

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01317
Patent 8,822,438 B2

Before LORA M. GREEN, RAMA G. ELLURU, and
KRISTINA M. KALAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KALAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Institution of *Inter Partes* Review and Grant of Motion for Joinder

37 C.F.R. § 42.108

37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)

Argentum Pharmaceuticals LLC (“Argentum”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 (the “challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,822,438 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’438 patent”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319. Concurrently with its Petition, Argentum filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3, “Mot.”), seeking to join this case, under 35 U.S.C. § 315(c), with the *inter partes* review in *Amerigen Pharmaceuticals, Ltd. v. Janssen Oncology, Inc.*, Case IPR2016-00286 (“the Amerigen IPR” and Petitioner “Amerigen”), which was instituted on May 31, 2016. *See* IPR2016-00286, slip op. at 19 (PTAB May 31, 2016) (Paper 14) (decision instituting review of claims 1–20 of the ’438 patent).

Patent Owner, Janssen Oncology, Inc. (“Janssen”), filed a Response to the Motion for Joinder (Paper 7, “Resp.”) and a Waiver of Preliminary Response (Paper 8, “Waiver”).

For the reasons set forth below, we conclude that Argentum has shown that its Petition warrants institution of *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 of the ’438 patent. This conclusion is consistent with our institution decision in the Amerigen IPR. *See* IPR2016-00286, Paper 14, 19. Thus, we institute *inter partes* review, grant Argentum’s Motion for Joinder, and exercise our discretion to join Argentum as a Petitioner to the Amerigen IPR. We further terminate the present proceeding, IPR2016-01317.

I. PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

The parties indicate that the ’438 patent is being asserted in a number of district court proceedings. Pet. 1–2; Paper 5, 2–3. In addition, the ’438 patent is the subject of pending *inter partes* review proceedings, including the Amerigen IPR, as noted above, which has been instituted, and IPR2016-01332 and IPR2016-01582, which are pending. Patent Owner also states

that the '438 patent “was the subject of *ex parte* reexamination request No. 90/020,096,” but “will not be granted a filing date for failure to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.501(a).” Paper 5, 2.

In the Amerigen IPR, we instituted *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 of the '438 patent on the same grounds of unpatentability asserted in the present Petition:

References	Basis	Claims Challenged
O'Donnell ¹ and Gerber ²	§ 103	1–20
Barrie ³ and Gerber	§ 103	1–4 and 6–11

Pet 4; Mot. 4; IPR2016-00286, Paper 14, 19.

Argentum supports its assertions with substantially the same evidence and arguments proffered by Amerigen in the Amerigen IPR. Pet. 18–60. The only exception is the declaration of Argentum's expert, Dr. Devalingam Mahalingam (Ex. 1073), which we discuss below. Argentum represents that joinder with the Amerigen IPR is appropriate because Argentum's Petition is limited to the same grounds instituted in the IPR2016-00286 petition. It also relies on the same prior art analysis and expert testimony submitted by Amerigen. Indeed, the Petition is nearly identical with respect to the grounds raised in the

¹ O'Donnell, A. et al., *Hormonal impact of the 17 α -hydroxylase/ C_{17, 20}-lyase inhibitor abiraterone acetate (CB7630) in patients with prostate cancer*, British Journal of Cancer 90:2317–2325 (2004) (“O'Donnell”) (Ex. 1003).

² Gerber, G.S. & Chodak, G.W., *Prostate specific antigen for assessing response to ketoconazole and prednisone in patients with hormone refractory metastatic cancer*, J. Urol. 144:1177–79 (1990) (“Gerber”) (Ex. 1004).

³ U.S. Patent No. 5,604,213 to Barrie, issued February 18, 1997 (“Barrie”) (Ex. 1005).

IPR2016-00286 petition, and does not include any grounds not raised in that petition.

Mot. 4.

We incorporate our analysis from our institution decision in the Amerigen IPR. IPR2016-00286, Paper 14, 4–15. For the same reasons, we determine that Argentum has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it will prevail with respect to its challenge to claims 1–20 of the ’438 patent on the asserted grounds. In view of the identical challenges in the Petition and Patent Owner’s waiver of its Preliminary Response, we institute an *inter partes* review in this proceeding on the same grounds as those on which we instituted trial in IPR2016-00286. We do not institute an *inter partes* review on any other grounds.

II. MOTION FOR JOINDER

In the Motion for Joinder, Argentum seeks joinder “of the concurrently filed Petition with a pending *inter partes* review filed by Amerigen.” Mot. 1. Argentum filed the present Motion on June 29, 2016, within one month of our decision instituting *inter partes* review in IPR2016-00286, which issued on May 31, 2016. *See* IPR2016-00286, Paper 14; Mot. Therefore, the Motion is timely under 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) (“Any request for joinder must be filed, as a motion under § 42.22, no later than one month after the institution date of any *inter partes* review for which joinder is requested.”).

The Board, acting on behalf of the Director, has the discretion to join a party to a pending *inter partes* review where the conditions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) are met. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 315(c); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.4(a) (“The Board institutes the trial on behalf of the Director.”). Specifically, 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) provides:

If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

As the moving party, Argentum bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to the requested relief. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). A motion for joinder should (1) set forth reasons why joinder is appropriate; (2) identify any new grounds of unpatentability asserted in the petition; (3) explain what impact (if any) joinder would have on the trial schedule for the existing review; and (4) address specifically how briefing and discovery may be simplified. *See Kyocera Corp. v. Softview LLC*, Case IPR2013-00004, slip op. at 4 (PTAB Apr. 24, 2013) (Paper 15).

As noted above, we have instituted *inter partes* review of claims 1–20 of the '438 patent in the Amerigen IPR. *See generally* IPR2016–00286, Paper 14. In addition, we determine above that Argentum has filed a Petition that warrants institution of *inter partes* review of the same claims. Accordingly, the conditions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) are satisfied, and we must consider whether to exercise our discretion to join Argentum as a Petitioner to the Amerigen IPR.

In its Motion for Joinder, Argentum asserts that joinder is appropriate “because it will promote efficient and consistent resolution of the validity of a single patent and will not prejudice any of the parties to the Amerigen IPR.” Mot. 2. Argentum represents that (1) joinder is appropriate; (2) no new grounds are presented; (3) joinder will not negatively impact the Amerigen IPR trial schedule; and (4) discovery and briefing can be

simplified, as Argentum will withdraw the declaration of its expert, Dr. Devalingam Mahalingam, if Amerigen allows Argentum to retain the same expert, Dr. Scott Serels. *Id.* at 4–6; *see also* Ex. 2002.

Janssen filed a Response to Argentum’s Motion for Joinder, stating that “Janssen does not oppose Argentum’s motion for joinder.” Resp. 2. Regarding the details of Argentum’s conditions to simplify discovery and briefing, Janssen summarizes that Argentum agrees to (i) rely on the same prior art analysis and expert testimony submitted by Amerigen, withdraw the declaration of Dr. Devalingam Mahalingam, rely solely on the testimony of Dr. Scott Serels, and require no additional depositions; (ii) present only grounds that have been instituted in the Amerigen IPR; (iii) participate in the proceeding in a limited capacity as an understudy, absent termination of Amerigen as a party, and not to extend the trial schedule; (iv) consolidate filings and limit Argentum to no additional filings in its understudy role, as long as Amerigen remains a party; and (v) not submit any separate filings unless it disagrees with Amerigen’s position, in which case it will submit a short separate filing directed only to points of disagreement. *Id.* at 3–4. In view of these representations by Argentum and Amerigen, Janssen states that it “does not oppose Argentum’s Motion for Joinder under the conditions listed above and agrees that judicial economy will be served by joining Argentum to the Amerigen IPR.” *Id.* at 4.

In response to an exchange of correspondence with the Board, Argentum filed a Waiver of Preliminary Response on August 24, 2016, stating that Janssen “elects to waive its Patent Owner Preliminary Response to the Petition for *inter partes* review” but “reserves all rights to submit a Patent Owner Response and/or a Motion to Amend pursuant to 37 C.F.R.

§§ 42.120 and 42.121.” Waiver 1. Janssen specifies that the Waiver does not constitute waiver or admission on the part of Janssen of any material presented in the Petition, or waiver of the arguments that Janssen raised in the Amerigen IPR. *Id.*

We agree with the parties that joinder would be appropriate under the circumstances. Based on the record before us, we institute an *inter partes* review in IPR2016-01317. Because Argentum has satisfied the requirements of § 315(c), we grant Argentum’s motion and join Argentum as a Petitioner to the Amerigen IPR. We further terminate the present proceeding.

As a Petitioner in the Amerigen IPR, Argentum shall adhere to the existing schedule in the Amerigen IPR and abide by Argentum’s representations as to consolidated filings, discovery and testimony, and other conditions detailed in its Motion. Mot. 4–7. Specifically, Argentum shall file a stipulation indicating that it withdraws the declaration of Dr. Devalingam Mahalingam and relies solely on the declaration and testimony of Amerigen’s expert, Dr. Scott Serels. More specifically, all filings by Argentum in the Amerigen IPR shall be consolidated with the filings of Amerigen, unless the filing involves an issue unique to Argentum or states a point of disagreement related to the consolidated filing. In such circumstances, Argentum shall seek authorization from the Board to file a separate paper. The page limits and word counts set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.24 will apply to all consolidated filings.

Argentum is bound by any discovery agreements, including deposition arrangements, between Janssen and Amerigen, and shall not seek any discovery beyond that sought by Amerigen. Janssen shall not be

required to provide any additional discovery or deposition time as a result of joinder.

The Board expects Amerigen and Argentum to resolve any disputes between them and to contact the Board only if such matters cannot be resolved.

IV. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that trial is instituted in IPR2016-01317 as to claims 1–20 of the '438 patent on the following grounds only:

Claims 1–20 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over O'Donnell and Gerber;

Claims 1–4 and 6–11 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Barrie and Gerber;

FURTHER ORDERED that Argentum's Motion for Joinder is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Argentum is joined as a Petitioner in IPR2016-00286;

FURTHER ORDERED that the instant proceeding, IPR2016-01317, is terminated under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72, and all further filings in the joined proceeding shall be made only in IPR2016-00286;

FURTHER ORDERED that the asserted grounds of unpatentability on which a trial was instituted in IPR2016-00286 are unchanged;

FURTHER ORDERED that the current Scheduling Order for IPR2016-00286 (Paper 15, as modified by Paper 22 and Paper 29) shall continue to govern IPR2016-00286;

FURTHER ORDERED that Argentum shall adhere to the existing schedule in the Amerigen IPR;

FURTHER ORDERED that Argentum shall adhere to its representations with respect to consolidated filings, discovery and testimony, and other matters;

FURTHER ORDERED that Argentum shall file a stipulation indicating that it withdraws the declaration of Dr. Devalingam Mahalingam and relies solely on the declaration and testimony of Amerigen's expert, Dr. Scott Serels;

FURTHER ORDERED that Amerigen will file all papers in the joined proceeding jointly on behalf of Amerigen and Argentum, except in the case of motions that do not involve the other party, unless the filing involves an issue unique to Argentum or states a point of disagreement related to the consolidated filing. In such circumstances, Argentum shall seek authorization from the Board to file a separate paper;

FURTHER ORDERED that all page limits and word counts set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.24 will apply to all consolidated filings;

FURTHER ORDERED that the case caption in IPR2016-00286 shall be changed to reflect the joinder of Argentum as a Petitioner in accordance with the attached example; and

FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Decision be entered into the file of IPR2016-00286.

IPR2016-01317
Patent 8,822,438 B2

FOR PETITIONER AMERIGEN:

William Hare
bill@miplaw.com
Gabriela Materassi
materassi@miplaw.com

FOR PETITIONER ARGENTUM:

Teresa Rea
trea@crowell.com
Shannon Lentz
slentz@crowell.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Dianne Elderkin
delderkin@akingump.com
Barbara Mullin
bmullin@akingump.com
Ruben Munoz
rmunoz@akingump.com

Example Case Caption

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMERIGEN PHARMACEUTICALS LIMITED and
ARGENTUM PHARMACEUTICALS LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

JANSSEN ONCOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00286⁴
Patent 8,822,438 B2

⁴ Case IPR2016-01317 has been joined with this proceeding.