

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 IPR2018-01426
U.S. Patent No. 9,890,211

**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 IPR2018-01426
Patent No. 9,890,211

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 1012, 1013, 1031-1035, 1038-1052, 1055-1057, 1061, 1062, 1064-1078, 1084-1090, 1095, 1101, 1103-1126, 1136, 1142, and 1196-1202 (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 1012

Exhibit 1012 purports to be the "Declaration of Dr. Andrew C. Charles, M.D." Teva objects to paragraphs 26-27, 60-67, 90, 160, and 183-184 in Exhibit 1012 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 and waste the

Board's time.

Teva also objects to paragraphs 18-24, 26-28, 34-40, 43-47, 49-51, 62-63, 70, 91, 105, 114-115, 118, 121-122, 128, 136, 140, 142-144, 148-152, 162-163, 167-168, and 171-172 of EX1012 because these paragraphs rely on evidence that is inadmissible under FRE 402, 403, 901, 1001(e), and/or 1003. *See infra*.

B. Exhibit 1013

Exhibit 1013 purports to be the "Declaration of Dr. Alain P. Vasserot, Ph.D." Teva objects to paragraphs 74-75, 132, 135, and 153-154 in Exhibit 1013 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 22-24, 27-29, 31-48, 56-59, 67-69, 70, 72, 90, 98-99, 103-104, 106, 108, 110-111, 116-119, 122-123, 126, 128, 130, 134, 138-140, 143-144, and 149 of EX1013 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, 1064-1078, 1084-1090, 1095, 1101, 1103-1126, and 1142

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

Case IPR2018-01426

Patent No. 9,890,211

1062, 1064-1077, 1083-1090, 1095, 1101, 1103-1126, and 1142 as lacking authentication under FRE 901. In particular, Teva objects to Exhibits 1031-1034, 1038-1050, 1052, 1055-1057, 1061, 1062, 1064-1078, 1084-1090, 1095, 1101, 1103-1126, and 1142 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, 1074, and 1117 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, 1078, 1089, 1107, 1109, and 1123 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."

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 1196-1202

Exhibits 1136 and 1196-1202 purport to be excerpts from the File History of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,597,649 (EX1136) and 9,890,211 (EX1196-1202). 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.