

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

ALLERGAN, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.,  
AKORN, INC., MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS  
INC., MYLAN INC., and INNOPHARMA, INC.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-1455-WCB

(Consolidated) LEAD CASE

**REDACTED PUBLIC VERSION**

**DEFENDANTS' BRIEF OPPOSING JOINDER OF  
THE SAINT REGIS MOHAWK TRIBE AS A CO-PLAINTIFF**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | BACKGROUND .....   | 2  |
| A.   | The admitted purpose of the transaction is to extend the Tribe’s sovereign immunity to Allergan’s Restasis patent portfolio to derail the IPRs. .... | 2  |
| B.   | The Tribe holds no actual rights; in a simultaneously executed license agreement Allergan took back all substantial and exclusionary rights. ....    | 5  |
| II.  | ARGUMENT .....   | 7  |
| A.   | The assignment to the Tribe should be disregarded as a sham. ....  | 7  |
| 1.   | The Tribe has not been assigned any rights; the transaction is like sham arrangements that have been condemned in other contexts. ....               | 7  |
| 2.   | The lack of valid consideration for the assignment confirms that the transaction is a sham that is injurious to the interests of society. ....       | 12 |
| 3.   | Because the transaction is a sham, joinder of the Tribe under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(c) is not appropriate. ....                         | 14 |
| B.   | Because Allergan retains all substantial rights, the Tribe lacks standing. ....  | 16 |
| 1.   | Each of the <i>Azure</i> factors precludes joinder of the Tribe; Allergan holds all substantial rights and the Tribe lacks exclusionary rights. .... | 18 |
| 2.   | Other provisions confirm that Allergan holds all substantial rights; Allergan’s rights are not actually limited to a “field of use.” ....            | 23 |
| III. | CONCLUSION.....  | 26 |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Cases

*AI23 Sys., Inc. v. Hydro-Quebec*,  
626 F.3d 1213 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....24

*Alfred E. Mann Found. For Sci. Research v. Cochlear Corp.*,  
604 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....16, 18, 22

*Alsaedi v. Alsaedi*,  
177 Misc. 2d 440 (N.Y. Civ. Ct. 1998).....13, 14

*Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Miracle Optics, Inc.*,  
434 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....16, 18

*AsymmetRx, Inc. v. Biocare Med., LLC*,  
582 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....23

*Attorneys Trust v. Videotape Computer Prods., Inc.*,  
93 F.3d 593 (9th Cir. 1996) .....11

*Azure Networks, LLC v. CSR PLC*,  
771 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... *passim*

*Barona Band of Mission Indians v. Yee*,  
528 F.3d 1184 (9th Cir. 2008) .....13

*Coltec Indus., Inc. v. United States*,  
454 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....8

*Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Think Fin., Inc.*,  
2016 WL 183289 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 14, 2016).....10

*Eli Lilly & Co. v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC*,  
435 F. App'x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....24

*FlowRider Surf, Ltd. v. Pac. Surf Designs, Inc.*,  
2017 WL 2349031 (S.D. Cal. May 26, 2017).....21, 23

*Gilead Scis., Inc. v. Merck & Co., Inc.*,  
2016 WL 3143943 (N.D. Cal. June 6, 2016).....7

*Hartman v. Harris*,  
810 F. Supp. 82 (S.D.N.Y. 1992).....12

*Higgins v. Smith*,  
308 U.S. 473 (1940).....8

*In re BP p.l.c. Sec. Litig.*,  
2016 WL 29300 (S.D. Tex. Jan. 4, 2016).....11

*Int’l Gamco, Inc. v. Multimedia Games, Inc.*,  
504 F.3d 1273 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....24

*Keystone Driller Co. v. Gen. Excavator Co.*,  
290 U.S. 240 (1933).....24

*Klamath Strategic Inv. Fund ex rel. St. Croix Ventures v. United States*,  
568 F.3d 537 (5th Cir. 2009) .....8

*Kramer v. Caribbean Mills, Inc.*,  
394 U.S. 823 (1969).....11

*Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Liown Elecs. Co.*,  
2015 WL 11018002 (D. Minn. Apr. 20, 2015).....22

*Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Liown Elecs. Co.*,  
814 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....22

*Matter of Covington Grain Co., Inc.*,  
638 F.2d 1362 (5th Cir. 1981) .....15

*Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*,  
134 S. Ct. 2024 (2014).....9

*Minnesota Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Eco Chem., Inc.*,  
757 F.2d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....15

*Morrow v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
499 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....16, 18

*Otoe-Missouria Tribe of Indians v. N.Y. Dept. of Fin. Servs.*,  
769 F.3d 105 (2d Cir. 2014).....13

*People ex rel. Owen v. Miami Nation Enters.*,  
2 Cal. 5th 222 (2016) .....9, 10, 11, 14

*Propat Int’l Corp. v. Rpost, Inc.*,  
473 F.3d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....22

*Salem Fin., Inc. v. United States*,  
786 F.3d 932 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....8

*Speedplay, Inc. v. Bebob, Inc.*,  
211 F.3d 1245 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....16, 22

*Television Reception Corp. v. Dunbar*,  
426 F.2d 174 (6th Cir. 1970) .....15

*Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation v. Wold Eng’g*,  
476 U.S. 877 (1986).....11

*Torres v. Krueger*,  
596 F. App’x 319 (5th Cir. 2015) .....16

*United States v. Line Material Co.*,  
333 U.S. 287 (1948).....24

*Vaupel Textilmaschinen KG v. Meccanica Euro Italia SPA*,  
944 F.2d 870 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....17, 22, 23

*Village of Upper Nyack v. Christian & Missionary All.*,  
143 Misc. 2d 414 (Sup. Ct. 1988).....13

*Washington v. Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation*,  
447 U.S. 134 (1980).....13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 256.....15

Other Authorities

Blank, Joshua D., & Staudt, Nancy, *Corporate Shams*, 87 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1641 (2012) .....7

Martin, Nathalie, & Schwartz, Joshua, *The Alliance Between Payday Lenders and Tribes: Are Both Tribal Sovereignty and Consumer Protection at Risk?*,  
69 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 751 (2012).....8

Simpson, *Sham Transactions*, Oxford University Press, Chapter 4 (2013).....7

Wright, Miller, & Kane, 7C Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 1958 (3d ed.) .....14

# 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.