basis based on the 'facts and circumstances surrounding the reference's disclosure to members of the public.'" *Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.*, IPR2014-01126, DI, 9 (citing *In re Lister*, 583 F.3d 1307, 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2009)) (holding that the proponent "provide[d] no competent evidence to show that the library allows public access to the thesis"). For a thesis allegedly found within a library, "[d]etermining public accessibility of a thesis for prior art purposes requires a showing of both shelving and meaningful indexing/cataloging" at that library. *Kayak Software Corp. v. International Business Machines Corp.*, CBM2016-00076, Paper 16, 8 (citing *In re Cronyn*, 890 F.2d 1158, 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Hall*, 781 F.2d 897, 899 (Fed. Cir. 1986);

In re Bayer, 568 F.2d 1357, 1358–59 (CCPA 1978)). Further, evidence relating to public accessibility at a library must be “sufficiently probative of [the] Library’s indexing/cataloging practices” on the asserted prior art date. *Kayak Software*, CBM2016-00076, DI, 8. And if a proponent of evidence provides evidence of *current* library practice, the proponent must then also “provide[] some analysis as to how the [evidence]... could be interpreted as supporting the conclusion that an analogous cataloging system existed [on the asserted prior art date].” *Id.*, 10.

Lilly introduced Exhibit 1287 late in this proceeding, during the deposition of Teva’s expert Dr. Ferrari on August 15, 2019. EX1303, 176:2-18. Teva immediately objected to its use as lacking foundation (among other objections). *Id.* As originally presented to Dr. Ferrari, Exhibit 1287 contained no indication of where the document came from or how it was obtained, no indication of whether it was publicly accessible, and no indication of when (if ever) the document became publicly available before November 14, 2005. *Id.*, 176:2-24. Lilly subsequently filed a version of Exhibit 1287 with Lilly’s Reply (Paper 37) that was allegedly the same as that presented during Dr. Ferrari’s deposition. Teva then renewed its objection to Exhibit 1287 as lacking foundation under FRE 901. Paper 39, 2. After receiving Teva’s renewed objection, Lilly served supplemental evidence on Teva

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.